

Chapter 1 : Arabia after World War I (video) | Khan Academy

Read *"The Arab Movements in World War I"* by Eliezer Tauber with Rakuten Kobo. This study surveys the many revolutionary attempts carried out against the Ottoman Empire in the Fertile Crescent and th.

Comment Damascus, year three of the civil war: The 4th Division of the Syrian army has entrenched itself on Kassiyoun Mountain, the place where Cain is said to have slain his brother Abel. United Nations ballistics experts say the poison gas projectiles that landed in the Damascus suburbs of Muadamiya and Ain Tarma in the morning hours of Aug. Some 1, people died in the attack -- 1, of the more than , people who have lost their lives since the beginning of the conflict. Two years after the American withdrawal, Iraqis are once again in full control of the so-called Green Zone, located on a sharp bend in the Tigris River. It is the quarter of Baghdad where the Americans found refuge when the country they occupied devolved into murderous chaos. Currently, the situation is hardly any better. On the other side of the wall, in the red zone, death has once again become commonplace. There were over 8, fatalities last year. Beirut, the capital of Lebanon that is so loved by all Arabs: The city has long been a focal point both of Arab life and of Arab strife. The devout versus the secular, the Muslims versus the Christians, the Shiites versus the Sunnis. With fighting underway in Libya and Syria, with unrest ongoing in Egypt and Iraq, the old question must once again be posed: Has Beirut managed to leave the last eruption of violence behind or is the next one just around the corner? Two years after the revolts of , the situation in the Middle East is as bleak as it has ever been. There is hardly a country in the region that has not experienced war or civil strife in recent decades. And none of them look immune to a possible outbreak of violence in the near future. The movement that came to be known as the Arab Spring threatens to sink into a morass of overthrows and counter-revolts. That, though, is likely only to surprise those who saw the rebellions in Tunisia, Libya, Egypt and Syria as part of an historical turn of events for the Middle East. To be sure, the unrest was a bloody new beginning, but it was also the most recent chapter in an almost uninterrupted regional conflict that began years ago and has never really come to an end. Nowhere else does the early 20th century orgy of violence still determine political conditions to the same degree. The so-called European Civil War, a term used to describe the period of bloody violence that racked Europe from onwards, came to an end in The Cold War ceased in But the tensions unleashed on the Arab world by World War I remain as acute as ever. Essentially, the Middle East finds itself in the same situation now as Europe did following the Treaty of Versailles: In Africa, Latin America and -- following the bloodletting of World War II -- Europe, most peoples have largely come to accept the borders that history has forced upon them. But not in the Middle East. The states that were founded in the region after , and the borders that were drawn then, are still seen as illegitimate by many of their own citizens and by their neighbors. Only two countries in the broader region -- Egypt and Iran -- possess such a long and uninterrupted history that their state integrity can hardly be shaken, even by a difficult crisis. Two others continue to stand on the foundation erected by their founders: These four countries surround the core of the Middle East, which is made up of five countries and one seemingly eternal non-state. Fromkin calls them the "children of England and France: No group of countries, particularly given their small sizes, has seen so many wars, civil wars, overthrows and terrorist attacks in recent decades. To understand how this historical anomaly came to pass, several factors must be considered: A Peace to End All Peace Perhaps most important, however, was the wanton resolution made by two European colonial powers, Britain and France, that ordered this part of the world in accordance with their own needs and literally drew "A Line in the Sand," as the British historian James Barr titled his book about this episode. It is still unclear where the Arab Spring will take us and what will ultimately become of the Middle East. Apocalyptic scenarios are just as speculative as the hope that the region will find its way to new and more stable borders and improved political structures. But where does this lack of legitimacy and absence of trust which poisons the Middle East come from? Istanbul, the summer of For centuries, the Ottoman Empire had controlled the southern and eastern Mediterranean, from Alexandretta to Arish, from the Maghreb to Suez. But in the early 20th century, it rapidly transformed into the arc of crisis we know today -- a place whose cities have become shorthand for generations of suffering: Had they known, the fighting in the Middle

East would likely have been even more violent and brutal than it was. At the time, however, the war aims of the two sides were determined by a world order that would dissolve within the next four years: Great Britain wanted to open a shipping route to its ally Russia and to secure its connection to India via the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf. The German Empire wanted to prevent exactly that. But shortly after the conflict began, Istanbul joined Berlin and Vienna. Once they arrived, they were handed over to the -- officially still neutral -- Ottoman navy and renamed Yavuz and Midilli; the German crews remained, but donned the fez. With the arrival of the two battleships in the Golden Horn and the subsequent mining of the Dardanelles, the casus belli had been established: The Ottomans and the Germans had blocked the connection between Russia and its allies, the French and the British. In London, strategists began considering an attempt to break the Dardanelles blockade and take Constantinople. The result was the arrival of a British-French fleet at the southern tip of the Gallipoli Peninsula three months later. The attack, which began with a naval bombardment but soon included an all-out ground-troop invasion, failed dramatically. The bloody battle also became a national trauma for Australia and New Zealand, thousands of whose soldiers lost their lives at Gallipoli. Because their plan to strike at the heart of the Ottoman Empire failed, the Allies began focusing on its periphery -- targeting the comparatively weakly defended Arab provinces. It was a plan which corresponded with the Arab desire to throw off the yoke of Ottoman rule. He and his sons, Ali, Faisal and Abdullah -- together with the Damascus elite -- dreamed of founding an Arab nation state stretching from the Taurus Mountains in southeastern Turkey to the Red Sea and from the Mediterranean to the Iranian border.

Chapter 2 : World War I - HISTORY

The Arab Movements in World War I and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.

