

UNIT ONE

PEOPLE AND RELIGIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Introduction

In ancient time Egyptian, Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations born and flourished in the Middle East. Judaism, the first of the three great monotheistic religions, took form here during the 3000 year of the Old Testament era. From its seeds sprang Christianity and Islam, the two other world faiths born in the Middle East. The region was, successively, a part of the Persian, Greek, Roman, Arab, Mongol, Tatar, and Turkish empires, each contributing to a new fusion of culture and civilization there, fusions that at times reached high points in man's development. During medieval times, the European Crusaders wrested the eastern shores of the Mediterranean from the Muslims in their attempts to seize the Holy Land. The practical result was to open Asia to contact and a free flow of trade with Western Europe.

Throughout the nineteenth century the great powers, recognizing the strategic value of the Middle East as the gateway to Asia made attempts to neutralize it, or, if that was not possible, to seize for themselves an area of influence within its confines. During both world wars I and II, the Middle East played a major role in the grand strategy of the major contestants.

Oil and natural gas and as well as its location on the air and the sea routes between the Europe and Africa, South East Asia, and the Far East involve the Middle East in the by polar conflict between communist and non-communist regions that came to the surface a few months after the end of World War II.

1.1. Territories and Region of the Middle East

Middle East, geographic and cultural region located in Southwestern Asia and north Eastern Africa. The Middle East (from a European perspective) is a region that encompasses Western Asia and North Africa. In some contexts, particularly in the United States, the term has recently been expanded in usage to sometimes include Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and North Africa. It's often used as a synonym for Near East, in opposition to Far East. In modern times Middle East remains a strategically, economically, politically, culturally and religiously sensitive region. The term Middle East may have originated in the 1850s in the British Indian office. However, it became more widely known when American naval strategist Alfred Thayer Mahan used the term in 1902 to designate the area between Arabia and India. There are **two types** of definition regarding the Middle East:

1. Traditional
2. Modern (broader definition)

- 1. Traditional:** The traditional definition of the Middle East was used by Europeans before world war the first. Before the First World War the term **Near East** was used in English to refer Balkans and the Ottoman Empire while the Middle East referred to Iran, Afghanistan and central Asia Turkestan and the Caucasus. In contrast Far East referred to the countries of East Asia. Example china, Japan, Korea etc.
- 2. The Modern:** The Modern definition of the Middle East started with the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the First World War; Near East largely fell out of Common use in English, while Middle East came to be applied to the re-emerging countries of the Islamic world.

1.2. People and Languages of the Middle East.

The main peoples with which we will deal in our study of the modern Middle East are the Semitic, Turkish, and Iranian linguistic groups. These are broad classifications and within each there are numerous subdivisions. It is difficult, if not impossible, to divide them into precise, scientific categories. Terms such as race, nationality, and religion often have meanings in the Middle East that differ from those of the western world.

A large portion of the people of the region has concentrated in fertile agricultural areas like the Nile valley of Egypt, the Syrian mountains, Turkey, the Euphrates and Tigris banks in Iraq and the mountain of Iran. The arid and the desert part of the region are very sparsely populated.

Arabs: - the name Arab, given to the ancient and present-day inhabitants of the Arabian Peninsula and often applied to the peoples closely allied to them in ancestry, language, religion, and culture. Presently more than 200 million Arabs are living mainly in 21 countries; they constitute the overwhelming majority of the population in Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Egypt, and the nations of North Africa. The Arabic language is the main symbol of cultural unity among these people, but the religion of Islam provides another common bond for the majority of Arabs. Language and religion are united in the Qur'an (Koran), the sacred scripture of Islam. The Arabic language is the members of the Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic languages.

Persians: - The Persians make up about 60% of the population of Iran. The Persians descended from Indo-European peoples who entered the country from central Asia during the second

century B.C. these people speak Persians, an Indo-Iranian language. It is much influence by the Arabic (through Islam) and Aramaic (the pre-Arabic lingua franca of the Middle East). Before the rise of Islam and the Arab expansion the Persians dominated most parts of the Middle East.

