



ZIONISM'S NEW PLAN IN IRAQ AND SYRIA ON THE CENTENARY OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION AND SYKES-PICOT

Ergenekon SAVRUN¹

Abstract

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 Britain 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 Britain has become the biggest supporter of the Jews, but 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 for 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 evaluate, and try to explain this idea.

Keywords: Sykes-Picot Agreement, Balfour Declaration, Syria-Iraq Issue, Zionism

BALFOUR DEKLARASYONU VE SYKES-PİCOT'NUN YÜZÜNCÜ YILINDA IRAK VE SURİYE'DE SİYONİZM'İN YENİ PLANI

Öz

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 kargaşa 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 gerekti 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 duram bu boşluğu doldurmak istediğini düşünüyoruz. Bu makalemizde de bu fikri açıklamaya çalışacağız.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sykes-Picot Antlaşması, Balfour Deklarasyonu, Suriye-Irak Sorunu, Siyonizm

¹ Yrd.Doç.Dr., Ufuk Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, Öğretim Üyesi, ergenekonsavrun@gmail.com

1. Introduction

As it is known that as a region the Middle East comprises the 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, The Ottoman period will be referred in the Middle East.

2. Ottoman Period in the Middle East

The Ottoman Turks ruled Middle East more than 400 years, but the Turks occurred here nearly a thousand year's ago. 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, Seljuk 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 era. Then another Turkic state the Mamelukes dominated here till 1517. Ottoman Sultan Yavuz (Inexorable) Selim I conquered first Syria with the Battle of Mercidabık in 1516, and then entered Egypt after the Battle of Ridaniye in 1517.

“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).

It can be argued that this period was zenith for the Ottoman Empires, and ofcourse for Middle East till 19th century.

3. 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 Cordoba ‘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 conversor who served the court, and in one of the first trials they conducted, in 1481 in Seville, dozens of members of the most prominent conversor 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.

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 *convertors* 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.

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."

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).

4. 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, 2006, p.1) He is so right to say that because the Ottoman Empire lost its deluxe power and days. Some parts of the Balkans, Caucasus, Crimea 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 againsts 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)

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' in to seperate, Christiane 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 fort he 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.

5. From Eastern Question to the First World War; Petroleum and the Turmoil of the Middle East

"Diplomats had simply assumed, fort he 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)

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 Trippolitanian 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 Jarusalem, 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 againts 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. (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. (Singer, 2008, p.1) No other element has shaped the history of the past 100 years so much as the fi ght to secure and control the world's reserves of petroleum. (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 fi nanciers 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 confl ict had already become central, though to a degree that few outside a tiny elite of London and New York bankers and fi nanciers 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.)

As 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 3)

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.

6. 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 it self 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 strength 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) Here it is some dialogue between Sir Edward Grey and Paul Cambon about the Sykes-Picot Agreements, then it will be mentioned 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...Sykes-Picot Agreement consists of twelve articles.(internet 4)

The 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 5)

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)

As we tried to describe above that the Great Britain and France crushed the Middle East and led to the establishment of the Jewish state with secret agreements. What's interesting is that we may not know if Bolsheviks did not disclose the agreement of Sykes-Picot in 1917. Therewith Cemal Pasha made a speech 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.

7. 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 organization 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 6)

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.

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.

8. 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 usually followed the lead of the West as 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 an 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 Disraeli 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 became new chancellor in Germany on January 30, 1933, that would cause soon a new World War. According to Hitler and Nazis, Jews are the main enemy. War lasted six years (1939-1945) and more than fifty million lost their lives. (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 learn 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)

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 7) 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 8) In other respects the collapse of the Nazi Germany

and the need to fill the resulting power gap caused the collapse of the war partnership and Cold War period started. (Kissinger, 2011, p.404) Under these circumstances, the Arabs manifested themselves as a series 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 an efficient 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.

9. Conclusion

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 parenthesis 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.

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 Isreal. Anglo-American Zionist plan in 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 him self 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 destroy lives, 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 destroy historical memory of Syria and Iraq, and leave an irreversible space. For this 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 of 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 shorthand for the 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, it is indeed tempting to predict the violent 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 northern neighbor is a powerful state with complex interest in Syria's 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.