Throughout the late 19th century, beginning in the s, a sense of loyalty to the "Fatherland" developed in intellectual circles based in the Levant and Egypt, but not necessarily an "Arab Fatherland". It developed from observance of the technological successes of Western Europe which they attributed to the prevailing of patriotism in those countries. In the s, literature produced in the Mashriq the Levant and Mesopotamia which was under Ottoman control at the time, contained emotional intensity and strongly condemned the Ottoman Turks for "betraying Islam" and the Fatherland to the Christian West. In the view of Arab patriots, Islam had not always been in a "sorry state" and attributed the military triumphs and cultural glories of the Arabs to the advent of the religion, insisting that European modernism itself was of Islamic origin. The Ottomans, on the other hand, had deviated from true Islam and thus suffered decline. The reforming Ottoman and Egyptian governments were blamed for the situation because they attempted to borrow Western practices from the Europeans that were seen as unnatural and corrupt. Ibrahim al-Yaziji , a Lebanese Christian philosopher, called for the Arabs to "recover their lost ancient vitality and throw off the yoke of the Turks" in A secret society promoting this goal was formed in the late s, with al-Yazigi as a member. The group placed placards in Beirut calling for a rebellion against the Ottomans. Meanwhile, other Lebanese and Damascus -based notables, mostly Muslims, formed similar secret movements, although they differed as Christian groups who disfavoured Arabism called for a completely independent Lebanon while the Muslim Arab societies generally promoted an autonomous Greater Syria still under Ottoman rule. By the beginning of the 20th century, groups of Muslim Arabs embraced an Arab nationalist "self-view" that would provide as the basis of the Arab nationalist ideology of the 20th century. This new version of Arab patriotism was directly influenced by the Islamic modernism and revivalism of Muhammad Abduh , the Egyptian Muslim scholar. Thus, while Europe advanced from adopting the modernist ideals of true Islam, the Muslims failed, corrupting and abandoning true Islam. Its stated aim was "raising the level of the Arab nation to the level of modern nations. Al-Fatat hosted the Arab Congress of in Paris, the purpose of which was to discuss desired reforms with other dissenting individuals from the Arab world. They also requested that Arab conscripts to the Ottoman army not be required to serve in non-Arab regions except in time of war. By now, Faysal along with many Iraqi intellectuals and military officers had joined al-Fatat which would form the backbone of the newly created Arab state that consisted of much of the Levant and the Hejaz. Nonetheless, Jerusalem , Beirut , and Baghdad remained significant bases of support. Its goal was to achieve unity and complete Arab independence. Prominent members included Izzat Darwaza and Shukri al-Quwatli. Centered in Damascus with branches in various cities throughout the Levant, al-Istiqlal received political and financial support from Faysal, but relied on the inner circle of al-Fatat to survive. Although the Arab forces were promised a state that included much of the Arabian Peninsula and the Fertile Crescent the secret Sykesâ€”Picot Agreement between Britain and France provided for the territorial division of much of that region between the two imperial powers. During the inter-war years and the British Mandate period, when Arab lands were under French and British control, Arab nationalism became an important anti-imperial opposition movement against European rule. Growth of the movement[edit] Syrian rebel leader Hilal al-Atrash at a ceremony marking a prisoner exchange with the French Mandate authorities during the Great Syrian Revolt , A number of Arab revolts against the European powers took place following the establishment of the British and French mandates. The uprising which was carried out by the urban population as well as the rural tribes of Iraq ended in The British drastically changed their policy in Iraq afterwards. Although the mandate was still in place officially, the British role was virtually reduced to an advisory one. The revolt subsequently spread throughout Syria, particularly in Damascus where an uprising by the citizens took place. The French responded by systematically bombarding the city, resulting in thousands of deaths. The revolt was put down by the end of the year, but it is credited with forcing the French to take more steps to ensure Syrian independence. It should also be noted that the political leaders of

the Egyptian revolution espoused Egyptian nationalism, rather than an Arab nationalist alternative. According to historian Youssef Choueiri, the "first public glimmerings" of a pan-Arab approach occurred in 1918, during the convention of a pan-Islamic conference in Jerusalem which highlighted Muslim fears of the increasing growth of Zionism in Palestine. Arab delegates held a separate conference and for the first time delegates from North Africa, Egypt, the Arabian Peninsula and the Fertile Crescent convened together to discuss Arab matters. A pan-Arabist covenant was proclaimed centering on three main articles: The Arab countries form an integral and indivisible whole. Hence the Arab nation does not accept or recognize the divisions of whatever nature to which it has been subjected. All efforts in every Arab country are to be directed towards the achievement of total independence within one single unity. Every endeavor which confines political activities to local or regional issues is to be fought against. Since colonialism is, in all its forms and manifestations, incompatible with the dignity and paramount aims of the Arab nation, the Arab nation rejects it and will resist it with all the means at its disposal. However, the Arab Independence Party was formed by Palestinian and Iraqi activists from al-Fatat as a direct result of the Jerusalem conference on 13 August 1918. In August 1919, the League of Nationalist Action LNA was founded in Lebanon by Western-educated professional civil service groups with the aims of creating a common Arab market and industrial base as well as the abolishment of customs barriers between the Arab countries. The LNA enjoyed a level of popularity throughout the 1920s, but did not survive into the 1930s. After Jews retaliated by killing two Arab farmers near Jaffa, this sparked an Arab revolt in Palestine. To protest increased Jewish immigration, a general strike was declared and a political, economic, and social boycott of Jews soon ensued. In Egypt, week-long anti-British demonstrations had eventually resulted in the restoration of the Egyptian constitution while in Syria, a general strike held in January–February 1920 led to major negotiations for an independence deal with the French government. He died in a car accident in 1933, but his death was blamed on the British by Iraqi army officers loyal to him. The ANP typically confined itself to influencing events and leaders in Iraq rather than taking the lead of a mass nationalist movement. King Ghazi of Iraq was one such leader. Ghazi intended to build a strong Iraqi army and actively sought to annex Kuwait. Many Arab nationalist politicians from Kuwait, who favored independence particularly after the discovery of oil there in 1938, were provided safe haven in Iraq after being repressed by the quasi-rulers of the sheikhdom, the al-Sabah family. Kuwait was still a British territory at the time. Ghazi died in a car accident in 1933, prompting a number of his army officers to allege the king was assassinated by British forces. Under great pressure from the latter, al-Gaylani resigned on 31 January 1933 and al-Said took his place. By 1 June, al-Gaylani and al-Husayni fled to the country for Germany, while the army officers who carried out the coup were captured and executed. Branches were subsequently opened in Baghdad, Beirut, Jaffa and Damascus, and Egyptian Prime Minister Mostafa El-Nahas adopted its platform, pledging to help protect "the interests and rights" of the "sister Arab nations" and explore the "question of Arab unity. It sought to unify those states in a stage-based process whereby the initial stage would see Syria, Transjordan, Palestine and Lebanon unite with limited autonomy given to the Jews in Palestine and special rights for the Christians in Lebanon. Between 25 September–8 October 1934, the leaders of Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Transjordan, Yemen and the Palestinian Arab community convened in Alexandria, Egypt in a meeting hosted by the Egyptian government which ended with an agreement known as the "Alexandria Protocol. A key aspect of this was the need for economic aid that was not dependent on peace with Israel and the establishment of U. Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal and directly challenged the dominance of the Western powers in the region. At the same time he opened Egypt up as a Cold War zone by receiving aid and arms shipments from the Soviet bloc countries that were not dependent on treaties, bases and peace accords. However, because of the connotations for Cold War dominance of the region, Egypt also received aid from the U. The question of Palestine and opposition to Zionism became a rallying point for Arab nationalism from both a religious perspective and a military perspective. The fact that the Zionists were Jewish promoted a religious flavor to the xenophobic rhetoric and strengthened Islam as a defining feature of Arab nationalism. However, the fact that most Arabs were Muslims was used by some as an important building block in creating a new Arab national identity. So let all the Arabs today be Muhammed. Islam had given the Arabs a "glorious past", which was very different from the "shameful present". In effect, the troubles of the Arab presence were because the Arabs had diverged from