The Turks: - It is the third most widely spoken language, Turkish is confined to Turkey, which is also one of the region's largest and most populous countries. It is the member of the Turkic languages, which have their origins in central Asia.

Kurds: - Kurds, ethnic group that originated as a semi nomadic, tribal people inhabited for centuries a mountainous region of southwestern Asia. Today, many Kurds are urban dwellers living in cities in southern Turkey and northern Iraq and in parts of Iran and Syria.

Jews: - Jews, a people who have maintained a distinct cultural identity originally based on the idea of a covenant, or special relationship, with God. The Jewish people are among the oldest of the many people's known to history. Their origins date back at least 3,000 years, and perhaps even further.

1.3.Religion of the Middle East

Middle East is the source of many religious practices. In ancient times, in the Middle East there were several religions. Many of them were polytheistic. Among them the most widely known religions in the Middle East before two millennia was Zoroastrianism. It is religion arose in ancient Persia from the teaching of poet Zoroaster, known as Zarathustra to ancient Iranians who are regarded as the faiths of founding prophet. The three major religions that originated in the Middle East were Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

1.4.Significance of the Middle East.

The Middle East has a paramount significance in the world politics and economy. It attracted the attention of the rest of the world since early times. It is important for the following reasons.

Historical:-historically the Middle East is the origin of ancient civilization and the major religion of the the world.

Politically:-The Middle East is an area of frequent conflicts . for example the conflict between palestenian and Israel.

Economically:- Economically the region has 65% and 26% of the worlds energy resourece and naturla gas respectively in the Middle East.

UNIT TWO

MIDDLE EAST AND FIRST WORLD WAR

2.1. The Middle East on the eve of the First World War

The era from 1875-1914 may be called the age of an empire not only because it developed a new kind of imperialism but also a number of rulers officially themselves Emperors. In the Europe the rulers of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Russia, Turkey and Britain claimed this title. Outside Europe the rulers of **china, Japan** and **Ethiopia** were in habitually allowed this title. The period is obviously the era of a new type of empire and colonialism. The economic and military supremacy of the capitalist countries had long been beyond serious challenge. Between 1880 and 1914 most of the world outside the Europe and the American was formally partitioned into territories under the formal rule or informal political domination of one or other states: mainly Great Britain, France Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, the USA and Japan.

For a long period of time the British followed the policy of preventing any European power from dominating the Ottoman Empire. The British believed that the domination of the Ottoman Empire would be threatening their interest in the Middle East and India. At the eve of the First World War the British had dominated most parts of the Middle East. In relative terms, Russia

was not strong threat to British interests. The French were also not severe enemies to the British. At the eve of the war Britain and France had established cordial relations.

Germany therefore, began to compete with France and Britain, in the Middle East. Later on the Germans got an important ally in their struggle against French and the British in the Middle East. This ally was Austro-Hungary. German interest in the Middle East was basically economic. On the other hand Austro-Hungary interested in the domination of the territories of the Balkans. Such different interests in the ME made the Germans and Austro –Hungary to work in alliance. Germans alliance with Austro-Hungary drove Russia into the arms of French and the British.

The discovery of petroleum oil deposits escalated the contest over the Middle East among European. Especially the discovery of oil aggravated the condition between German and Britain. In addition to Britain and Germany the Turkish petroleum company, the Deutsche Bank, the Agro-Iranian oil company and the Anglo-Saxon oil company began to compute for oil concession in the Middle East. A few months before the beginning of First World War Germany recognized British interests and supremacy in Kuwait, the Persian Gulf coast and the Anglo-Berlin –Baghdad rail way line. All these were efforts to avoid conflicts in the Middle East. But all these efforts were not successful.

Ottomans Turkey`s war aims in the Middle east were basically **four**.

