



From Sykes-Picot to Present; The Centenary Aim of The Zionism on Syria and Iraq

Ergenekon SAVRUN¹

Özet

Over the past hundred years, much of the Middle East was arranged by Sir Mark Sykes and François Georges Picot. During the World War I Allied Powers dominated Syria by the treaty of Sykes-Picot which was made between England and France. After the Great War Allied Powers (England-France) occupied Syria, Palestine, Iraq or all Al Jazeera and made them mandate. As the Arab World and Syria in particular is in turmoil, it has become fashionable of late to hold the 1916 Sykes-Picot Agreement responsible for the current storm surge. On the other hand, Theodor Herzl, the father of political Zionism, published a star-eyed novel entitled Altneuland (Old-New Land) in 1902. Soon after The Britain has become the biggest supporter of the Jews, but The Britain had to occupy the Ottoman Empire's lands first with some allies, and so did it. The Allied Powers defeated Germany and Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, the gamble paid off in the short term for Britain and Jews. In May 14, 1948 Israel was established. Since that day Israel has expanded its borders. Today, new opportunity is Syria just standing in front of Israel. We think that Israel will fill the headless body gap with Syrian and Iraqis Kurds with the support of Western World. In this article, we will emerge and try to explain this idea.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sykes-Picot Agreement, Syria-Iraq Issue, Zionism, Isreal and Kurds' Relation.

Sykes-Picot'dan Günümüze; Suriye ve Irak Üzerinde Siyonizm'in Yüz Yıllık Hedefleri

Abstract

Geçtiğimiz son yüzyılda, Orta Doğu'nun birçok bölümü Sir Mark Sykes ve François Georges Picot tarafından tanzim edildi. Birinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında İngiltere ve Fransa tarafından hazırlanan Sykes-Picot Antlaşması ile müttefikler Suriye'ye hâkim oldular. Büyük Savaş sonrasında müttefik güçler (İngiltere-Fransa) bugün ki Suriye'yi, Filistin'i, Irak'ı ya da El Cezire'yi işgal etti ve sömürgeleştirdi. Arap Dünyası ve özellikle Suriye kargaşası içinde olduğundan mevcut fırtına dalgalanmasından 1916 Sykes-Picot Antlaşmasının sorumluluğunu üstlenmek modası geçti. Öte yandan, siyasal Siyonizm'in babası Theodor Herzl 1902'de Eski-Yeni Toprak adında bir eser yayınladı. Bir müddet sonra, İngiltere Yahudilerin en büyük destekçisi oldu ancak İngiltere'nin bunu eyleme dökmesi için öncelikle Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun topraklarını müttefikleri ile işgal etmesi gerektiği ve yaptı da. Müttefik İtilaf Devletleri Almanya ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun yenilgiye uğrattı. Yine de bu kumar hesabı kısa vadede İngiltere ve Yahudilere ödenmişti. 1948'in 14 Mayıs'ında İsrail Devleti kuruldu. O günden beri de İsrail sınırlarını genişletmektedir. Bugün ise, İsrail'in önünde Suriye yeni bir fırsat olarak durmaktadır. İsrail'in Batı Dünyası'nın desteği ile Suriye ve Irak Kürtleri ile başsız vucüt gibi duran bu boşluğu doldurmak istediğini düşünüyoruz. Bu makalemizde de bu fikri açıklamaya çalışacağız.

Keywords: Sykes-Picot Antlaşması, Suriye-Irak Sorunu, Siyonizm, İsrail ve Kürt İlişkileri

Introduction

¹ Yrd. Doç. Dr., Ufuk Üniversitesi, İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi Ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, E-mail:ergenekonsavrun@gmail.com

As its known that as a region the Middle East comprises Arab Peninsula, North Africa, Western Asia and Mesopotamia. The term is Eurocentric and used in opposition to the Far East. The history of the Middle East dates back to ancient times, and throughout its history, the Middle East has been a major center of world affairs. In very real terms, history began in the Middle East because that is where writing started. The territory of the Middle East is also the origin of monotheistic religions like Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. However, the rise of European Empires and the modern rise of nationalism have led to violent struggles for power and independence throughout the Middle East, which also suffers from the history of a negative reputation in Europe. Generally speaking, the Middle East has an arid and hot climate. The region is dominated by flat deserts, grassy plains, hills and several mountain ranges. Because of relatively low rainfall, its major rivers are of vital importance. The Middle East remains economically, politically, culturally and religiously sensitive region. (internet 1) Since the Middle East is home to some of the world's earliest civilizations, it is difficult to choose a starting point for examining its political history, for no matter how far back the investigator searches, there still seem to be deeper layers of historical and political developments that influenced the course of later events (Kamrava, 2005, p.9). We mentioned above that Middle East is the origin of the divine religions, but unquestionably Islam as both a system of beliefs and a historical-political phenomenon has distinctively marked the Middle East, and its rise and evolution created dynamics that continue to shape the destiny of nations today. The rise, evolution, and spread of Islam in the seventh century A.D. were greatly influenced by the geography of the region in which it was born. Islam is not unique in this respect, for any religious or political phenomenon is shaped and influenced by its geographic circumstances. It then traces Middle Eastern history from the birth and expansion of Islam to the rise of the Ottomans and, after nearly five centuries, their ultimate collapse and replacement by European colonial Powers (Kamrava, 2005, p.9).

On the other hand, geographically the Middle East is not comprised of one homogenous group of peoples. There are several ethnic groups in there. After this brief explanation we will refer to the Ottoman period in the Middle East.

Ottoman Period in the Middle East

No doubt Ottoman Turks ruled Middle East more than 400 years, but the Turks occurred here nearly a thousand year. The Turks were known for the two long braids they wore down their backs, and were dedicated horse warriors who used archers with deadly effect. Driving massed arrow fire into ranks of opponents, then turning and regrouping safely out of range of

a response, the Turks would fire and retreat repeatedly until their enemies were so decimated that their archers would finally close and finish their enemies with short swords. The Turks conquered most of the eastern Abbasid Caliphate and ultimately drove all the way to the Mediterranean before they stalled. However, Selchuk Sultan Tuğrul Beg was the beneficiary of these campaigns; the Arabs would never again control the vital heartland of Mesopotamia.

Afterwards these territories were in contention between the Muslim Turks, the Crusaders, the Mongols and some other ethnic groups during the mediaeval. Then another Turkic state the Mamelukes dominated here till 1517. Ottoman Sultan Yavuz (Inexorable) Selim I conquered first Syria with the Battle of Mercidabik in 1516, and then entered Egypt after the Battle of Ridaniye in 1517.

Selim I “the Inexorable” (1512-1520) transformed the Ottoman Empire from a ghazi state on the western fringe of the Muslim world into the greatest empire since the early caliphate. Equipped with firearms and highly disciplined, Selim’s forces routed the Safavids at Chaldiran in 1514 and even entered their capital, Tabriz, before withdrawing from Azerbaijan. Two years later they defeated the Mamluks and took over their vast empire. As the new masters of Syria, Egypt, and the Hijaz, the Ottomans now ruled the heartland of Arab Islam. The Ottoman capture of Cairo made Selim the most prestigious ruler in the Muslim world as he took over the caliphate from the Mamluks’ puppet Abbasid caliph or so the Ottomans would later claim. Islam’s holy cities, Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, also came under Ottoman rule (Goldschmit, Davidson, 2010, p.136).

Suleyman “the Lawgiver” or “the Magnificent” (1520-1566) had no living brothers to challenge his succession to Selim. Seen as the greatest of the Ottoman sultans by Turks and Westerners alike, Suleyman headed the forces that took Rhodes and Belgrade, defeated the Hungarians, besieged Vienna, captured most of the North African coast, drove Portugal’s navy from the Red Sea, and twice defeated the Safavids. He revamped the Ottoman Empire’s government and laws. Regrettably, though, he delegated too many of his functions to his viziers. Late in life he fell under the influence of his favorite wife, who caused him to have one of his sons (by another wife) killed and another exiled, thus leaving the throne to her son, Selim II “the Sot” (1566-1574). Few of the remaining sultans would match the quality of the first ten.

You may have inferred that the power and the glory of the Ottoman Empire stemmed from the personalities and policies of those first ten sultans. Rarely in history has one state enjoyed

such a succession of just and brave rulers for almost three centuries. No doubt the Ottoman Empire owed some of its strength to these capable sultans, who learned the principles of government from their fathers during their on-the-job training in the provinces. They gained power by competing against their brothers, and usually the best man won. To avoid costly power struggles, they established a rule that the man who succeeded to the sultanate should have all his brothers put to death. They let no religious prejudices stop them from using the administrative (and sometimes even the military and naval) skills of their Anatolian and Balkan Christian subjects to benefit the Ottoman Empire. When rival factions arose in the army and the bureaucracy, they kept them balanced and thus under control.

“No distinction is attached to birth among the Turks,” wrote a sixteenth-century envoy from the Habsburg Empire:

The deference to be paid to a man is measured by the position he holds in the public service. There is no fighting for precedence; a man’s place is marked out by the duties he discharges. In making his appointments the sultan pays no regard to any pretensions... of wealth or rank, nor does he take into consideration recommendations of popularity; he considers each case on its own merits, and looks carefully into the character, ability, and disposition of the man whose promotion is in question. Among the Turks, therefore, honors, high posts, and judgeships are the rewards of great ability and good services (Goldschmit, Davidson, 2010, p.136-137).