their "eternal and perfect symbol", Islam. He called for the establishment of the Muslim World League, visiting several Muslim countries to advocate the idea. He also engaged in a propaganda and media war with Nasser. From the mids onward, the movement was further weakened by factional splits and ideological infighting. The formerly pro-Nasser Arab Nationalist Movement , publicly abandoned "Nasserism" in favor of Marxismâ€”Leninism and fell apart soon after. Reasons for decline[edit] Aside from the defeat, factors credited with weakening the movement include: Attempts at unity[edit] Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser signing unity pact with Syrian president Shukri al-Quwatli , forming the United Arab Republic , February In the s, rulers such as Abdullah I of Jordan and Nuri al-Said of Iraq sought to create an expanded Arab empire constructed out of the smaller nation-states that had been created in the mandate period. These aspirations, however, were unpopular and met with suspicion in the countries they sought to conquer. The creation of the Arab League and its insistence on the territorial integrity and respect for sovereignty of each member state, the assassination of Abdullah , and the 14 July Revolution weakened the political feasibility of these ideas. It was accompanied by attempts to include Iraq and North Yemen in the union. With the 14 July Revolution taking place in Iraq the same year, Western powers feared the fallouts of a powerful Arab nationalism in the region. However, due to discontent over the hegemony of Egypt and after a coup in Syria that introduced a more radical government to power, the United Arab Republic collapsed in Another unsuccessful attempt at union occurred in In response, large pro-Nasser riots erupted in Damascus and Aleppo but were crushed with 50 rioters killed. A pro-Nasser coup attempt on 18 July in Syria also ended unsuccessfully. Hundreds of people killed or wounded in an attempt to take over the Damascus radio station and army headquarters, and 27 rebel officers were summarily executed. The plan was rejected by Bourgiba due to his realization of unity of the Maghreb states. This would later become the Arab Maghreb Union. They signed a charter in Baghdad for Joint National Action which provided for the "closest form of unity ties" including "complete military unity" as well as "economic, political and cultural unification". However, Iraqi Vice President Saddam Hussein was fearful of losing his power to Assad who was supposed to become the deputy leader in the new union and forced al-Bakr into retirement under threat of violence. Instead Assad, perhaps fearful of Iraqi domination and a new war with Israel, advocated a step-by-step approach. The unity talks were eventually suspended indefinitely after an alleged discovery of a Syrian plot to overthrow Saddam Hussein in November

Chapter 3 : Arab Revolt - Wikipedia

The Arab movements in World War I. [EliÉ»ezer á¹-aÉ¼uber] -- This study surveys the many revolutionary attempts carried out against the Ottoman Empire in the Fertile Cresecnt and the Arabian Peninsula during World War I. Special emphasis is laid upon the.

Nationalists exaggerate the value or importance of their country, placing its interests over those of other countries. Nationalism was a prominent force in early 20th century Europe and became a significant cause of World War I. Many Europeans â€” particularly citizens of the so-called Great Powers â€” were convinced of the cultural, economic and military supremacy of their nation. This over-confidence was fuelled by popular culture and the press. The pages of many newspapers were filled with nationalist rhetoric and inflammatory stories, such as rumours about rival nations and their evil intentions. Nationalism could be found in literature, music, theatre and art. Royals, politicians and diplomats did little to deflate nationalism and some actively contributed to it with provocative remarks and rhetoric. Nationalism created inflated confidence in their nation, government and military strength. In matters of foreign affairs or global competition, many were convinced that their country was fair, righteous and without fault or blame. In contrast, nationalist ideas demonised rival nations, caricaturing them as aggressive, scheming, deceitful, backward or uncivilised. Nationalist reports convinced many that their country was threatened by the plotting, scheming and hungry imperialism of its rivals. Nationalist and militarist rhetoric assured them that if war did erupt, their nation would emerge victoriously. In concert with its dangerous brothers, imperialism and militarism, nationalism contributed to a continental delusion that suggested a European war was both justified and winnable. Aside from the Crimean War and the Franco-Prussian War , the 19th century was one of comparative peace in Europe. The citizens of England, France and Germany had grown accustomed to colonial wars: Along with rising militarism and the burgeoning arms race, this fostered a growing delusion of invincibility. The British, for example, believed their naval power and the economic might of the Empire would give them the upper hand in any war. The Germans placed great faith in Prussian military efficiency, their growing industrial base, new armaments and an expanding fleet of battleships and U-boats submarines. The French placed their faith in a wall of concrete fortresses and defences, running the length of their eastern border, capable of withstanding any German attack. The Battle of Dorking, typical of anti-German invasion fiction By the late s, some European powers had grown almost drunk with patriotism and nationalism. Britain, to focus on one example, had enjoyed two centuries of imperial, commercial and naval dominance. London had spent the 19th century advancing her imperial and commercial interests and avoiding wars â€” however, the unification of Germany, the speed of German armament and the bellicosity of Kaiser Wilhelm II caused concern among British nationalists. By , a Londoner could buy dozens of tawdry novellas warning of German, Russian or French aggression. This invasion literature often used racial stereotyping or innuendo: Penny novelists, cartoonists and satirists mocked the rulers of these countries. Two of the most popular targets were the German Kaiser and the Russian tsar, both of whom were ridiculed for their arrogance, ambition or megalomania. German nationalism and xenophobia were no less intense, though they came from different origins. Unlike Britain, Germany was a comparatively young nation: The leaders of post Germany relied on nationalist sentiment to consolidate and strengthen the new nation and to gain public support. German culture â€” from the poetry of Goethe to the music of Richard Wagner â€” was promoted and celebrated. German nationalism was backed by German militarism; the state of the nation was defined and reflected by the strength of its military forces. Both the Kaiser and his nation were young, nationalistic, obsessed with military power and imperial expansion. The British became a popular target in the pre-war German press, where Britain was painted as expansionist, selfish, greedy and obsessed with money. Nationalism was also emerging in distant colonies. This cartoon depicts rising Chinese nationalism As the Great Powers beat their chests and filled their people with a sense of righteousness and superiority, another form of nationalism was on the rise in southern Europe. This nationalism was not about supremacy or military power â€” but the right of ethnic groups to independence, autonomy and self-government. With the world divided into large empires and spheres of influence, many

different regions, races and religious groups wanted freedom from their imperial masters. In Russia, more than 80 ethnic groups in eastern Europe and Asia were forced to speak the Russian language, worship the Russian tsar and practice the Russian Orthodox religion. Nationalist groups contributed to the weakening of the Ottoman Empire in eastern Europe, by seeking to throw off Muslim rule. No nationalist movement had a greater impact on the outbreak of war than Slavic groups in the Balkans. Pan-Slavism, the belief that the Slavic peoples of eastern Europe should have their own nation, was a powerful force in the region. Slavic nationalism was strongest in Serbia, where it had risen significantly in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Pan-Slavism was particularly opposed to the Austro-Hungarian Empire and its control and influence over the region. It was this pan-Slavic nationalism that inspired the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in June , an event that led directly to the outbreak of World War I. Nationalism was an intense form of patriotism. Those with nationalist tendencies celebrated the culture and achievements of their own country and placed its interests above those of other nations. British nationalism was fuelled by a century of comparative peace and prosperity. The British Empire had flourished and expanded, its naval strength had grown and Britons had known only colonial wars. German nationalism was a new phenomenon, emerging from the unification of Germany in 1871. Rising nationalism was also a factor in the Balkans, where Slavic Serbs and others sought independence and autonomy from the political domination of Austria-Hungary. Content on this page may not be republished or distributed without permission. For more information please refer to our Terms of Use. This page was written by Jim Southey and Steve Thompson. To reference this page, use the following citation:

Chapter 4 : From nationalism to 'fake news,' legacies of World War I still relevant - blog.quintoapp.com

In an understated but devastating rebuttal in two parts, Tauber shows that Arab nationalism dominated neither the very important pre-World War I organizations nor the rebellious activities during the war.