1. **Ottoman Turkey** was highly worried about the Continuous and growing influence of the Europeans in the Middle East in general and its territory in particular. The cultural, religious. Ethnic diversity of the region also was a factor that made Europeans involvement is very easy. The Arabs, the Kurds, Armenians, Syrians and other ethnic groups in the Ottoman Empire did not want the existence of the Ottoman Empire. The Turks were the ones who wanted the maintenance and growth of the empire. Therefore ottoman Turkey wanted to extend the influence of Turkish language and Culture all over its Empire. The can be termed as Tarkification of the Empire. The ottomans believed that

would create a national feeling all over the empire and reduce the involvement of Europeans.

2. A new policy of Turkish national policy which was adopted in 1913, which emphasized *Turkism* (the culture and traditions of the Turks) as a substitute for multiethnic Ottomans. On the one hand it sought to replace Islam as the empire's unifying force, but on the other it used Islam as an instrument against non-Muslim elements.
3. The ottomans aimed at the re-conquest of the lost territories in the Balkans and North Africa. They were highly interested conquering Egypt. The Opening of Suez canal in 1869 has made Egypt economically and strategically very important. Thus the Ottomans desperately wanted to annex Egypt. Following Egypt their Object was occupied the lost Territories in the Balkan and Cyprus. Cyprus under the control of the British navy. The control of Cyprus would benefits the ottomans strategically in their naval activity in the eastern Mediterranean as well as the Suez Canal area.
4. Ottoman Turkey planned to conquer Turkish inhabited areas that were under Russian rule. Turks primarily inhabited the Caucasus and Turkestan. The control of these Territoirs would benefit Ottoman Turkey immensely. It would increase the military potential of Ottoman Turkey since the Turks were ready to fight for the empire , not for Russians moreover , the caucuses was were very important strategically. Control of the Caucasus would create a directly link between the Iranian front and the Caspian on the one hand and the black sea and Balkan front on the other.
5. Ottoman Turkey aimed at re-establishing the Sultan`s authority all over the Muslim of the Middle East. A successful implementation of this plan could result in the development of loyalty to the Ottomans among the Arabs of the Middle East.

2.2. War Time Secret Treaties and Agreements

The Sykes –Picot Agreement

After reaching agreements with Russia and Italy, Britain and France made their own agreement regarding the ME from the side of Britain **Sir Mark Sykes** and from the side of France **George Picot** were delegated to make negotiations. The result of the negotiation and agreement made between these two officials was represented to Russia for Approval. This is because without Russian recognition the agreement would have the outcome of changing Russians alliance with

France and Britain. With the approval of Russia, the Sykes-picot agreement was signed in Petersburg (Leningrad) on 16/1916. In the Sykes- Picot agreement the following arrangements were made.

- Russia was to obtain the Provinces of Erzurum, Trebizond, Van, Northern Kurdistan , strait, Amidiya and Batlis
- France was to obtain the coast of Syria, Adana and Cilicia.
- Britain was to obtain Mesopotamia including Baghdad, the Ports of Haifa and Acre in Palestine.
- Parts of the Middle East not Occupied by Britain and France were to be organized into an independent Arab state. This included the Arabian Peninsula.
- Alexandria was to become a free port.
- Palestinian was to be internationalized

This agreement was kept secret among Russia, Britain and France Italy and Sheriff Hussein Ali ruler of Mekkah most of the rulers of Arabian Peninsula were not communicated this agreement

2.3. Britain Agreement with the Arabs.

Most of the Arabs of the Middle East were under Ottoman rule since the 16th century. Ottoman rule was oppressive for the Arabs in many ways. Especially since the coming into power of the young Turks (CUP), the Arabs were very anxious about the new policy of Turkification at the expense of the Arab culture, language and Identity. As result, the Arabs wanted independence from the Ottomans. A strong nationalist movement among the Arabs emerged since the 19th century. Educated Arabs in Syria started a strong and wide spread anti-Ottoman agitation. In the control and Eastern parts of Arabia, some chieftains gained independence from the rule after a successful rebellion Sheriff Hussein Ali Mekkah also began to make diplomatic relations with Europeans powers independently without the knowledge of Ottoman authorities. Aware of this fact, the British decided to mobilize the growing Arab nationalism to their advantage and war effort into the Middle East. This strategy can be compared to the Germans plan towards India and Iran against the British Empire. The immediate plan of Britain was to secure Arab Military support. Their Ultimate plan was to establish an independent Arab state that will serve the interest of Britain in the Middle East. Sheriff Hussein on his behalf was highly interested in