No doubt this period was zenith for the Ottoman Empires, and ofcourse for Middle East till 19th century.

Fisrt Encounter of the Jews and the Ottoman Turks

The Ottoman Empire housed the majority of the world’s Jews for most of the medieval period, and the Jewish communities of the Islamic world were responsible for many of the institutions, (Rustow, 2013, p.75.) but as its known most of the Jews came as an exiled to the Ottoman lands from Iberia. The Jewish communities of al-Andalus the part of the Iberian Peninsula under Muslim rule were particularly illustrious between the reign of the Umayyad caliph of Cordova ‘Abd al- Rahman III (912–961) and the Almohad takeover after 1140. No other medieval Jewish community had so many high-ranking personalities in the political and economic spheres; no other produced a literary culture of such breadth, revealing an intellectual life shared with the Muslims. That blossoming was all the more unexpected in that the Jews of Hispania had lived in great social and legal insecurity during the time of

the Spanish Inquisition in 15th century (Arenal, 2013, p.111.). There were more than 300.000 Jews at that time who lived in Iberia. But the eventual reports of the Inquisitors severely alarmed the Spanish monarchs, who took their religious responsibilities very seriously. The Inquisitors made a special target of those conversos who served the court, and in one of the first trials they conducted, in 1481 in Seville, dozens of members of the most prominent conversos families were burned at the stake. During the 1480s the Inquisition introduced a policy of partial expulsions that were designed to separate the Jews from the conversos. The first expulsions were from Seville, Córdoba, and Cádiz in 1484, and expulsions from Zaragoza and Teruel quickly followed. (internet 2) As it will remember similar pressures applied on the Iberia Muslims by Spanish Inquisitors.

But the tipping point for the Jews' remaining in Spain came in 1490 when a charge of blood libel (the episode of the *Santo Niño*, the Holy Child) arose in La Guardia, a community near Toledo, and confessions were extracted from tortured Jews and *conversos* that they had crucified a Christian child and were plotting to overthrow Christianity. No evidence was presented during the trial and there actually was no missing child; furthermore, a plot involving the overthrow of Christianity was a ludicrous idea, but despite this, those defendants who had survived a year of torture were convicted and executed and the townspeople became filled with such anti-Jewish passion that rioting was barely averted. At the beginning of 1492, with the conquest of Granada complete, the stage was now set for the decision about the fate of Iberia's Jews.

Not much is known about the composition of the Charter of Expulsion (Alhambra decree of expulsion) Scholars assume it was written in late January of 1492, because it was about this time that Senor and Abrabanel began to try to influence the king and queen to revoke the decree before its publication. Abrabanel wrote that he met three times with the king to plead for the Jews. There are other reports that a substantial bribe was offered, but the royal couple was firm in their resolve. The decree was dated March 31 but wasn't made public for a month; the original effective date was July 31 but was delayed two days to wait for Tish'a b'Av to pass the sole concession that Abrabanel was able to obtain.

The difficulties for the Jews in disposing of their property and selecting a destination country, let alone finding the means to travel, were monumental. Not only were they at a considerable disadvantage in selling their property, they were prohibited from leaving Spain with any funds in the form of precious metals, coinage, or jewels. All negotiable assets were to be forfeited to the crown. And any Jew within the borders of Aragon or Castile on the effective date of

expulsion would be forced to convert or be killed. England and France were closed as was virtually all of Italy. Most German city-states had expelled their Jews during the Black Death plague. Portugal and the tiny independent kingdom of Navarre were possibilities, but these countries, closely allied with Avalon-Castile, were uncertain; they actually only provided a few years' respite.

North Africa, the Balkans, and the near East were the best available choices, but traveling there put the exiles into the hands of rapacious ship-captains who were as likely to kill the passengers or sell them into slavery as to deliver them to their destinations. Many sources cite the number of Jews expelled from Castile and Aragon as greater than 150,000; but Aragon's Jewish population was far smaller than Castile's, and probably numbered only about 6,000 families. However, the population numbers given in various early sources vary greatly. Also, the total number of *conversos* over the history of the Jews in Spain must be significantly greater than reported by historians given the results of genetic testing mentioned at the beginning of this article: these tests show that about 20 percent of the Spanish male population has a direct patrilineal descent from Sephardic Jews.

For the expelled Jews, two countries offered the most hope for sanctuary one from a most unlikely source. Pope Innocent VIII, pope from 1484 to 1492, was strongly opposed to the practices of the Spanish Inquisition and the extreme methods used by the Dominicans to examine and convict *conversos*. His successor, Pope Alexander VI, appeared to be also sympathetic to the Jews' plight and opened the Papal States to Jewish immigrants (this sympathy of the papacy lasted only some eighty years; Jews were expelled from the Papal States in 1569).

The other region of refuge lay farther East. In the early fifteenth century the Ottoman Turks invaded the Byzantine Empire and in the 1440's began a siege of Constantinople. The capital city fell in 1453 with many of its residents having died of starvation and disease. The Ottoman rulers needed people to repopulate the city; the Byzantine Greeks were not an option because of strong mutual hatred. So the Ottomans relocated the populations of a large number of Jewish communities into Constantinople now renamed Istanbul. The Jewish population of the city immediately went from zero to over ten percent. Jews leaving Spain were welcome in the Ottoman Empire and as a result of the Spanish expulsion, Istanbul's Jewish population swelled almost eightfold. Sultan Bayazid II, the Ottoman ruler, was said to have remarked that "the Catholic monarch Ferdinand was wrongly considered as wise, since he impoverished Spain by the expulsion of the Jews, and enriched Turkey."

Regardless of the potential sanctuaries in the east, many thousands of Jews lost their lives in leaving Spain, thousands wound up as slaves, many thousands were forced to convert, while the lucky ones who were able to find a place of refuge had to pay sizable bribes. The Jews who were able to find refuge in Portugal after payment of a stiff royalty soon learned that their safety would only be temporary. In 1497, those Jews were given an expulsion decree but it had a cruel twist. The expulsion was a ruse to assemble the Jews at ports, but no vessels were waiting for their transport. Instead, once assembled they were converted en masse and many of their children were seized and converted and given for adoption. The Jews who had sought refuge in Navarre were also forcibly converted in 1498 at the insistence of Ferdinand and Isabella. This was the end of the open presence of Jews in a land that had been occupied by their ancestors for at least 1500 years (internet 3).

Jews had a superior place in trade between Ottoman Empire and Western Europe in 15th century. They owned most of the trade capital and money. Ottomans followed a typical Middle Eastern trade policy which was applied before them. It was to protect the rich merchants and to welcome them in their country so the state could be rich. Thus Sultan Bayazid II accepted the Iberian Jews whom were exiled from Spain in 1492, and placed them in to the some major trade ports and cities like Istanbul, Avlona and Thessaloniki (İnalçık, 2017, p.282).

Later on from the first decades of 17th century on, the harmony and mutual trust that had existed between the Muslims and non-Muslims was upset partly because of heavier taxation and widespread abuses of the local authorities, and partly because of the growing tendency among the Christian *re'aya* to cooperate with the crusading plans of Christendom. It is interesting to observe that while Muslims and non-Muslims used to belong to and work together in the same crafts in the earlier period, they now tended to have their own separate craft guilds. This is also the period in which the Catholic missions settled and extended their activities in the Ottoman Empire. In the 18th century growing commercial and cultural ties between Europe and the non-Muslims of the Ottoman Empire and the rise of national movements in the Balkans in the following century threw the Islamic set-up of the Empire into disorder. Ottoman efforts to create a new kind of loyalty among the non-Muslims populations by furthering idea of Ottomanism, that is equality before the law of all Ottoman subjects, as a kind of secularized state, did not take root. These developments, however, made a strong impact on the Muslim-Turkish society itself and prepared the way for the rise of the secular national state of the Turks against the old consecutives. (İnacık, 2016, p.210.)

Impacts of the European Powers on the Ottoman Territories in 19th and 20th Centuries

“19th century was the longest century for the Turkish Empire” says İlber Ortaylı. (Ortaylı, yıl, p.1) He is so right to say that because Ottoman Empire lost its deluxe power and days. Some parts of the Balkans, Caucasus, Crimes and North Africa were already lost. British Empire was leading the century and it was followed by France, Russia and Germany. These empires were also rivals against each other. Regrettably, the Crimean War (1853-1856) and Russo-Ottoman War (1877-1878) were the milestone for the Ottoman Empire. Maybe Turks won Crimean War, but debt to Europe was not really payable, and the Russian Empire did not digest this defeat. The war of 1853–56, known as the Crimean War, began after the Russian emperor Nicholas I tried to obtain further concessions from Turkey. Great Britain and France entered the conflict on Turkey’s side in 1854, however, and the Treaty of Paris (March 30, 1856) that ended the war was a serious diplomatic setback for Russia, though involving few territorial concessions. Twentyone years later declared a war against the Turks in the Balkans and Caucasus. As a result of this war, Russia was able to extend its European frontiers southward to the Black Sea, southwestward to the Danube River, and south of the Caucasus Mountains in Asia.