Below is a map of Europe looked like in , after the war. What was the Austria-Hungary Empire has become several countries including, Yugoslavia. Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary are now separate countries. In , their secret was disclosed by The Russian Government. Notice the little strip called the Allied Condominium, which is later to become Israel and Palestine. The Zionist movement, established in the s, had a mission to establish a Jewish homeland for Jews living in Russia, Germany, and Poland. League of Nations Mandate Source The Carving up of the Ottoman Empire As you can see from the map above, that the former Ottoman Empire was carved up by the League of Nations without any regard for the culture, ethnicity, religious beliefs or interests of the peoples living in the regions. It was done arbitrarily to create conflict, turmoil and corruption, thus giving the British and the French control over the area. If you were to overlay the Ottoman Empire map of over this map, you would see many similarities. Shiites occupy the coast of Lebanon and Syria and parts of Turkey. This is what this area was called after the British mandate. Shiites also occupy southern Iraq as the majority. Sunnis occupy most of Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the southern parts of Turkey where they are mixed with the Kurds. They also occupy most of the northern parts of Iraq, where they are in the minority. They are in one of the most oil-rich regions in the Middle-East. They are also one of the largest populations of people in the world without a country. Conclusion WWI resulted in carving up the Middle-East without any regard for religion, ethnic diversity or culture. From everything that I have researched, it appears as if it was done intentionally to create chaos in the region for the purpose of control by the winners of WWI. It has become apparent to me that trying to democratize these countries is an exercise in futility and results in the loss of blood and treasure for all involved. When they try democracy, the wrong people get into office, e. Israel and the Palestinians are in a constant state of turmoil because of the Balfour Declaration. I believe in large part, the terrorism that we have experienced has been caused because of the preferential treatment that the U. This angers the Arab world and they retaliate by terrorizing us. If I were president, I would make Palestine its own country. We must learn that we cannot make a Theocracy into a Democracy. Men draw maps and layout boundaries, not nature. Borders mean nothing to the people of these areas. They have been connected to each other for hundreds of years without any regard for borders.

Chapter 5 : How the Middle East Was Affected by World War I | Owlcation

ASIAN AND AFRICAN STUDIES, 75, , 1, THE ARAB NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN WORLD WAR I Karol Sorby Jr. Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences.

Franz Haider German exploitation of the Arab nationalist movements in World War II extended from the field of strategic planning at the highest levels of command to the military measures actually taken. General der Flieger Helmut Felmy has presented an account of the military measures taken by Germany. Of all contemporary authorities on the subject still available, he therefore has the most thorough knowledge of the military steps actually taken on the German side. Unfortunately, the men who were his most able and experienced assistants at the time were later killed in action. Thus, consultations held to verify existing documentary evidence were restricted to junior officers, some of them of Arab origin, whose experience was naturally limited. Similar difficulties arose in the study of the political side of the problem. In agreement with the Office, Chief of Military History, this subject was to be treated only insofar as it contributed to an understanding of the concept of Arab nationalist movements and of the atmosphere in which the inadequate and unsuccessful German military measures were introduced. Here again, some of the important contemporary witnesses are no longer alive, or are not available for other reasons. In some measure this lack was compensated by foreign sources. Part One of the study, by General Felmy, therefore bears the imprint of the field commander. Part One required supplementation through a presentation of the military-political vantage point from which the Wehrmacht High Command, as the highest strategic command authority, viewed the development of the Arab nationalist movements and from which it proceeded in its planning. Between these two levels of planning and military execution, there existed no practical effective connecting link apart from the basic directive issued by the Wehrmacht High Command. This side of the problem therefore called for a separate treatment. The most important participants in this field at the Wehrmacht High Command level Canaris and Lahousen are dead; other participants, particularly members of the SS, are not known by name and cannot be contacted. Members of the Wehrmacht High Command at lower levels proved to have had very little information on the subject. The circumstances are similar in the related and intimately involved fields of German political decisions and measures. General Warlimont, whose research was seriously hampered by these difficulties, has presented his findings in a study which forms Part Two of the entire manuscript. Part Two is characterized by the spirit of sober detached intellectualism of the highest levels of command. The experiences set forth in this manuscript, and the lessons drawn there from, are for the most part negative. They show how things should not be done. German efforts to exploit the Arab nationalist movements against Britain lacked a solid foundation. Occupied by other problems more closely akin to his nature, Hitler expended too little interest on the political and psychological currents prevalent in the Arab world. This explains why the German intelligence service was inadequate in an area which presented favorable opportunities because of friendly contacts of long standing. The German supreme command was taken by surprise by the uprising in Iraq. The essential military conditions were lacking for the overhasty attempts then made. Secret doubts as to the possibility of success for German military improvisations in the Arab regions probably contributed toward the remarkable degree of inactivity displayed by the top levels of German command. One thing is certain, that individual actions were duplicated by the most varied agencies, but that no uniformly thought out plan was developed for the exploitation of the Arab nationalist movements. The military efforts made were examples of inadequate and half-hearted measures. They finally deteriorated to the point where Arab volunteers were accepted as substitutes for unavailable German combat personnel. If the measures taken at both levels—strategic planning and practical implementation—can thus be considered essentially as a lesson in omission and inadequacy, the experience gained with Arabs in the psychological field can in contrast be considered profitable. The results are portrayed plastically by General Felmy. The deductions which can be drawn from these results are still valid in our present day. After some bickering between the victorious Allies, Russia obtained Armenia and Azerbaidzhan. The Sykes-Picot Agreement, concluded between England and France in 1916, stipulated that certain territories were to become British and French administrative zones, while the