closely working with the British against the Ottomans. Thus, he started correspondence with the British high commissioner in Egypt **Sir Henry McMahon** and Hussein. In a series of letters exchanged between McMahon and Hussein an informal agreement was reached. Sheriff Hussein promised to declare war on Ottoman Turkey and raise an Arab army. But this was conditional on Britain's decision to allow an independent Arab state in the Middle East. Britain responded positively to this demand. Not only did Britain promise the establishment of an independent Arab state but also promised to give financial assistance and protect the Muslim holy places against external aggression. The British gave a financial assistance amounting to 200,000 a month in gold. Satisfied with this, Sheriff Hussein started the Arab revolt on June 5/1916.

2.4. The Arab Revolt

Realizing the opportunity to liberate Arab lands from the Ottoman Oppression and trusting the words of British officials who promised their support for unified kingdom for the Arab lands Sheriff Hussein bin Ali of Mekkah launched the great Arab revolt.

Following the Young Turk Coup of 1908, the Ottomans abandoned their pluralistic and pan-Islamic policies. Instead, they pursued a policy of secular Turkish nationalism. Then the formerly Cosmopolitan and tolerant Ottoman Empire began openly discriminating against its non-Turkish inhabitants. Arabs in particular were faced with political, cultural and linguistic persecution. During this time Arab nationalist groups in Syria Iraq, and Arabia began to rally behind the Hashemite banner of Abdullah and Feisal, sons of Sheriff Hussein.

When the Ottoman entered First World War on the side of central powers in 1914, they upheld the ban on the official use of the Arabic language and teaching in schools while arresting many Arab nationalist figures in Damascus and Beirut. Arabs were further threatened by the construction of the Hejaz Railway, connecting Damascus and Mecca which promised to facilitate the mobility of Turkish troops into the Arab heartland. In June 1916, as head of the Arab nationalist and in alliance with Britain Sheriff Hussein initiated the Great Arab revolt against Ottoman rule. His sons, the Emirs Abdullah and Feisal, led the Arab forces. At the end of the war, Arab forces controlled all of modern Jordan, most of the Arabian Peninsula and much of southern Syria. Sheriff Hussein's objective in undertaking the great Arab revolt was to establish a single independent and unified Arab state stretching from Syria to Yemen.

2.5. Military Operation in The Middle East

The Middle East was an important arena of the theatre of First World War next to Europe. There were different war fronts in the Middle East. Some of these were actual war in the Middle East as part of the First World War started when the Turkey attacked Russia and Iran.

2.5.1 The Ottoman Front

Initially the Ottoman Offensive was successful. They defeated the Iranian armies at several battle fields and came close to the town of Tabriz. They also defeated the Russian army in the Caucasus and approached the city of Batumi both in Iran in the Caucasus, the Ottoman mobilized and recruited the Ajar (Muslim Georgians) and the Atabaks in Azerbaijan. Eventually they failed to succeed in defeating both Russia and Iran. The initial success of Ottoman Turkey could be attributed to the absence of preparation on the side of the Iranian as well as the Russians. Russia as well as Iran quickly mobilized war on several fronts against the Ottomans.

2.5.2. The Sinai and Palestinian Front

The canal was another area of intense conflict between Ottoman Turkey and the Allied powers in the Middle East during World War the First. At the beginning of the war the canal was under the control of the British to defend the Canal Zone. The British had stationed a huge force in the delta of Egypt since 1882. The occupation of the canal was crucial for the Ottoman Turkey to weaken Britain's positions in the Middle East. Thus, Ottoman Turkish forces under **Jamal pasha** attacked British positions in the Canal Zone with the effort of occupying the canal in February 1915. Throughout 1915 both powers fought several battles in the Sinai Peninsula without scoring major victories. In 1916, the British organized a superior military expedition known as the **Egyptian expeditionary force**. At the beginning **General sir Archibald Murray** commanded the force of later general Sir **Edmund Allenby** replaced him. The ultimate goal of this force was to push the Ottomans out of Sinai and Palestine and occupy Syria.