The last Russo-Turkish War (1877–78) was also the most important one. In 1877 Russia and its ally Serbia came to the aid of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Bulgaria in their rebellions against Turkish rule. The Russians attacked through Bulgaria, and after successfully concluding the Siege of Pleven they advanced into Thrace, taking Adrianople (Edirne) in January 1878. In March of that year Russia concluded the Treaty of San Stefano with Turkey. This treaty freed Romania, Serbia, and Montenegro from Turkish rule, gave autonomy to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and created a huge autonomous Bulgaria under Russian protection. Britain and Austria-Hungary, alarmed by the Russian gains contained in the treaty, compelled Russia to accept the Treaty of Berlin (July 1878), whereby Russia’s military-political gains from the war were severely restricted (Britanica, 1970, p.829-830).

On the other hand, the route to India had made security in the eastern Mediterranean, especially against Russia, a long-standing British preoccupation. Between 1854 and 1856 the British and French, with some assistance from Piedmont-Sardinia, had sent substantial fleets and armies to prop up Turkey. The Crimean War had a complex series of causes, but the root one was Russian aggrandizement against the sprawling and feeble Ottoman Empire. The performance of Britain and France, the two most advanced European nations, against backward Russia was disappointing and in certain respects inept, although the supply by sea

of large armies at a considerable distance created new problems. The newspaper reporting by telegraph of the hardships of the troops starkly illustrated the problems and the paradox of war-making by a liberal state, and Florence Nightingale made a name for herself as the “lady with the lamp”. The immobility of the campaign, which consisted largely of a series of sieges, bloodily resolved in the Crimea and in the area of Kars in Asiatic Turkey, looked forward to the 1914-1918 war. Turkey was successfully defended, and the British thus shored up the Ottoman Empire of which Egypt was a part.

The hope was that Turkey would reform and behave like a modern, liberal state. This hope was not fulfilled. By the 1870s, Turkey was again disintegrating, and under attack from Russia. The Disraeli government of 1874-1870 continued the Crimean policy of defending Turkish integrity. The Liberal opposition under Gladstone argued that this was no longer feasible and supported the division of much of ‘Turkey in Europe’ into separate, Christian states. The ‘Concert of Europe’ present at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 reached agreement on this and Disraeli returned to London bringing ‘peace without honour’ what Gladstone’s and his party said, and the imperial gain of the island of Cyprus, thought to be of strategic importance for the Eastern Mediterranean, but in fact useless as a naval base (Morgan, 2009, p.506-507). As we see Ottoman Empire were being lonely in European state system even worse British Empire’s next government Gladstone thought that Turkey should divided.

Oil and the Turmoil of the Middle East

“Diplomats had simply assumed, for the first but not for the last time, that state building was possible.” (Ottaway, 2015, p.4).

Oil was found at Masjed Soleyman in southwestern Iran on May 26, 1908, and three years later was piped down to a newly built refinery at Abadan on the Iranian side of the Shatt alrab, not many miles below Basra. Its global importance was immediately recognized, not just by the Admiralty in London, looking for new sources of supply for its oil fired battleships, but in other European capitals as well leading to a brief British-German-Turkish skirmish for control of the pipeline at the start of World War I.

Oil also played and imported role in the struggle after the war over the future of the Ottoman province of Mosul, where a large oil field was eventually discovered in 1927 at Baba Gargur near Kirkuk in the new, British mandated Iraq. Oil was next found in the Persian Gulf. The story of the discovery, exploitation, and importance of Middle Eastern oil has been told in many different ways, and from many different points of view. For some it has been a source

of Western triumphalism as in the case of the Aramco story, in which brave Texas pioneers conquer the world's last oil frontier. For others, like the Arab novelist Abd al-Rahman Munif, it is a tale of woe, as the lives of nomadic people are disrupted by the appearance of prisons and exploitative local officials. For still others, it amounts to a local success story, where in the embryonic nation states of the Gulf learn to challenge Western oil companies in such a way as to force them both pay more for the oil (Owen, 2008, p.1).

From Eastern Question to the First World War

In the Near East, the perennial breeding ground of international curses, a new threat to regional stability and to the peace of Europe emerged in the late nineteenth century with the rise of yet another movement (Rich, 1992, p.329). In the overall international picture, the greatest significance of the Tripolitanian War was its impact on the Balkans. All the Balkan states with the exception of Romania bordered on the Ottoman Empire, and all were eager to seize the lands adjacent to their own (Rich, 1992, p.425).

This time within in the holy and oil reserve lands of the Ottoman Empire where was today's Jerusalem, Syria, Iraq and all other Arab lands. Ottoman Empire struggled against the Europe's Great Powers. Just a few years before the Great War 1, they first fought against the Italians in Tripoli, and second big Balkan defeat against its old consecutives.

There is no doubt that Austria wanted to exploit the general horror aroused by the assassination of Francis Ferdinand and Sophie throughout Europe to take punitive action against Serbia (Rich, 1992, p.440). Maybe we may heard this cliché sentence above. Children in schoolage could give an answer if they asked why First World War started? But what is actually happening is different.

The availability or lack of oil profoundly influenced international affairs throughout the twentieth century. Although most scholars understand that oil played a significant role in many of the great power contests of the last century, they do not always grasp the how and why. This is particularly the case when it comes to the two global conflicts of the first half of the twentieth century, the world wars, not to mention the volatile interwar period. The evolution of oil from a purely commercial product into a strategic commodity began in 1912, when the Royal Navy shifted to burning oil rather than coal for fuel. Although the contribution of oil to the outcome of the First World War was marginal, after 1918, policymakers around the world understood that ample and secure supplies of oil were a necessary if not sufficient prerequisite for both economic prosperity and national security.

During the Second World War, oil played a vital role not only by facilitating or hindering military operations, but also as an object of grand strategy. The increasing mechanization of warfare played to the strengths of the Allies, whose massive economic and industrial superiority over the Axis was complemented by ample and relatively secure supplies of oil. Control of major oil reserves, most notably those of the Middle East, also figured prominently in the war aims of both the Allied and Axis powers (Toprani, 2012, p.1). To be sure, oil did once have a special strategic military significance. The decision just before World War I to convert the British Navy from coal to oil enhanced the naval superiority of the allied powers. Internal combustion engines also played an important role on land toward the end of World War I. (Singer, 2008, p.1) No other element has shaped the history of the past 100 years so much as the fight to secure and control the world's reserves of petroleum. Too little is understood of how political and economic power around the raw material, petroleum, has been shaped by interests principally under the control of two nations the United Kingdom and, later, the United States of America. (Engdahl, 2004, p.1) British secret intelligence services at this time also evolved in an unusual manner. Unlike the empires of France or other nations, Britain modelled its post-Waterloo empire on an extremely sophisticated marriage between top bankers and financiers of the City of London, government cabinet ministers, heads of key industrial companies deemed strategic to the national interest, and the heads of the espionage services (Engdahl, 2004, p.7-8).

On the other hand, Growing divergence after 1873 between the depressed economy of the British Empire and the emerging industrial economies of Continental Europe, above all the German Reich, created the background to the outbreak in 1914 of the Great War. The role of petroleum in this conflict had already become central, though to a degree that few outside a tiny elite of London and New York bankers and financiers realized until years later (Engdahl, 2004, p.11). Great Britain fought the First World War largely with oil imports from the United States, which was a painful reversal of fortune for a nation that had enjoyed energy independence during the Age of Coal. Since domestic oil production was miniscule, with little likelihood of any change in the near future, Britain had no choice but to import oil. 1 But even if imports were indispensable, Britain could still try to avoid relying upon sources of oil controlled by rival powers. The most important question after 1918 was whether Britain could acquire control of supplies of foreign oil on its own terms and maintain access to them without recourse to the military and economic power of the United States or any other great power. Most importantly, British oil companies would be supplied largely from oilfields in a

region under British political, military, and economic control. For a country that lived and died on its access to imports, this was as close to energy independence as Britain was ever going to get (Toprani, 2012, p.31-33.).

For the Turks; The Ottoman Empire's entry into the First World War, as a result of a complex web of secret alliances between the European powers, can be characterised as part of the European origins of the war. But, just like the involvement of all other European empires, it meant that parts of the world well beyond Europe were drawn into the conflict. The Ottoman army just under three million conscripts of Turkish, fought the British in Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Mesopotamia (modern-day Iraq) and Persia (today's Iran). Of all these encounters, the defeat against Ottoman forces at Gallipoli in particular has made a lasting impression on Britain, as well as Australia and New Zealand due to the heavy losses they incurred. It is also remembered as one of the most significant battles of the conflict in Turkey. Overall, the total number of combatant casualties in the Ottoman forces amounts to just under half of all those mobilised to fight. Of these, more than 800,000 were killed.