rest of Arabia was to be divided into British and French spheres of influence. During the years following the war the Sykes-Picot Agreement involved the British in serious difficulties because it was not compatible with previous agreements made with Arab chieftains. The already tense situation in the Middle East was further complicated by the emergence of Jewish nationalistic aspirations. Arab hatred of the Jews and disappointment of the Arab hopes for independence led to bloody riots. At first purely anti-Jewish in nature and directed against the rapidly increasing Jewish immigration in Palestine, the uprisings were later aimed at Great Britain as the mandatory power. The situation continued unsatisfactory until the outbreak of World War II, when it was overshadowed by the crisis in Europe. When England declared war on Germany the Zionist organizations, which had actively supported the influx of Jewish immigrants in Palestine, at once proclaimed solidarity with Britain against Germany. Her interests in the Middle East were mainly in the economic sphere. She was active in the construction of the Baghdad railway and participated in the production of oil. Thus her position remained unaffected by the events which took place in the period between the two wars. In fact Germany enjoyed a degree of confidence among the Moslems seldom manifested toward unbelievers. As was inevitable, the victories achieved by the Third Reich in had repercussions in the Arab world. The regime of the pro-British Regent Abdul Illa was overthrown. During the following days the Emir Sharif-Sharaf was appointed Regent and a new government was set up with Rashid Ali as prime minister. As far as Great Britain was concerned, the fall of the government in Iraq, constituted a crisis of the first magnitude. Troop reinforcements were sent to Iraq from Egypt and India, in defiance of a treaty between Great Britain and Iraq which stipulated the number of British troops allowed on Iraqi soil. On 28 April Rashid Ali refused permission for two additional troop ships to land at Basra before a first contingent, which had disembarked on 18 April, had left the country. On 1 May the Iraqis moved additional artillery into position and threatened to fire on any British personnel or planes attempting to leave the base. The outcome of the situation was that the Iraqis promised not to start shooting first. This irresolution on the part of Rashid Ali caused his downfall. A telegram from British Prime Minister Winston Churchill reading "If you have to strike, strike hard," strengthened Smart in his decision. At dawn on 2 May the British attacked. Iraqi artillery immediately responded with fire on the airfield, while Iraqi aircraft from Baghdad bombed the installations. However, there could be no doubt about the outcome of the unequal contest. The Royal Air Force quickly proved its superiority, and the Iraqi resistance began to slacken. During the night of 5 May the Arab troops withdrew to Al Falluja. Iraq had broken off diplomatic relations with Germany at the beginning of World War II, but had not declared war. Now Rashid Ali sent an urgent appeal for assistance to Berlin, where the Wehrmacht High Command held a conference on 6 May to discuss measures to be taken to support the rebellion. It was decided to give Iraq all assistance possible and to intensify the war against Great Britain in the Middle East. Diplomatic relations between the Third Reich and Iraq were resumed. The former German Ambassador to Iraq, Dr. Grobba, returned to Baghdad. Even so, the only direct and immediate support that Germany could give the regime of Rashid Ali was in the form of air forces. A squadron of Me fighter aircraft and a squadron of He bombers were made available for this purpose. In addition, tons of weapons and ammunition were made ready for shipment to the Iraqis. Plans were also made to send a German military mission to Baghdad. The Vichy French government granted Germany permission to land planes on French airfields in Syria, and also declared its willingness to furnish Iraq with weapons and ammunition from the stores of the French Army of the Levant. Rahn, a member of the German Embassy in Paris, was entrusted with the task of organizing the transport of the war materials from Syria to Iraq. On 10 May he arrived in Beirut, having conferred with Dr. Grobba, the Ambassador, en route. As a result of his intercession, the first train loads of weapons and ammunition for the rebels moved in Mosul on 13 May. Additional war materials followed on 26 and 28 May. This unit had been held in readiness on the island of Rhodes off the Turkish coast, the Luftwaffe having intended to use the planes to bomb the Suez Canal. Before starting out for Syria the squadron flew to Silistra, in Rumania, where the aircraft were given a complete overhauling. The Luftwaffe personnel were issued tropical uniforms and equipment on the return trip, at the Tatoi Airport north of Athens. The pilots were poorly briefed, because of the general haste and in the absence of all news from Iraq. However, the German bombers were crammed with ammunition, rations, tents, and spare parts and sent on their way. Rahn advised

against continuing on to Baghdad because of the lack of news, so that same morning five bombers and three fighters flew to Palmyra where the French had an air base. Finally, on 15 May, the Germans were able to make a first reconnaissance flight over Iraq. They followed this the next day by bombing Habbaniya. A total of six bombing raids were carried out on the British air base. Then the bombers had to halt their attacks, partly because the Royal Air Force had destroyed a number of German aircraft on the ground but also because of the death of Major von Blomberg, a son of the Field Marshal. This officer had been charged with coordinating the activities of the Axis air squadrons with the Iraqi forces. Just as his plane was about to land on the Baghdad airfield, Major von Blomberg was killed by Iraqi anti-aircraft fire. In consequence there was no contact between the German and the Iraqis. On 19 May they captured Al Falluja and a bridge over the Euphrates. The Iraqis, counterattacking with vigor, retook the city on 22 May, and then lost it again when the British renewed their attack. For a few days the British were held up by string floods, but on 30 May, they advanced in two columns under the command of Major General Clark to within sight of the suburb of Baghdad. The total strength of this British Force was men, 8 artillery pieces, and a few armored cars. The Iraqis had a division stationed in the neighborhood of the capital, but made no attempt to commit it. Since the British enjoyed superiority in the air, the ill-timed Iraqi unit commanders were in no position to put up a fight. They had had an excellent chance to deal the British a telling blow at Habbaniya, and had failed to take it. The beating they took at Al Falluja had resigned them to the worst. Thus the Iraqi uprising collapsed. When the government fled, the mayor of Baghdad capitulated to the British. On 31 May an armistice was concluded.

Chapter 6 : Arab nationalism - Wikipedia

This book examines the communist movement in the Arab world from the time of the Russian revolution until after the collapse of the Soviet Union. It traces the interaction of the world communist movement which was characterized by an uncritical.

Mallet to Sir Edward Grey. March 18, R. Sir, In my despatch No. Although Colonel Erskine goes on to state that the projected conference is unlikely to be held, the report is significant in view of the dissatisfaction which prevails among Ottoman Arabs generally; and the list of names given is an indication of the possibility of the great Chieftains on the Arab fringe of the Empire sinking their personal differences in order to enforce nationalist aspirations as against the Central Government, which is directed by the Committee of Union and Progress and which they still regard as pursuing a Turkifying policy. As for Ibn Saud his occupation of El Hassa last year is an eloquent demonstration both of his power and of his feelings towards the Central Government. If these leaders were to combine either in a constitutional agitation for devolution or autonomy or in an avowedly separatist movement they could undoubtedly cause much trouble. In this connection I may refer to that part of my despatch No. It is still impossible to say what real prospect there may be of any united Arab movement. That the Central Government is on the alert is perhaps indicated by the fact that energetic military valis on whom the Committee can rely have been within the last few months appointed to Bagdad, Basrah and the Hedjaz. Ibn Saud has been negotiating terms of submission to the Government. I have reported in my despatch No. As I am disposed to see in the recent outrages at Basrah which are principally directed against British subjects an attempt on the part of the Arabs to force the hand of His Majesty's Government in the direction of intervention, I informed Mr. Crow on the 17th ultimo that I could not recommend the despatch of a British man-of-war to the Shatt-el-Arab. The need for caution is apparent at the present moment, when there is evidence of a concerted movement on the part of the Arabs. If these projects should mature and if the Arabs are eventually successful in defeating the Ottoman armies the loss of the Caliphate would probably follow, where, shorn of a further large portion of territory and of the religious leadership, Turkish rule, as it exists today, would presumably disappear. Europe might then be faced with the question of a partition of the Turkish Empire which might easily produce complications of a serious nature, whilst it is difficult to estimate what might be the effects on India of a prolonged struggle for the possession of the Caliphate. I should imagine that in view of the great issues at stake the present Government would do all in their power to avoid bringing matters to a point at the present moment and that they will probably temporise with the Grand Sherif at any rate until they have either divided the Arabs and feel that they are in a position to face them with certainty of success. December 20, R. December 29, , is not reproduced as the contents are sufficiently indicated above. Memorandum on the position of the Grand Sheriff of Mecca. Any given Grand Sherif might quite conceivably put himself at the head of an Arab movement, and, if he wished to do so, his alleged descent from the Prophet, and membership of the Koreish tribe would doubtless be a valuable asset; but in order to gain any widespread influence he would have to start almost from the beginning, and, in the case of the present man, I think he would have to live down a past in which, while working for his own aggrandizement, he has posed very definitely as the representative of the Central Government. The following is a sketch of his recent history so far as it is known to me. During the last years of the old regime Sherif Hussein Pasha was a member of the council of State here. Towards the end of he was appointed Grand Sherif in the ordinary course of succession, his predecessor Abdullah who seems to have been Grand Sherif without proceeding to Mecca having died that year. He was then about 56 years of age. On his arrival he created a good impression, and it was hoped that he would not prove extortionate and would restore security in the country about Mecca. In reporting his appointment to the Foreign Office Sir G. Lowther spoke favourably of him, and mentioned that some months before, at a time when there was no prospect of his becoming Grand Sherif, he had gone out of his way to express his friendship towards England. Since his appointment it cannot be said that he has done anything definite to alleviate the pecuniary burdens of the pilgrim. On the other hand, although insecurity continued to prevail on the roads in , no robberies were reported to the Embassy in the three following years