The Egyptian expeditionary force launched a series of major attacks on the Ottomans in Sinai the Ottomans lost successive battles and retreated to Palestine. To assist the retreating Ottoman army, German expeditionary force under the leadership of General Von Falkenhayn arrived in Palestine in May 1917; Mustafa Kemal also came to this front with the intention of organizing a surprise operation named **Yildirim** (lightning war). Moreover a German brigade arrived to reinforce the Ottoman Turks. All these efforts were unsuccessful. The **Yildirim** failed. The

Ottoman and German forces faced a series of disasters and defeats. On December 9, 1917, General Sir Allenby entered Jerusalem with triumph. At this point of the war the Ottomans were completely defensive and could not stop the advances of the British. The Ottomans lost a major and decisive battle on September 18, 1918 at **Megiddo** following this battle the British occupied Syria. In October, 1918 the Ottomans agreed for armistice which ended the war in this front.

2.5.3. The Arabian Front

At the outbreak of war in the Middle East most of the Arabian Peninsula was under the control of the Ottoman Turks. However, Ottoman control of the Arabian Peninsula was nominal. In fact some chieftains had gained their independence from Ottoman rule through successful revolts. After reaching agreements with the British, Sheriff Hussein Ali declared war on the Ottoman Empire on June 5, 1916. This triggered what came to be known as in history of the Middle East as the **Arab Revolt**. Arab people (Bedouin) in the Arabian Desert were organized into small and mobile bands. Their objective at the beginning of the twentieth century was to drive the Ottoman Turks out of Arabia. The operations of these bands were successful. They inflicted a heavy damage on the Ottoman garrisons in Arabia. They also co-ordinated their attack with Egyptian expeditionary forces.

In addition to the desert wars bands, Sheriff Hussein was able to raise an Arab army within a short period of time. Emir Feisal, Sheriff Hussein's son, commanded this Arab army. The British officer Colonel T.E. Lawrence assisted this army in advice and leadership.

The Arab army attacked the Ottoman at Mecca. A fierce battle and siege forced the Ottomans at Mecca to surrender. Next to Mecca, Red Sea port of Jeddah was liberated from the Ottoman rule. In September 1916 all the principal towns of Arabia except Medina were liberated from the Ottoman rule. After September 1916, the Arab army was divided into two; half of the army remained in Hejaz and laid as siege to Medina. Ali Abdullah and Zaid were in command of Feisal moved northwards flanking General Sir Allenby's forces. Feisal's army engaged Ottoman forces to the east of the Jordan River. Once again the Ottomans faced a devastating defeat. The Arabs controlled important towns and cities such as Wajh, Akaba, Ma'an and Dara. Hereafter the goal of the Arabs was to control Damascus. The news of the success of the Arabs and the defeat of the Ottomans had already stirred up an uprising in Syria. On October 1, 1918 the Arabs jointly

worked with the British in liberating the rest of Syria from Ottoman control. General Allenby the revolt and war of the Arabs resulted in the capture of about 65,000 Turkish troops.

2.5.4. Mesopotamian Front

Britain's has strong economic interest in the Persian gulf, especially in southern Iran. To defend their interest the British settled an army at Fao where the Euphrates and the Tigris rivers expeditionary force from India. The main objective of this force was to defend British Controlled oil wells in Southern Iran and launch a major attack against in Mesopotamia. Generals Delamin, Barret and Moude commanded the British Forces in the Mesopotamia front.