When the war ended for some countries in 1918-19, it did not for Turkey: the First World War led straight into the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923). This, together with the secret wartime agreements between the British and the French to divide up the Ottoman territory amongst themselves, sealed the fall of this formerly formidable empire, and led to the creation of the Turkish republic reduced primarily to the former empire's Anatolian heartland under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Turkish collective memory of this period is coloured by these events. It lost its status amongst the great empires and, with it to some extent, its role in Europe. And it felt betrayed by the British who had, during the war, formed secret alliances with Ottoman Arabs to stir up revolts against their Turkish imperial rulers and entered into the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement in 1916 with the French, to take control of much of the empire's former territory (internet 4).

Ottoman Army fought bravely in every battlefield on unequal conditions, and They won some of the battles, but at the end Turks' empire lost the Great War. Nothing will be like the rest now especially in the Middle East as we will mention in further writings.

Road of the Zionist Israel: Sykes-Picot Agreement and Balfour Declaration

Sir Mark Sykes (1873-1919), a distinguished British orientalist, and Charles Georges-Picot, formerly French Consul in Beirut, prepared a draft agreement in 1915-1916 about the post-war division of the Middle East, which was also approved in principle by Russia.

Persuant to the 1916 agreement, arbitrary borders were drawn that grouped adverse ethnic groups and competing religions together into states of a loose identity. Organizing in state frameworks was new to the region, which customarily grouped itself into local clan, tribal, ethnic, and religious frameworks under the remote rule of foreign empires. What sustained the Sykes-Picot system were though regimes that acted for their own benefit (Tira, 2015, p.57).

At the end of the Ottoman Empire, many community leaders and individuals within those communities were faced with “critical choices” that often determined the fate of the particular group to which they belonged. Having witnessed what had transpired in the chaos of World War I, people realized that making the wrong choices could harm their standing at best, or destroy their communities at worst (Patrick, 2013-2014, p.107).

The state was not a means for the self-determination of a nation, but primarily a framework for enabling opportunities and legitimacy to exercise force in the service of ruler interests. In the first wave, the system was based on kings, headed by the Hashemite family, with its origins in Saudi Arabia. This family was alternately given control over Syria, Iraq, and Jordan. The second wave to visit the Middle East consisted of military regimes, secular and ostensibly socialist. Both the kings and the generals promoted the idea of unique Arab national identities in order to strengthen the legitimacy of the state and the person its helm. This was especially obvious in states where the generals were part of a religious or ethnic minority as in Syria and Iraq.

The third wave to visit the region was terror. The rationale of religious reorganization does not necessarily comply with the nation-state orientation and is likely to ignore borders or redraw them. At the same time, the label “Islamic” is itself misleading and comprises polarized elements. There is more that divides than is common between Sunni and Shiite movements; between the old guard of the Muslim Brotherhood and the new jihadist movements (such as ISIS); between organizations with national and territorial orientation such as Hamas and global organizations such as al-Qaeda; between conservative establishments seeking to safeguard the status quo such as the Saudi Wahhabi and those seeking to destroy the existing system (Tira, 2015, p.57-58). We give Sykes-Picot Agreements protocols and stop here for now because we will mention this subject again afterwards.

15 & 16 May, 1916:

1. *Sir Edward Grey to Paul Cambon, 15 May 1916*

I shall have the honour to reply fully in a further note to your Excellency's note of the 9th instant, relative to the creation of an Arab State, but I should meanwhile be grateful if your Excellency could assure me that in those regions which, under the conditions recorded in that communication, become entirely French, or in which French interests are recognised as predominant, any existing British concessions, rights of navigation or development, and the rights and privileges of any British religious, scholastic, or medical institutions will be maintained.

His Majesty's Government are, of course, ready to give a reciprocal assurance in regard to the British area.

2. *Sir Edward Grey to Paul Cambon, 16 May 1916*

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 9th instant, stating that the French Government accept the limits of a future Arab State, or Confederation of States, and of those parts of Syria where French interests predominate, together with certain conditions attached thereto, such as they result from recent discussions in London and Petrograd on the subject.

I have the honour to inform your Excellency in reply that the acceptance of the whole project, as it now stands, will involve the abdication of considerable British interests, but, since His Majesty's Government recognise the advantage to the general cause of the Allies entailed in producing a more favourable internal political situation in Turkey, they are ready to accept the

arrangement now arrived at, provided that the co-operation of the Arabs is secured, and that the Arabs fulfil the conditions and obtain the towns of Homs, Hama, Damascus, and Aleppo.

It is accordingly understood between the French and British Governments...

1. That France and Great Britain are prepared to recognize and protect an independent Arab State or a Confederation of Arab States in the areas (A) and (B) marked on the annexed map, under the suzerainty of an Arab chief. That in area (A) France, and in area (B) Great Britain, shall have priority of right of enterprise and local loans. That in area (A) France, and in area (B) Great Britain, shall alone supply advisers or foreign functionaries at the request of the Arab State or Confederation of Arab States.

2. That in the blue area France, and in the red area Great Britain, shall be allowed to establish such direct or indirect administration or control as they desire and as they may think fit to arrange with the Arab State or Confederation of Arab States. 3. That in the brown area there shall be established an international administration, the form of which is to be decided upon after consultation with Russia, and subsequently in consultation with the other Allies, and the representatives of the Shereef of Mecca.

4. That Great Britain be accorded (1) the ports of Haifa and Acre, (2) guarantee of a given supply of water from the Tigris and Euphrates in area (A) for area (B). His Majesty's Government, on their part, undertake that they will at no time enter into negotiations for the cession of Cyprus to any third Power without the previous consent of the French Government.

5. That Alexandretta shall be a free port as regards the trade of the British Empire, and that there shall be no discrimination in port charges or facilities as regards British shipping and British goods; that there shall be freedom of transit for British goods through Alexandretta and by railway through the blue area, whether those goods are intended for or originate in the red area, or (B) area, or area (A); and there shall be no discrimination, direct or indirect against British goods on any railway or against British goods or ships at any port serving the areas mentioned.

That Haifa shall be a free port as regards the trade of France, her dominions and protectorates, and there shall be no discrimination in port charges or facilities as regards French shipping and French goods. There shall be freedom of transit for French goods through Haifa and by the British railway through the brown area, whether those goods are intended for or originate in the blue area, area (A), or area (B), and there shall be no discrimination, direct or indirect, against French goods on any railway, or against French goods or ships at any port serving the areas mentioned.

6. That in area (A) the Baghdad Railway shall not be extended southwards beyond Mosul, and in area (B) northwards beyond Samarra, until a railway connecting Baghdad with Aleppo via the Euphrates Valley has been completed, and then only with the concurrence of the two Governments.

7. That Great Britain has the right to build, administer, and be sole owner of a railway connecting Haifa with area (B), and shall have a perpetual right to transport troops along such a line at all times.

It is to be understood by both Governments that this railway is to facilitate the connexion of Baghdad with Haifa by rail, and it is further understood that, if the engineering difficulties and expense entailed by keeping this connecting line in the brown area only make the project unfeasible, that the French Government shall be prepared to consider that the line in question may also traverse the polygon Baniyas-Keis Marib-Salkhab Tell Otsda-Mesmie before reaching area (B).

8. For a period of twenty years the existing Turkish customs tariff shall remain in force throughout the whole of the blue and red areas, as well as in areas (A) and (B), and no increase in the rates of duty or conversion from ad valorem to specific rates shall be made except by agreement between the two Powers.

There shall be no interior customs barriers between any of the above-mentioned areas. The customs duties leviable on goods destined for the interior shall be collected at the port of entry and handed over to the administration of the area of destination.

9. It shall be agreed that the French Government will at no time enter into any negotiations for the cession of their rights and will not cede such rights in the blue area to any third Power, except the Arab State or Confederation of Arab States without the previous agreement of His Majesty's Government, who, on their part, will give a similar undertaking to the French Government regarding the red area.

10. The British and French Governments, as the protectors of the Arab State, shall agree that they will not themselves acquire and will not consent to a third Power acquiring territorial possessions in the Arabian peninsula, nor consent to a third Power installing a naval base either on the east coast, or on the islands, of the Red Sea. This, however, shall not prevent such adjustment of the Aden frontier as may be necessary in consequence of recent Turkish aggression.

11. The negotiations with the Arabs as to the boundaries of the Arab State or Confederation of Arab States shall be continued through the same channel as heretofore on behalf of the two Powers.

12. It is agreed that measures to control the importation of arms into the Arab territories will be considered by the two Governments.

I have further the honour to state that, in order to make the agreement complete, His Majesty's Government are proposing to the Russian Government to exchange notes analogous

Savrun, E.

to those exchanged by the latter and your Excellency's Government on the 26th April last. Copies of these notes will be communicated to your Excellency as soon as exchanged.

I would also venture to remind your Excellency that the conclusion of the present agreement raises, for practical consideration, the question of the claims of Italy to a share in any partition or rearrangement of Turkey in Asia, as formulated in article 9 of the agreement of the 26th April, 1915, between Italy and the Allies.