until nearly the end of , when there was a recrudescence of brigandage. Meanwhile the Grand Sherif was engaged in consolidating his own power, and his success in doing so was facilitated by the frequent changes of Valis, most of the nominees to that post having been men of little account. He and his sons took a considerable share in military operations, which though undertaken in the name of the Government, contributed to his own aggrandizement. Thus, in , he conducted an expedition against the Nejd ruler Ibn Saud, which ended in a paper success for the Turkish Government, though the promises made by Ibn Saud were never kept and extremely bad relations subsisted between him and the Grand Sherif throughout the following year. When in the summer of that year three Indians were found murdered in the Medina district, the Consul was assured that the guilty parties were emissaries of the Grand Sherif, who had been ordered by the Government to withdraw his son and his Bedouins from Asir, and who, so the informant said, was deliberately seeking to create disturbance in the Medina district so as to convince the Government of the necessity of bringing it also under his authority. However that may be there was certainly a recrudescence of brigandage, as mentioned above, towards the end of . His own son Sherif Abdullah sat for Mecca in the first parliament, and in the packed Committee Parliament of he was able to put in one son for Mecca and the other, Faizal, for Jeddah. They played no prominent part in Parliamentary life here but it is significant that in , some months before the second election, the Committee Clubs in Mecca and Jeddah "died a natural death. Now these brothers are reported to be bitterly hostile to the present Grand Sherif. Ali Haidar is the head of the dispossessed Motallib branch of the Sherifian family and is said to cherish the ambition of becoming Grand Sherif himself. Under all these circumstances it is easy to understand how anxiously Hussein Pasha must have viewed the advent of a young and possibly energetic Vali. This doubtless explains his sending Abdullah Bey to Lord Kitchener. As for the subsequent report of an amicable settlement of his differences with the Turks, it is difficult to form an opinion as to the sincerity of either side. It is conceivable that statesmen here may have thought it best not to seek for trouble and the Grand Sherif may not think his position sufficiently menaced to make it worth his while to risk everything on open defiance of the Central Government. On the other hand Constantinople may feel that his aggrandizement has gone too far, and the Grand Sherif may think that the existence of a rival, friendly to the Committee and already a candidate for the post increases very considerably the danger of his position. In that case the reconciliation would be merely a form of temporising and the Grand Sherif might still be tempted to associate himself with Arab adventures. Garstin has told Your Excellency in what a nervous frame of mind the young man was as to his reception here. February 24, , R. March 2, , is not reproduced as the contents are sufficiently indicated above. A very delicate situation. I have always felt that the policy we are pursuing towards Ibn Saud is fraught with grave danger to the integrity of Turkey, and I was always personally strongly opposed to the interviews which took place between him and our officials. Qu[ery] telegraph to Sir L.

Eliezer Tauber is the author of The Arab Movements in World War One (avg rating, 2 ratings, 0 reviews, published), The Emergence of the Arab Mo.

Visit Website The assassination of Franz Ferdinand set off a rapidly escalating chain of events: Austria-Hungary, like many in countries around the world, blamed the Serbian government for the attack and hoped to use the incident as justification for settling the question of Serbian nationalism once and for all. The Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary then sent an ultimatum to Serbia, with such harsh terms as to make it almost impossible to accept. World War I Begins Convinced that Austria-Hungary was readying for war, the Serbian government ordered the Serbian army to mobilize, and appealed to Russia for assistance. On August 4, German troops crossed the border into Belgium. In the first battle of World War I, the Germans assaulted the heavily fortified city of Liege, using the most powerful weapons in their arsenal—enormous siege cannons—to capture the city by August. Leaving death and destruction in their wake, including the shooting of civilians and the execution of a Belgian priest, whom they accused of inciting civilian resistance, the Germans advanced through Belgium towards France. First Battle of the Marne In the First Battle of the Marne, fought from September, French and British forces confronted the invading German army, which had by then penetrated deep into northeastern France, within 30 miles of Paris. The Allied troops checked the German advance and mounted a successful counterattack, driving the Germans back to north of the Aisne River. The defeat meant the end of German plans for a quick victory in France. Both sides dug into trenches, and the Western Front was the setting for a hellish war of attrition that would last more than three years. Particularly long and costly battles in this campaign were fought at Verdun February-December and the Battle of the Somme July-November. German and French troops suffered close to a million casualties in the Battle of Verdun alone. This increased hostility was directed toward the imperial regime of Czar Nicholas II and his unpopular German-born wife, Alexandra. Russia reached an armistice with the Central Powers in early December, freeing German troops to face the remaining Allies on the Western Front. America Enters World War I At the outbreak of fighting in, the United States remained on the sidelines of World War I, adopting the policy of neutrality favored by President Woodrow Wilson while continuing to engage in commerce and shipping with European countries on both sides of the conflict. In, Germany declared the waters surrounding the British Isles to be a war zone, and German U-boats sunk several commercial and passenger vessels, including some U.S. Widespread protest over the sinking by U-boat of the British ocean liner Lusitania—traveling from New York to Liverpool, England with hundreds of American passengers onboard—in May helped turn the tide of American public opinion against Germany. Germany sunk four more U.S. Gallipoli Campaign With World War I having effectively settled into a stalemate in Europe, the Allies attempted to score a victory against the Ottoman Empire, which entered the conflict on the side of the Central Powers in late. After a failed attack on the Dardanelles the strait linking the Sea of Marmara with the Aegean Sea, Allied forces led by Britain launched a large-scale land invasion of the Gallipoli Peninsula in April. The invasion also proved a dismal failure, and in January Allied forces were staged a full retreat from the shores of the peninsula, after suffering, casualties. The young Winston Churchill, then first lord of the British Admiralty, resigned his command after the failed Gallipoli campaign in, accepting a commission with an infantry battalion in France. British-led forces also combated the Ottoman Turks in Egypt and Mesopotamia, while in northern Italy, Austrian and Italian troops faced off in a series of 12 battles along the Isonzo River, located at the border between the two nations. British and French—and later, American—troops arrived in the region, and the Allies began to take back the Italian Front. The biggest naval engagement of World War I, the Battle of Jutland May left British naval superiority on the North Sea intact, and Germany would make no further attempts to break an Allied naval blockade for the remainder of the war. Second Battle of the Marne With Germany able to build up its strength on the Western Front after the armistice with Russia, Allied troops struggled to hold off another German offensive until promised reinforcements from the United States were able to arrive. On July 15, German troops launched what would become the last German offensive of the war,