Moreover, Israel's policy toward the Syrian crisis derived from several sources: the tendency of Netanyahu to be cautious, deliberate, and wary of bold, grand moves; the lessons of Israel's spectacular failure in Lebanon in 1982, when it tried to tinker with the politics of a neighboring state; a sense of satisfaction at the idea that major conflicts can unfold in the Middle East in which Israel is not involved and that the violence and instability cannot be attributed to the Arab-Israeli conflict or the Palestinian question; and the absence of a "pull factor" in Syria—something equivalent to the Lebanese forces that played a crucial role in pulling Israel into the Lebanese crisis in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Besides Israel is naturally interested in the future of the Iraqi state and the prospect of its disintegration, but this interest is less intense than Israel's interest in the future of its immediate neighbors. The issue that is of highest potential interest for Israel in the Iraqi context is the prospect of Kurdish independence. Iraq's Kurds have benefited from the turn of events that began with the American invasion in 2003 and culminated with the Islamic State's rattling of the Iraqi state in June 2014. The Iraqi Kurds now control more territory and oil and have a stronger position vis-à-vis Baghdad. Turkey sees a mortal danger in the establishment of an independent Kurdish state on its border and the potential impact this could have on its own Kurdish population. Developments in Iraq have been compounded by the autonomy that Syria's Kurds now enjoy. Turkey's anxiety is also heightened by the prominence among Syria's Kurds of elements identified with the PKK, the terrorist Kurdish organization that has been fighting against the Turkish state for decades.

Israel has an obvious interest in the prospect of Kurdish statehood. There is a historic relationship between Israel and Iraq's Kurds. In the 1970s, Israel trained and supported the Kurdish rebels in Iraq, seeking to tie down the Iraqi army rather than have it join Arab efforts against Israel on what was then known as the Eastern Front. That collaboration was terminated by the Shah's Iran and Israel, leaving some residual resentment among the Kurds; nevertheless, Israel and the Kurds still view each other as potential partners. Seeking alliances with other non-Arab elements in the Middle East has been a traditional component of Zionist and Israeli policy, and a Kurdish state in Iraq and possibly in Syria could have positive strategic implications for Israel. However, though Prime Minister Netanyahu offered one public statement of support of Kurdish independence, and Israel did buy some oil from Iraqi Kurdistan, Israel, like the Kurdish leadership itself (and for the same reasons), treads very carefully in this minefield. At this point they have made a conscious policy decision to deal first with supposed "apostate" Arab regimes and their Western allies, but slogans like "First Damascus, then Jerusalem" truly reflect their longer-term objectives. (Robinovich, 2014, p.8-10)

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*, 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),Yazılama Yayınları, İstanbul.
- 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, Pluto Press, London.
- Erdoğan, Ş., & Deligöz, E. (2015 May). “Irak Şam İslam Devleti (İŞİD): Gücü ve Geleceği”, *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi, The Journal of Defense Scineces*, 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.
- Goldshmhj 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), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Hourani, A. (2011). *Arap halkları tarihi* (Çev: Yavuz Alogan, 3. Baskı), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- 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), İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.
- 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”, *Advencing Jewish Thought, Mosaic*, pp.1-23.

- Kissenger, H., (2011 February). *Diplomasi*, Çev: İbrahim H. Kurt, 10. Baskı, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Lewi, B. (2005). *Orta Doğu, Hıristiyanlığın Başlangıcından Günümüze Orta Doğu'nun İki Bin Yıllık Tarihi*, Çev: Selen Y. Kölay, 1. Baskı, Arkadaş Yayınları, Ankara.
- Lewis, B. (2009 February). *Tarihte Araplar*, Çev: Hakkı Dursun Yıldız, 5. Baskı, Ağaç Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- 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, Sebil Yayınları, İstanbul.
- 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*, Volume 2, No 1, 1-15.
- Ortaylı, İ. (2006 January). *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 25. Baskı, Alkım Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Ottoway, M. (2015 Fall). "Learning from Sykes-Picot", *Middle East Program Occasional Paper Series*, Wilson Center, 1-11.
- Ottawa, M., Ottaway, D. (2014 May-June) "How the Kurds Got Their Way Economic Cooperation and the Middle East's New Borders", *Foreign Affairs*, 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, 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, 107-117.
- Parker, Geoffrey, (2014 June). *Cambridge Savaş Tarihi*, Çev: Füsün Tayanç, Tunç Tayanç, 1. Baskı, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.
- 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*, 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*, Number 32, 1-9.
- Singer, C. (2008 January). "Oil and Security", *Policy Analysis Brief*, *The Stanley Foundation*, USA, 1-11.
- Tira, R (2015April). "Israel, Strategy for What Follows the Sykes-Picot Era", *Strategic Assessment*, Volume 18, No 1, 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 Collapase And How Washington Can Stop It”, *Foreign Affairs*, 90-100.

Wickersham, A. (2016). “Hashemites and Zionist: The Post-War Anglo-Arab Relationship and the Failure of the One State Solution”, *MJUR*, Oxford, 28-39.

- <http://www.indiana.edu/~global/icab/notebook/Exploring%20Global%20Issues%20in%20the%20Middle%20East.pdf>
- <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://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>