His Majesty's Government further consider that the Japanese Government should be informed of the arrangement now concluded. (internet 5)

As to Balfour Declaration; In 1914, war broke out in Europe between the Triple Entente (Britain, France and the Russian Empire) and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary and later that year, the Ottoman Empire). The war on the Western Front developed into a stalemate. Jonathan Schneer writes: *Thus the view from Whitehall early in 1916: If defeat was not imminent, neither was victory; and the outcome of the war of attrition on the Western Front could not be predicted. The colossal forces in a death-grip across Europe and in Eurasia appeared to have canceled each other out. Only the addition of significant new forces on one side or the other seemed likely to tip the scale. Britain's willingness, beginning early in 1916, to explore seriously some kind of arrangement with "world Jewry" or "Great Jewry" must be understood in this context (internet 6).*

On November 2, 1917, a century ago, Arthur James Balfour, the British foreign secretary, conveyed the following pledge in a public letter to a prominent British Zionist, Lord Walter Rothschild:

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

At the time, as World War I raged, British and Australian forces were fighting deep in Palestine against the Ottomans, and were poised to take Jerusalem. The Balfour Declaration, for all its vagaries, constituted the first step toward the objective of political Zionism as outlined by the First Zionist Congress at its meeting in Basle, Switzerland in 1897: "Zionism seeks to establish a home for the Jewish people in Palestine secured under public law." Theodor Herzl had failed to land such a commitment, either from the Ottoman sultan or from

any of Europe's potentates. The declaration was the much-awaited opening: narrow, conditional, hedged, but an opening all the same. "There is a British proverb about the camel and the tent," said the British Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann later that November. "At first the camel sticks one leg in the tent, and eventually it slips into it. This must be our policy." And so it became (Kramer, 2017, p.1-2).

Since the Balfour Declaration constitutes the beginning of Israel's legitimation by other nations, the declaration's own legitimacy has been the subject of unending attacks. This is made easier with each passing year, as the world that produced the declaration draws ever more remote. Few people today are sure why World War I was fought at all, and Britain circa 1917 is best known through PBS costume dramas along the lines of *Downton Abbey*. The Balfour Declaration? In the mind's eye, one imagines back-and-forth negotiations in the palaces of Whitehall and the gilded drawing rooms of the Rothschild dynasty, with white-gloved servants delivering urgent sealed missives. Surely the declaration was stirred by similarly antique passions and interests, from safeguarding England's route to India to satisfying the Christian Restorationist imperative of returning the Jews to the Holy Land. The content of the declaration seems no less distant or downright baffling. The prominent Jewish intellectual Arthur Koestler, repeating a frequent mantra, would call it "one the most improbable political documents of all time," in which "one nation solemnly promised to a second nation the country of a third." The fact that it included no explicit rationale for itself has also fueled the suspicion that its authors had dark or disreputable motives. After all, it was issued in the name of the largest empire in history, embracing (or, perhaps, gripping) almost a quarter of the world's landmass and population. In the guilt-sodden litany of imperialism at its apogee, the Balfour Declaration has enjoyed a certain preeminence as (in the words of the British Arabist Elizabeth Monroe) "one of the greatest mistakes in our imperial history (Kramer, 2017, p.2).

The various views of Britain's motives need only be summarized here. In 1916 and 1917, the Allied powers (Britain, France, Belgium, Russia, Italy, and later the United States) were locked in a devastating war with the Central powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire) and fearful that they might be fought to a draw. Hence the most documented explanation for the declaration is that the British government hoped to persuade Jews in two wavering Allied countries, the United States and Russia, to insist that their governments stay in the war until total victory. Jewish influence, the British thought, would tilt the debate in Washington and St. Petersburg and could best be activated by the promise of

a Jewish restoration to Palestine. This was married to a (misplaced) fear that Germany might steal a march on the Allies by issuing its own pro-Zionist declaration.

To us today, this seems like a vast exaggeration of the power of Jews at the time. But British policymakers believed in what the British Zionist Harry Sacher once called “the great Jewish legend”: That legend finds its crudest and its stupidest expression in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion ‘wrote Sacher’, but many even of those who reject a forgery and a lie have a residual belief in the power and the unity of Jewry. We suffer for it, but it is not wholly without its compensations. It is one of the imponderabilia of politics, and it plays, consciously or unconsciously, its part in the calculations and the decisions of statesmen.

The second explanation is that the British rushed to embrace Zionism as a means of justifying their own claim to Palestine in the anticipated postwar carve-up of the Middle East. The British, as patrons of the Jews, could exclude their French ally from Palestine while claiming to champion the “self-determination” of a small people. While this explanation differs from the first, it shares with it a straightforward assumption: needing Zionism for their own ends, the British required very little prodding to produce the Balfour Declaration (Kramer, 2017, p.3-4).

As we tried to describe above that the Great Britain and France crushed the Middle East and led to the established of the Jewish state with secret agreements. What’s interesting is that we may not know If bolshevist did not disclose the agreement of Sykes-Picot in 1917. Therewith Cemal Pasha made a spech on 4 December, 1917 and said that; *The true purpose of the English is now known. Now, will Sharif Hussein endure this humiliation that he is causing, and will the honor of the Caliphate of Islam change to a slave state to the English?* Yes he did.

What is Zionism ?, Who Helps It and What Did Create?

In 1896, Theodor Herzl, a Jewish journalist living in Austria-Hungary, published *Der Judenstaat* "The Jewish State", in which he asserted that the only solution to the "Jewish Question" in Europe, including growing antisemitism, was through the establishment of a Jewish State. Political Zionism had just been born. A year later, Herzl founded the Zionist Organization (ZO), which at its first congress, "called for the establishment of a home for the Jewish people in Palestine secured under public law". Serviceable means to attain that goal included the promotion of Jewish settlement there, the organisation of Jews in the diaspora, the strengthening of Jewish feeling and consciousness, and preparatory steps to attain those

necessary governmental grants. Herzl passed away in 1904 without the political standing that was required to carry out his agenda of a Jewish home in Palestine.

During the first meeting between Chaim Weizmann and Balfour in 1906, Balfour asked what Weizmann's objections were to the idea of a Jewish homeland in Uganda, (the Uganda Protectorate in East Africa in the British Uganda Programme), rather than in Palestine. According to Weizmann's memoir, the conversation went as follows: "Mr. Balfour, supposing I was to offer you Paris instead of London, would you take it?" He sat up, looked at me, and answered: "But Dr. Weizmann, we have London." "That is true," I said, "but we had Jerusalem when London was a marsh." He said two things which I remember vividly. The first was: "Are there many Jews who think like you?" I answered: "I believe I speak the mind of millions of Jews whom you will never see and who cannot speak for themselves." ... To this he said: "If that is so you will one day be a force." Two months after Britain's declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire in November 1914, Zionist British cabinet member Herbert Samuel circulated a memorandum entitled *The Future of Palestine* to his cabinet colleagues. The memorandum stated that "I am assured that the solution of the problem of Palestine which would be much the most welcome to the leaders and supporters of the Zionist movement throughout the world would be the annexation of the country to the British Empire". (internet 7).

However some scholars says that the history of Zionism began earlier and related to Judaism and Jewish history. The Hovevei Zion, or the Lovers of Zion, were responsible for the creation of 20 new Jewish settlements in Palestine between 1870 and 1897. Before the Holocaust the movement's central aims were the creation of a Jewish National Home and cultural centre in Palestine by facilitating Jewish migration. After the Holocaust, the movement focussed on creation of a "Jewish state" (usually defined as a secular state with a Jewish majority), attaining its goal in 1948 with the creation of Israel. Since the creation of Israel, the importance of the Zionist movement as an organization has declined, as the Israeli state has grown stronger. The Zionist movement continues to exist, working to support Israel, assist persecuted Jews and encourage Jewish emigration to Israel. While most Israeli political parties continue to define themselves as Zionist, modern Israeli political thought is no longer formulated within the Zionist movement. The success of Zionism has meant that the percentage of the world's Jewish population who live in Israel has steadily grown over the years and today 40% of the world's Jews live in Israel. There is no other example in human

history of a "nation" being restored after such a long period of existence as a Diaspora (internet 8).

Even if Sykes-Picot had resolved the conflicting interests of the French, British, and Arabs, an additional party soon joined the debate over the future of the Near East the Zionists. Like many 19th century politicians, both British and German leaders overestimated the power of the global Jewish community. The Kaiser had great hopes of winning the Jews over to the Central Powers. He believed that of all the powers, the Jews hated Russia the most. If the Germans could persuade them to join the war and rebel against Russia, it could mean eliminating an entire theater of operations from the war. This was just the kind of conspiracy that the British feared. Mark Sykes and Arthur Balfour were among those British politicians who most feared a global Jewish conspiracy. They believed that winning the Jews over to the Entente would help decide the outcome of the war. This prejudice, coupled with Prime Minister Lloyd George's religious zeal and his undersecretary Leo Amery's understanding of the strategic importance of Palestine, led to the issuing of the Balfour Declaration of 1917. This declaration barely two paragraphs long stated that Great Britain would establish in Palestine "a national homeland for the Jewish people." Never before in any negotiations with Husayn had the British excluded Palestine from the Arab state. Now suddenly Balfour unilaterally offered Palestine to the Zionists. To this day, no one has successfully resolved this inconsistency of British foreign policy; however, one attempt came close. In January 1919, a little over two months after the last shots of World War I were fired, Arab and Zionist leaders created one of the most unusual documents in the history of the Near Eastern conflict. The delegations at the Paris Peace Conference had the enormous responsibility of shaping the postwar order. It was in the course of these many months of debate that Faisal representing the Arabs on behalf of his father and Chaim Weizmann representing the Zionists met. The two men had much in common they both represented nationalist movements with much at stake in the peace process, and they both had apprehensions about the British. Faisal continued to worry about whether the British would honor their agreement with France over the fate of Syria, which he was determined to keep as part of the Arab state. He feared that they would. He doubted whether they had any intent to fulfill the obligations of the Husayn-McMahon correspondence (Wickersham, 2016, p.31-32).