attacking French forces joined by 85, American troops as well as some of the British Expeditionary Force in the Second Battle of the Marne. The Allies successfully pushed back the German offensive, and launched their own counteroffensive just three days later. The Second Battle of the Marne turned the tide of war decisively towards the Allies, who were able to regain much of France and Belgium in the months that followed. Toward Armistice By the fall of , the Central Powers were unraveling on all fronts. Despite the Turkish victory at Gallipoli, later defeats by invading forces and an Arab revolt had combined to destroy the Ottoman economy and devastate its land, and the Turks signed a treaty with the Allies in late October Austria-Hungary, dissolving from within due to growing nationalist movements among its diverse population, reached an armistice on November 4. Facing dwindling resources on the battlefield, discontent on the homefront and the surrender of its allies, Germany was finally forced to seek an armistice on November 11, , ending World War I. Treaty of Versailles At the Paris Peace Conference in , Allied leaders would state their desire to build a post-war world that would safeguard itself against future conflicts of such devastating scale. As the years passed, hatred of the Versailles treaty and its authors settled into a smoldering resentment in Germany that would, two decades later, be counted among the causes of World War II. Civilian casualties caused indirectly by the war numbered close to 10 million. The two nations most affected were Germany and France, each of which sent some 80 percent of their male populations between the ages of 15 and 49 into battle. The political disruption surrounding World War I also contributed to the fall of four venerable imperial dynastiesâ€”Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia and Turkey. World War I brought about massive social upheaval, as millions of women entered the workforce to support men who went to war, and to replace those who never came back. The severe effects that chemical weapons such as mustard gas and phosgene had on soldiers and civilians during World War I galvanized public and military attitudes against their continued use. The Geneva Convention agreements, signed in , restricted the use of chemical and biological agents in warfare, and remains in effect today.

Chapter 8 : Eliezer Tauber (Author of The Arab Movements in World War One)

Arab Revolt; Part of the Middle Eastern theatre of World War I: Soldiers of the Arab Army in northern Yanbu carrying the Flag of the Arab Revolt.

And the third section deals with the aftermath of the World War as it pertained to the destinies of the eastern half of the Arab world – the Arabian Peninsula and the Fertile Crescent. It is not a neutral work, and it does not pretend to be so: And in telling that story, Antonius does not place himself as a disinterested observer but as an insider and an advocate. He is well-placed to offer insights from sources not available to other English-speaking explorers of the topic, and does so with a kind of journalistic zeal. He is nonetheless a gifted writer and a careful scholar, which makes his advocacy on behalf of the ordinary Arab, particularly the ordinary Arab living in Syria or Palestine, that much more pointed and potent. Antonius himself is a nominal Orthodox Christian, though one would not know it to read his history, which is – very typically for the Arab nationalist sentiment of the time – impartial and anti-sectarian on religious questions. Antonius is not without critique of his own countrymen. He shows, with love but not without a bit of chagrin, the dual tendencies of the early Arab activists to lethargy and dormancy on the one hand, and swift, inspired action on the other: It is in the nature of the Arab temperament to conceive action in spasms rather than on a plan of sustained effort, and the history of the national movement is in a sense a chronicle of vivid outbursts with periods of recovery and preparation between them. It unfolds itself in a pattern of flames shooting upwards from a dull fire of smouldering feeling. The revolutionary effort of the Beirut secret society was the first of a series of waves which were to follow each other at regular intervals. It was a testament to their discipline that despite arbitrary arrests and torture employed by the Turkish secret police, their existence remained hidden from the Turks until after the World War. Even as Antonius acknowledges the failures of al-Husayn and Faysal to successfully advocate for the Arab cause to the Allies or to fight effectively for it themselves, his portrayal of them is nonetheless deeply sympathetic, rendering them as tragic victims of their own honest and trusting natures. In his hand was forced: After such a demonstration of brutality, a revolt became inevitable. Not only did this force the Ottomans to turn their attention inward and take the pressure off of British troops who were fighting in North Africa, but even more importantly from a strategic standpoint, the Arab Revolt effectively thwarted German communications with the colonies through Ottoman territory. In the two years to come, Ottoman resources would be drained and its manpower sapped trying to put down revolts throughout Iraq, Syria, Palestine and the Arabian Peninsula. The reprisals against the Arabic civilian populace by the Turks were by no means as dramatic or as broad in scale as the Medz Yeghern, though they were every bit as heinous. As with all famines, this one was the result of political choice. In this case, Ahmed Jamal Pasha deliberately withheld shipments of grain into Syria in order to starve the Arab nationalist elements there into submission. The only reason the death toll from this famine did not ultimately rise to the sorts of figures calculated for the Armenian genocide, is that the Allies were stunningly efficient in the aftermath of the war in distributing food and medical supplies to the suffering Syrian countryside. However, for all the debts of gratitude owed by the Allies – particularly Britain – to the leaders of the Arab Revolt and their supporters among the populace, their actions in the wake of the war fell stunningly short of fitting. Instead, the Sykes-Picot Agreement, made by the European Allies completely over the heads of the Arab people, was aimed at essentially turning the Arab lands into a new colonialist frontier between Britain and France. In Iraq, after a brief struggle against Britain and a successful bid for independence, the state-building project undertaken by Faysal ibn al-Husayn – that is to say, Faysal I of Iraq – met with a mixed record of success. In Syria, however, at first the French mandate behaved themselves with brutality and supreme contempt for the rule of law. He describes the indiscriminate bombing of villages and the looting of neighbourhoods by French regulars and mercenaries under General Sarrail. Interestingly, not only armed uprisings but also peaceful measures, including mass labour strikes, were used against the French administration to effect. Antonius describes with some irony and reference to Saul of Tarsus the sudden and inexplicable change of heart the French High Commissioner of Syria Damien de Martel underwent when it came to the treatment of

the people of Damascus. He questions whether it was motivated by genuine humane considerations or simply by pragmatism, but closes his treatment of Syria on a hopeful note that the French have learned from their mistakes going forward. In Palestine, the Balfour Declaration gave the Arab leadership still deeper misgivings. However – understandably – they were not about to give up their legitimate sovereign claims to the land to make way for a Zionist state-building project, and they saw rightly so the Balfour Declaration as a dangerous step in that direction. Here Antonius also makes plain his own sympathies for the plight of the Jews in Europe under the looming storm of fascist hatred – but also his conviction that settling them in Palestine would be no solution worthy of the name at all: The treatment meted out to Jews in Germany and other European countries is a disgrace to its authors and to modern civilisation; but posterity will not exonerate any country that fails to bear its proper share of the sacrifices needed to alleviate Jewish suffering and distress. To place the brunt of the burden upon Arab Palestine is a miserable evasion of the duty that lies upon the whole of the civilised world. It is morally outrageous. It is at the very end, though, that the sympathies of the author are the most directly and the most viscerally engaged. Though one can hardly accuse Antonius of being a romantic – his treatment of even historical figures he admires being unfailingly multifaceted, attempting sober, realistic and objective assessments – it is here that his history turns from a story of the movement into a thundering, apocalyptic prophecy and a stirring plea. He takes it upon himself to speak to English-speaking audiences on behalf of the politically-voiceless Levantine peasant, attached firmly to his land and to his neighbours by inexpressibly-profound bonds of love, and oppressed not only by British and French mandatory maladministration, not only by Zionist settlement, but also by the shortsightedness and greed of the Arab landowning class and traditional tribal elites. In his own words: One of the most prevalent misconceptions is that the trouble in Palestine is the result of an engineered agitation. The blindness of that view is clear to-day. Former outbreaks had similarly been explained; but, after inquiry by one or other of the commissions appointed by the mandatory Power, the underlying causes had always been found to have lain in the profound attachment of the Arabs to the soil and their culture. The rebellion to-day is, to a greater extent than ever before, a revolt of villagers. The moving spirits in the revolt are not the nationalist leaders, most of whom are now in exile, but men of the working and agricultural classes who are risking their lives in what they believe to be the only way left to them of saving their homes and their villages. It is a delusion to regard it as the work of agitators, Arab or foreign. This is a view toward which I am already profoundly sympathetic. Many of the predictive and admonitory aspects of the work – particularly those pertaining to Iraq and Palestine – have indeed come to pass. There are, indeed, weaker passages: But in the broad strokes, this is still an extraordinary book and well worth the time taken to read it. Participants in the Arab Revolt Posted by.

Chapter 9 : British Imperial Connexions to the Arab National Movement - World War I Document Archive

World War I began in 1914, after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, and lasted until 1918. During the conflict, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire (the Central

Monitor writers took a look at nine of those topics and how they still reverberate today. On Armistice Day in 1918, those bells rang out over a country that was near the territorial peak of its empire. But Vladimir Putin is changing the narrative. There was mass mobilization, huge crowds in the streets cheering for war, and talk of it all being over by Christmas. That was followed by years of grinding trench warfare that killed millions, brought mass disillusionment, and ultimately shattered the once mighty Russian Empire. Though other empires collapsed under the impact of that titanic conflict, Russia was the only member of the victorious coalition of Western allies, including Britain, France, and the US, to do so. About eight months before the war ended in the West, the Bolsheviks made a separate peace with Germany, which freed up huge numbers of German troops to launch a last offensive against the Allies in France. That is the short reason why Nov. 11 is the new view, the millions of Russians who died in WWI are seen as patriotic soldiers fighting for their country. Petersburg historian specializing in the Russian Revolution. In the former heart of the Ottoman Empire, memories of World War I have mostly been about glories amid a losing conflict. But modern Turkey is pursuing policies that are starting to rhyme with those of the past. Today the remnants of an empire that once stretched from Budapest to Baghdad are scattered across the Middle East: Yet rather than mourning a lost empire, most Turks use the centennial of WWI to celebrate the reclaiming of their national identity and independence. While Turks commemorate victories over the British in Al Kut, Iraq, or at the Battle of Gallipoli, what resonates more is the proceeding war of Turkish independence in 1922. The Turkish parliament abolished the Islamic caliphate in 1924. The caliph himself, Abdülmecid II, was exiled. A little over years ago, she was successful in winning some British women the right to vote. Not coincidentally, that victory came just months before the end of a war in which women across nations took on revolutionary new roles in factories or on the front lines – laying bare for the world to see the hypocrisies they faced and catalyzing emancipation movements globally. A century later women are again holding up Ms. The fight for equal work and wages gained international resonance, but voting rights were earned more variably. If some British and Canadian women won the right during the war, it came later in the US – and much later in France, for example. After the war, many women emerged as paragons, such as nurses who were able to combine bravery with traditional roles as caregivers. Others, particularly women combatants, faced stigmas upon their return. But that model, powerfully espoused by President Woodrow Wilson, seems to be in retreat today due to the efforts of a new set of political leaders – including President Trump. In fact, some scholars consider it the single most important such address ever made in the US. Though the US backtracked after combat ended in 1919 when the Senate failed to ratify entry into the new League of Nations, US leaders after World War II decisively embraced the United Nations and the concept of liberal internationalism outlined by Wilson earlier in the century. Today that legacy appears in question. To his critics, President Trump is a big part of this problem. He speaks more fondly of authoritarian leaders than he does of venerable democratic allies. Perhaps more importantly, Mr. He talks of pulling back from overseas and focusing defense dollars and effort on the homeland. But in these cases Trump is not singular. He is reflective of trends that predate his election in 2017. In the US, political partisanship has become endemic. Voters are increasingly divided along racial and religious lines. Politically, opponents are described not as adversaries, but enemies. Officials exercise their powers to the utmost. Where did Germany suffer its first defeat in World War I? The answer is Togoland, a narrow tongue of land poking out into the Atlantic Ocean just east of Ghana. A tiny German colony with a big radio transmitter, it was an important early target for British troops. They conquered it the same month they entered the war, August 1914. Take Namibia, for example. And when it left Africa, Germany took with it a dark history. Those who remained were sent to concentration camps, or shot on sight. For nearly a century, that history remained submerged, rarely discussed outside of the Namibian communities that had lived the horror, and vastly overshadowed in Germany by the brutalities of World War II. But in recent years, activists have

forcefully demanded a reckoning. The remains were from victims of the genocide against the Herero and Nama people, carried out by the German Empire in German South West Africa – modern Namibia. Although the German government has agreed in principle to an apology, negotiations have stalled over the exact terms. A group of Herero and Nama, meanwhile, have filed a class action law suit in New York to force the German government to pay direct reparations to descendants of those killed in the genocide. And while the context is much different today, the problem of "fake news" is back with a vengeance. His journal, like those of his fellow soldiers, shows him alternately struggling to deny, digest, and justify horrors his countrymen did, in fact, inflict on Belgians. But for many, the war was the crucible that truly forged them into nascent nations. Canada was automatically at war in because the British Empire was at war. The war was deeply divisive, with convictions over issues like conscription or income taxes roiling the dominion. But Canada united under its sacrifice, with , men enlisting – one of every three adult men in the country. And when the war ended on Nov. It also joined the League of Nations with its own seat, a scenario that would have been unthinkable prior to the onset of the conflict. Canada lost one tenth of the men who enlisted, a much higher percentage than the US, which only entered the war in the spring of That was two and a half years after the first Canadian Expeditionary Force sailed to Europe. And once again that means Canada finds itself punching above its weight on the global stage – and wondering how much it can continue to depend on the US for stability. And the allegiances that those nations stirred persist today, posing a modern challenge to continental stability. For the whole of the 19th century, the country had been erased from the map, partitioned among three European empires. It was reborn in the same nationalist wave that had contributed to World War I in the first place. That nationalist tone can still be heard. Until , empires were the organizing principle in much of continental Europe and its neighborhood: Nationalist stirrings among ethnic groups within those empires helped spark continental conflict, and all of them evaporated in the crucible of WWI. But German nationalism was denied. The continent exploded again in That has brought economic prosperity and unprecedented peace, but it has failed to engender much sense of continental loyalty. A recent EU poll found that only six percent of Europeans see themselves as Europeans first, and then as their own nationality. Ninety percent see themselves primarily, or only, as their own nationality. Get the Monitor Stories you care about delivered to your inbox. The EU is now fraying at the edges, and under strong attack by populist nationalist politicians such as those who persuaded Britain to leave the grouping. Their pedigree goes back years and further, says Dr. Should we come back to this topic? Or just give us a rating for this story. We want to hear from you.