T.E. Lawrence, the notorious British officer of nearly mythical status who served as Faisal's British liaison officer, penned the final wording of their agreement. The goal was to tie Zionist and Arab nationalist movements together in order to improve the chances of the

success of both. The agreement consisted of ten articles. The first article proposed the “one-state” solution. Rather than establishing separate Arab and Jewish states in Palestine or a single Arab or Jewish state, Article One established joint Arab-Jewish cooperation in a national government. This government would be constitutionally established and fully independent of European powers. The treaty guaranteed that there would be no exclusion from representation in the government based on religious creed. It also promised full civil rights to all citizens regardless of their beliefs.

Once established, the government would allow but also encourage unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine, while ensuring the land rights of the existing population. In order to further soothe any Arab apprehensions over unlimited Jewish immigration, the agreement also provided for control of the Holy Places by the Muslim population. To gain Faisal’s support even further, the treaty promised that the Jews would both plan and finance the development of agriculture and infrastructure in Arab Syria. Lastly, the agreement recognized that future conflict was still a possibility. In the case that a conflict between Palestine and Arab Syria ever arose, the British would act as an international arbitrator. Before signing it, Faisal added an additional piece of insurance for the Arab cause. To this document he wrote, “Provided that the Arabs obtain their independence. I shall concur in the above articles. But if the slightest modification or departure were to be made, I shall not be bound by a single word of this present Agreement which shall be deemed void...” This emendation made it clear that the responsibility of the success or failure of this agreement rested solely on the British honoring the terms of the Husayn-McMahon letters.

The series of events between the last months of conflict and the late months of 1919 proved to be the crucial period for the development of Palestine. British foreign policy in the Near East during this period turned decisively against the Arabs and became increasingly pro-French. This turn of events brought into effect the end provision that Faisal had amended to the Weizmann-Faisal agreement, thus nullifying it.

In the fall of 1918, British forces continued their advance northward through Palestine into Syria. General Allenby commanded the forces that had previously occupied Jerusalem from Turkish rule and were now on the verge of driving the Turks from Damascus. Allenby, however, was cautious of the effect a European army would have on the local population and, therefore, wanted Faisal’s army to be the first to enter Damascus. After Faisal’s arrival, Allenby’s army would arrive. He would then be responsible for setting up a temporary Arab government under Faisal’s authority in the interior of Syria. French officials, in accordance

with Sykes-Picot, would then move in to assist Faisal with the administration of civil law while the British would continue to provide military stability. At some future point, the British would withdraw leaving an Arab state led by Faisal under French protection. That, at least, was the plan. On October 1 the Turks abandoned Damascus (Wickersham, 2016, p.32-33). Nothing will be as its now in the Middle East.

Up to here, we tried to explain the process of the fragmentation of the Middle East by the Great Powers of the Europe with achievement of the Zionists. All of them's willings were accomplished the objective of divide and rule. Moreover established the Israel.

New Society New Middle East

Indeed, Syria was the very birthplace of pan-Arabism in the 19th century. It saw itself as the natural heir to the medieval province Bilad el-Sham, which covered to the territories of contemporary Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Israel as well as parts of Turkey and Iraq. It was here that the first modern Arab state "the Arab Kingdom of Syria" proclaimed its existence in 1920. Although it was crushed after only four months by French Army.

Since Arab states are supposedly not naturally born entities, the logical upshot is that there is no Arab national identity. Instead, the Arab World is seen as a puzzle of tribal or religious identities, without national ones. While it is true that both tribal and religious identities have more leverage in the Arab World than they do in Europe, this does not imply that there are no other identities (Gaub-Pawlak, 2013, p.2). People of the Middle East ususally followed the lead of the West as a dreamers, (Kramer, 1997, p.90) but soon their dreams turned to a nightmare by West. Now They had to fight against the new masters for their independence till 1940s and 1950s. And yet, as the 20th century closes, much of the Middle East resists. A new Middle East does exist in places, but there is still and old Middle East of tradition. The gaps between them have been filled with dictatorship, xenophobia, and fundamentalism. In some places in the Middle East, secular culture flourishes. But in other places, people live, die, and occasionally kill (Kramer, 1997, p.91).

A British Statesman Benjamin Disreali said that in his book *Coningsby* in 1844; "*The World is ruled by people who are not behind their scenes.*" (Marschalko, 1972, p.47).

It spent fifty years to make Europe ready to explode before the First World War. But to inflate five years had enough (Hart, 2014, p.1). Just before the Second World War, When Hitler's became new chancellor in Germany on January 30, 1933, that would caused soon a new

World War. According to Hitler and Nazis, Jews is the main enemy. War lasted six year (1939-1945) and more than fifty million lost their life (Parker, 2014, p.352).

As we have already emphasized, the British promised independence from the Ottoman administration to the Arab people of the Middle East and besides to the Zionist movement gave a national homeland in Palestine during the First World War. Jewish migration began to Palestine in 1930s, most of them were escaped from Nazis, and that fugitives caused conflict between Arab and Jews. Jews volunteers also joined the British Army during the Second World War, and that helped them to learned modern war tactics (Parker, 2014, p.423).

The victory of allies and defeat of the axis states did not bring peace immediately to the World. The decline of the western colonial empires in Asia and Africa, Soviet movements in Eastern and Middle Europe created ethnical and political conflicts. The lost and won independence led to the revival of old hatreds and the emergence of new one and brought millions of people to refugee status. Middle East get one's share from it (Lewis, 2003, p.415).

Findings

On May 14, 1948, David Ben-Gurion, the head of the Jewish Agency, proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel in Tel Aviv. U.S. President Harry S. Truman recognized the new nation on the same day. Although the United States supported the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which favored the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, President Franklin D. Roosevelt had assured the Arabs in 1945 that the United States would not intervene without consulting both the Jews and the Arabs in that region. The British, who held a colonial mandate for Palestine until May 1948, opposed both the creation of a Jewish state and an Arab state in Palestine as well as unlimited immigration of Jewish refugees to the region. Great Britain wanted to preserve good relations with the Arabs to protect its vital political and economic interests in Palestine (internet 9). However the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was not solely a British policy but was also clearly supported by policy maker from France, Italy, Russia and the US (Internet 10). In other respects the collapse of the Nazi Germany and the need to fill the resulting power gap caused the collapse of the war partenership and Cold War period started (Kissinger, 2011, p.404). Under these circumstances, the Arabs manifested themselves as a serious of strong nationalist movements and felt disappointment. The Arabs still have a religious character in the administration and politics of the old order. Second World War were also revealed changes. Although the Arab states did not play aan efficent role in this war, they were influenced (Lewis, 2009, p.234-

235). After the war the biggest problem will be conflict against Israel for the Arab states. While Jews continue to immigrate by the thousands, the U.K. Mandate runs out, but the country is war weary and out of money. No renewal of the mandate is attempted. Israel declares independence on 14 May 1948. Within days, Arab League declares war and invades Israel. Israel emerges victorious but Jordan captures the West Bank and Egypt captures the Gaza Strip. Over 700,000 Palestinians are displaced and become refugees. Zionists believe that Jews need their own state in order to exist. British Mandate causes the emergence of Arab nationalism. Arabs fear that Zionists will take more neighboring territory. The Arab-Israel wars and conflict continued in the following decades like, 1948 Al-Nakba, 1956 The Sinai War, 1967 Six Day War, 1973 Yom Kippur War, 1987, First Intifada, Second Intifada, 2006 Lebanon War and hundreds of conflicts are still going on. In general, Israel is profitable in politically. Israel have extended its borders since 1948 and occupied lands from some of the Arab states. Most likely Israel are not going to stop enlarge its sphere of influence. As If they were staring at Syria, Iraq maybe some part of Turkey.

Up to here we tried to focus and explain on historical background of the events in the Middle East. We will now touch on the subject that we want to emphasize.

Result And Suggestions

Great Dream of the Israel

In his classic work *Political Order in Changing Societies*, the political scientist Samuel Huntington used the term “political decay” to explain political instability in many newly independent countries after the Second World War. Huntington argued that socioeconomic modernization caused problems for traditional political orders, leading the mobilization of new social groups whose participation could not be accommodated by existing political institutions (Fukuyama, 2014, p.8). We do know how Middle East decay? And why Middle East forced to decay by the others? Now we may ask that question.

The regional order has been threatened before, but today’s challenge is unique. Syria and Iraq are what has prompted the latest reevaluation of the Sykes-Picot borders, but many of the problems predated the Syrian civil war. Ambitious monarchs in the 1930s and 1940s challenged the order after the colonial period. The doctrine of Pan-Arab Nationalism and Gamal Abd al-Nasir’s messianic leadership in the 1950s and by Saddam Hussein in 1990 again posed a threat. Now its now challenged not by a powerful state or a sweeping ideology but by the weakness of several Arab states that seem to be on the verge of implosion or

disintegration (Rabinovich, 2014, p.2). The main political breakdown between Arabs is based on the 1967 Arab-Israel War. The 1967 defeat was seen not only as a military setback but also as a kind of moral judgment. The defeat in such a short time is perceived as the moral collapse of society and the system. Heroic saga of the struggle for independence was over. The struggle no longer united the people of Arab (Hourani, 2001, p.508). These circumstances created a political vacuum in the region. Therefore according to some legal, according to some illegal organizations have emerged like Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, Hezbollah, Al-Qiada, Emel, Al Fattah, Isis and etc... The people of the region are divided into hundreds of ethnic, religious, denominational and political parts. But here we need to open a separate paranthesis for Isis.

The Persian Gulf War (August 2, 1990 – February 28, 1991), commonly referred to as simply the Gulf War, was a war waged by a U.N.authorized coalition force from thirty four nations led by the United States, against Iraq in response to Iraq's invasion and annexation of the State of Kuwait. This war has also been referred to (by the Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein) as the Mother of All Battles. And is commonly, though mistakenly, known as Operation Desert Storm for the operational name of the military response, the First Gulf War, Gulf War I, or the Iraq War, before the term became identified with the 2003 Iraq War.

Throughout much of the Cold War, Iraq had been an ally of the Soviet Union, and there was a history of friction between it and the United States. The U.S. was concerned with Iraq's position on Israeli–Palestinian politics, and its disapproval of the nature of the peace between Israel and Egypt. The United States also disliked Iraqi support for many Arab and Palestinian militant groups such as Abu Nidal, which led to its inclusion on the developing U.S. list of State Sponsors of Terrorism on 29 December 1979. The U.S. remained officially neutral after the invasion of Iran in 1980, which became the Iran–Iraq War, although it assisted Iraq covertly. In March 1982, however, Iran began a successful counteroffensive Operation Undeniable Victory, and the United States increased its support for Iraq to prevent Iran from forcing a surrender.

In a U.S. bid to open full diplomatic relations with Iraq, the country was removed from the U.S. list of State Sponsors of Terrorism. Ostensibly this was because of improvement in the regime's record, although former United States Assistant Secretary of Defense Noel Koch later stated, "No one had any doubts about the Iraqis' continued involvement in terrorism... The real reason was to help them succeed in the war against Iran' With Iraq's newfound success in the war, and the Iranian rebuff of a peace offer in July, arms sales to Iraq reached a

record spike in 1982. An obstacle, however, remained to any potential U.S. Iraqi relationship. Abu Nidal continued to operate with official support in Baghdad. When Iraqi President Saddam Hussein expelled the group to Syria at the United States' request in November 1983, the Reagan administration sent Donald Rumsfeld to meet President Hussein as a special envoy and to cultivate ties. By the time the ceasefire with Iran was signed in August 1988, Iraq was virtually bankrupt, with most of its debt owed to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Iraq pressured both nations to forgive the debts, but they refused. Iraq also accused Kuwait of exceeding its OPEC quotas and driving down the price of oil, thus further hurting the Iraqi economy. The collapse in oil prices had a catastrophic impact on the Iraqi economy. The Iraqi Government described it as a form of economic warfare, which it claimed was aggravated by Kuwait slant-drilling across the border into Iraq's Rumaila oil field.

The Iraq-Kuwait dispute also involved Iraqi claims to Kuwait as a territory of Iraq. After gaining independence from the United Kingdom in 1932, the Iraqi government immediately declared that Kuwait was rightfully a territory of Iraq as it had been an Iraqi territory for centuries until the British creation of Kuwait after World War I, and thus stated that Kuwait was a British imperialist invention. Iraq claimed Kuwait had been a part of the Ottoman Empire's province of Basra. Its ruling dynasty, the al-Sabah family, had concluded a protectorate agreement in 1899 that assigned responsibility for its foreign affairs to Britain. Britain drew the border between the two countries, and deliberately tried to limit Iraq's access to the ocean so that any future Iraqi government would be in no position to threaten Britain's domination of the Persian Gulf. Iraq refused to accept the border, and did not recognize the Kuwaiti government until 1963. In early July 1990, Iraq complained about Kuwait's behavior, such as not respecting their quota, and openly threatened to take military action. On the 23rd, the CIA reported that Iraq had moved 30,000 troops to the Iraq-Kuwait border, and the U.S. naval fleet in the Persian Gulf was placed on alert. On the 25th, Saddam Hussein met with April Glaspie, an American ambassador, in Baghdad. According to an Iraqi transcript of that meeting, Glaspie told the Iraqi delegation, "We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts." According to Glaspie's own account, she stated in reference to the precise border between Kuwait and Iraq "that she had served in Kuwait 20 years before then, "as now, we took no position on these Arab affairs." On the 31st, negotiations between Iraq and Kuwait in Jeddah failed violently. On 2 August 1990 Iraq launched the invasion by bombing Kuwait City, the Kuwaiti capital (internet 11). The first scenario went into effect, the second scenario was 2003 Iraq War. The chief cause of this war was George W. Bush and his management in the name

of the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) (Bassil, 2012, p.29). In 2003, all public institutions were disbanded by U.S. after Iraq invaded. Provisional Coalition Administration privileged Shia Arabs and Kurds. Sunni Arabs and Turkmens have emerged outside of the state. Both America's supports to the Kurds and Iran's growing influence to the Shias further enlarged the problems (Bilgesam, 2015, p.1). On the other hand, another side had much more benefits from it. No doubt it was Israel. Anglo-American Zionist plan is forced. Millions of civilians lost their lives, be crippled, orphaned and lost their homelands and became refugees.

In 2010, something happened in Tunisia. A Tunisian hawker Mohamed El- Bouazizi burned himself in December and impacted all around the Middle East that we call Arab Spring (Birdal-Günay, 2012, p.7). For more than decades now, the Arab world has been the scene of epic paroxysm; the greatest wave of empowerment the world had seen in the last twenty years. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, young people moved by decades of disappointment with their elite and rejecting the violent approach to improving their daily life, have chosen to unravel the dust of submission. They have attempted to shake the status quo which has kept their situation miserable not only since their grandparents threw off the brutal yoke of colonialism, but has also worsened their economic, political, and social conditions. The wave of social protests that swept through the Arab world during 2011, toppling some long-standing regimes and seriously destabilizing others, was the consequence of decades of oppressive and authoritarian political systems, failed economic policies, and socially alienated and disaffected populations, mainly youths. Indeed, when the self-immolated Tunisian citizen Mohamed El Bouazizi committed his final act of desperate protest on 17 December 2010, he was not aware that he was kicking the first domino piece in a long chain of events that is still unfolding today, having claimed four among the longest sitting Arab leaders (Aissa, 2012, p.1-2).

On March 15th, 2011, day of dignity protests in Damascus and Daraa; security forces fire on and kill protestors, triggering violent unrest and Israeli jets accused of bombing military base near Damascus in January 2013, thus the last act has begun in Syria (Mariwala, 2014, p.7).

The current situation in which Iraq and Syria involved fosters the emergence and existence of radical religious organizations in this region. ISIS, one of those organizations, has become a source of threat through its bloody attacks and power in global and regional scale. Due to ISIS's existence as a threat, a US-led coalition force was established. By this coalition force, an action plan based on the purpose to "weaken ISIS and finally exterminate" was adopted and implemented. But it is needed to obtain regional and well trained and equipped troops to

fight against this organization. It requires long time to train some kind of troops and naturally to fight against ISIS. Besides, military interventions triggers the violence political implementations are required to get to the root of the problem. The current status in Iraq and Syria demonstrates that it is needed long time to implement political solutions and stability which will exterminate ISIS at the end. ISIS established in Afghanistan by Ebu Musab El-Zarkavi in 1999 as Tawhid and Jihad (Erdoğan-Deligöz, 2015, p.5-6).

ISIS does not only destory lifes, intentional destruction of cultural heritage by ISIS is only a part of its policy, which dramatically comprises various other serious violations of the core international law rules protecting peace and human rights. Every sensible person in whatsoever part of the world felt a blow in the stomach or was led to the brink of tears each time the news of such an act was broadcast (Mucci, 2016, p.2). ISIS want destory historical memory of Syria and Iraq, and leave an irreversible space. Fort his reason millions of people have been left their homeland, half of the Syrians are refugee, dead, cripple and struggling with hunger and diseases. The lands are divided into a several ethnic parts.

Syria and Iraq are melting down. In Syria, the ruling regime's attempt to shoot its way out of the largest uprising it has ever faced has killed over 470,000 people, and displaced roughly half of Syria's population of 22 million (Tabler, 2013, p.90).

The surge of ethnic and strife in Syria and across the Middle East has led a number of analysts to predict the coming breakup of many Arab states. This potential upending of the region's territorial order has come to be known as "the end of Sykes-Picot" a reference to the secret 1916 Anglo-French agreement to divide up the Middle Eastern provinces or the Ottoman Empire into British and French zones control. Because the European treaties that created new Arab states in the aftermath of First World War upheld the outlines of that agreement, Sykes-Picot became the convenient shortland fort he map that colonial powers imposed on the region, one that has remained essentially to the present day. With bloodshed from Aleppo to Baghdad to Beirut, ,ts indeed tempting to predict the voilent demise of Sykes-Picot (Ottoway, 2014, p.139).

As the conflict festered it also prompted a broader discussion and debate over the future of the Arab State system. The collapse of Syria, the ongoing fighting in Iraq, and the general instability in the Middle East has led some observers to question whether the very geography of the region will be change (Robinovich, 2014, p.1). Syria's nothern neighbor is a powerful state with complex interest in Syria'a affairs. Therefore, Turkey is now facing with Kurdish

groups in Syria and Northern Iraq which are YPD, PYD, and has been fighting against PKK more than thirty years. What interesting thing is here that U.S.A's heavy arms and money assistance to YPD and PYD despite Turkey being a NATO allied with U.S.A. On the other hand Russia, England, France, Germany and Iran and China's ears are also all there, and of course Israel.

The fate of Ankara is one with Damascus, Aleppo, Mosul, Kirkuk. The future of Turkey can not be separated from the future of Syria and Iraq. The risk for Turkey's foreign policy is to establish a puppet Kurdish state apparently under the American umbrella, but in reality the plan is that expansion of the Israel. If any comfort with a fait accompli like Sykes-Picot in near future, Turkey should be more careful. Regional peace depends on it.

In Turkey, much of the American Kurdish card has been mentioned up to now. Establish a Kurdish state in northern Iraq by America that issue has been focused sizably by many scholar, officers, journalists and statemen. But Israel support to establish a Kurdish state most because this is the last scenario for the great Israel Project for now.

References

- Arenal, M. G., (2013). "A Jews of al-andalus", abdelwahab meddeb, benjamin stora, a history of jewish-muslim relations: From the origins to the present day, Marina Rustow, *Princeton University Press*, pp. 111-135.
- Aissa, E. H., (2012). The Arab spring: Causes, consequences, and implications, *Strategy Research Project*, United States Army War College Class of 2012.
- Bassil, Y., (2012 Nov-Dec). "The 2003 Iraq War: Operations, causes, and consequences". *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(5), 29-47.
- BİLGESAM, (2015, April). Irak ve Suriye'deki Gelişmelerin Türkiye'ye Etkileri, *Bilge Adamlar Kurulu Raporu*, *Bilge Adamlar Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi*, Rapor No: 65, İstanbul.
- Birdal, A., (2012 August). *Yiğit Günay, arap baharı aldatmacası orta doğu'da emperyalist restorasyon* (2. Baskı). İstanbul:Yazılama Yayınları.
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANICA, (1970). Volume 19, William Benton Publisher, USA.
- Engdahl, W., (2004). *A century of war: anglo-american oil politics and the new world order*, Revised Edition. London:Pluto Press.
- Erdoğan, Ş., & Deligöz, E. (2015 May). "Irak Şam İslam Devleti (İŞİD): Gücü ve Geleceği", *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, *The Journal of Defense Sciences*, 14(1), 5-37.
- Fukuyama, F. (2014 September-October). "America in Decay". *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), 5-26.
- Gaub, F. P. P. (2013 October). "Sykes-Picot and Syria", *Issue Alert*, *European Union Institute for Security Studies*, 34, 1-2.

- Goldshmihr jr., A. D. L. (2011). *A concise history of the middle east* (Ninth Edition). Boulder:Westview Press.
- Hart, B. L. (2014). *Birinci dünya savaşı tarihi* (Çev: Kerim Bağrıaçık, 1. Baskı). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Hourani, A. (2011). *Arap halkları tarihi* (Çev: Yavuz Alogan, 3. Baskı). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- İnalçık, H. (2017). *Devlet-i Aliyye Osmanlı İmparatorluğu üzerine araştırmalar-ı, klasik dönem (1302-1606): Siyasal, kurumsal ve ekonomik gelişim, seçme eserleri II* (58. Baskı). İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- İnalçık, H. (2016). *Osmanlı tarihinde islamiyet ve devlet, seçme eserleri IX* (2. Baskı). İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Kamrava, M. (2005). *The modern middle east political history since the first world war*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kramer, M. (1997). "The Middle East, Old and New", *Deadalusi*, 126(2),89-112.
- Kramer, M. (2017). "The Forgotten Truth About The Balfour Declaration", *Advancing Jewish Thought, Mosaic*, pp.1-23.
- Kissenger, H., (2011 February). Diplomasi, Çev: İbrahim H. Kurt, 10. Baskı, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Lewi, B. (2005). Orta Doğu, Hıristiyanlığın Başlangıcından Günümüze Orta Doğu'nun İki Bin Yıllık Tarihi, Çev: Selen Y. Kölay, 1. Baskı, Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınları.
- Lewis, B. (2009 February). Tarihte Araplar, Çev: Hakkı Dursun Yıldız (5. Baskı). İstanbul: Ağaç Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Mariwala, A. (2014). "The Syrian Civil War, Regime of Bashar Al-Assad", *Stanford Model Ubited Nations Conference*, pp.1-23.
- Marschalk, L. (1972). Yahudi (Dünya Hâkimleri), Çev. Cüneyd Emiroğlu (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Sebil Yayınları.
- Morga, K. O. (2009). *The Oxford illustrated history of Brittain*, Updated Edition. Oxford University Press.
- Mucci, F. (2016 Winter-Spring). "Intentional destruction of cultural heritage by ISIS: the reaction of the International Community against this specific aspect of the aggression to peace and human rights", *Peace Processes Online Review*, 2(1), pp.1-15.
- Ortaylı, İ. (2006 January). *İmparatorluğun en uzun yüzyılı* (25. Baskı). İstanbul: Alkım Yayınları.
- Ottoway, M. (2015 Fall). "Learning from Sykes-Picot", *Middle East Program Occasional Paper Series*. Wilson Center, pp.1-11.
- Ottowa, M., & Ottaway, D. (2014 May-June) "How the Kurds Got Their Way Economic Cooperation and the Middle East's New Borders". *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 139-149
- Owen, E. R. (2008 January). "One Hundred Years of Middle East Oil", *Crown Center for Middle East Studies*, Middle East Brief, No.24, Brandies University, pp. 1-7.
- Patrick, A. J. (2013 Winter-2014 Spring). "The Zionist Commission and the Jewish Communities of Greater Syria in 1919". *Jarusalem Quarterly* 56&57, pp.107-117.

- Parker, Geoffrey, (2014 June). *Cambridge savaş tarihi*, Çev: Füsün Tayanç, Tunç Tayanç (1. Baskı). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Rustow, M. (2013). Jews and Muslims in the Eastern Islamic World, Abdelwahab Meddeb, Benjamin Stora, A History of Jewish-Muslim Relations: From the Origins to the Present Day. Marina Rustow, *Princeton University Press*, pp. 75-110.
- Richa, N. (1992). Great Power Diplomacy 1814-1914, McGraw-Hill Publisher, USA.
- Rbinovic, I. (2014 February). The End of Sykes-Picot? Reflections on the Prospects of the Arab State System. *Middle East Memo*, 32, pp.1-9.
- Singer, C. (2008 January). Oil and security. *Policy Analysis Brief, The Stanley Foundation, USA*, pp.1-11.
- Tira, R (2015 April). Israel, strategy for what follows the sykes-picot era. *Strategic Assessment*, 18(1), pp.57-69.
- Toprania, A. (201). Oil and grand strategy: Great Britain And Germany, 1918-1941 (*PhD Thesis*). *Histpory Department of Georgetown University*.
- Tabler, A. J. (2013 July-Agust). Syria's Collapse And How Washington Can Stop It. *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 90-100.
- Wickersham, A. (2016). "Hashemites and Zionist: The Post-War Anglo-Arab Relationship and the Failure of the One State Solution", *MJUR*, Oxford, pp.28-39.

Internet

- <http://www.indiana.edu/~global/icab/notebook/Exploring%20Global%20Issues%20in%20the%20Middle%20East.pdf>
- <http://kehillatisrael.net/docs/learning/sephardim.html>
- <http://kehillatisrael.net/docs/learning/sephardim.html>
- <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/why-turkey-hasnt-forgotten-about-first-world-war>
- https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Sykes-Picot_Agreement
- <http://www.i-acuse.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Balfour-Declaration1917.pdf>
- <http://www.i-acuse.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Balfour-Declaration1917.pdf>
- <https://www.saylor.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/History-of-Zionism.pdf>
- <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/creation-israel>
- <http://www.bicom.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/BICOM-Briefing-Balfour-paper-FINAL.pdf>
- <https://www.saylor.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Gulf-War.pdf>