The British started their military operation in the Mesopotamia front in November 1914 with the occupation of Basra. Following this the British launched an offensive that targeted Baghdad. The Ottoman army in Mesopotamia was under the command of General von Goltz. The advance of the British in the Mesopotamian front was very slow. This was because in this front the British were not assisted through revolts of the Arabs. The main operation based of the British was located in India. The harsh climatic condition of the region also delayed the advance of the British army. General Von Goltz was an able military leader. Until his death in April 25, 1916 the British faced stiff resistance and even defeated on April 25, 1916 the British faced a major defeat at Kut-el-Amara and 13,000 British troops surrendered to the Ottoman Turks. General Von Goltz died at the same time. This was a major loss to the Ottomans. They were not able to get on able leader. Halil Rasha who was less competent to Goltz took command of the Ottoman army. The balance of military power changed at this point. The British gained an upper hand over Ottoman forces. Their pace of advance became fast and swift.

On March 11, 1917 Baghdad fell in to the hands of the British after securing Baghdad the British force advanced further north of in the following few months. British and Russian forces met in the boarder area between Iran and Mesopotamia. The British and Russian armies planned a joint attack against Ottomans east wards. However the Russian revolution led to the demobilization of the Russian army. Thus Britain launched a unilateral attack on Ottoman Turkey. In October 1918, British forces reached to outskirts of Mosul. Ottoman Turkey proposed an armistice at this stage of war. Britain accepted the proposal and an armistice were signed. At the time of the

signing of the armistice Mosul was under Ottoman control but the Turks evacuated Mosul shortly after the armistice and the British occupied the town.

UNIT –THREE

ARAB NATIONALISM

Arab nationalism is a nationalist ideology celebrating the glories of Arab civilization, the language and literature of the Arabs, calling for rejuvenation and political union in the Arab world. Its central premise is that the peoples of the Arab World, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Arabian Sea, constitute one nation bound together by common linguistic, cultural, religious, and historical heritage.

3.1. Ideology of Arab Nationalism

Arab nationalists believe that the Arab nation had existed as a historical entity prior to the rise of nationalism in the 19th-20th century. The Arab nation was formed through the gradual establishment of Arabic as the language of communication and with the advent of Islam as a religion and culture in the region. Both Arabic and Islam served as the pillars of the nation. Arab nationalism represents the "Arabs' consciousness of their specific characteristics as well as their endeavor to build a modern state capable of representing the common will of the nation and all its constituent parts. Within the Arab nationalist movement are **three** differentiations:

1. **The Arab nation:** the nation is the group of people who speak Arabic; inhabit the Arab world, and who have a feeling of belonging to the same nation.
2. **Arab nationalism:** Nationalism is the "sum total" of the characteristics and qualities exclusive to the Arab nation.
3. **Pan-Arab unity:** pan-Arab unity is the modern idea which stipulates that the separate
4. Arab countries should unify to form a single state under one political system.

Pan-Arabism is an ideology espousing the unification of the peoples and countries of the Arab world, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Arabian Sea. It is closely connected to Arab nationalism, which asserts that the Arabs constitute a single nation. Its popularity was at its height during the 1960s. Advocates of Pan-Arabism have often espoused socialist principles and strongly opposed Western political involvement in the Arab world. It also sought to empower Arab states from outside forces by forming alliances and, to a lesser extent, economic co-operation. The modern Arabic language actually has **two** distinct words which can be translated into English as "nationalism":

1. **Qawmiyya:** derived from the word *qawm* (meaning "tribe, ethnic nationality")
2. **Wataniyya:** derived from the word *watan* (meaning "homeland, native country").

The word *qawmiyya* has been used to refer to pan-Arab nationalism, while *wataniyya* has been used to refer to patriotism at a more local level (sometimes disparaged as "regionalism" by those who consider pan-Arabism the only true form of Arab nationalism).

3.2. Arabs under Ottoman Rule

During four centuries of Ottoman domination the Turkish and Arab cultures blended many institutions beneath the surface of Turkish administration. Arab culture and language continued to exist, Arabs and their language played an important roles in the Ottoman administration, Arabic was the language of the Koran and the Masjid (mosque). The back bone of Ottoman government was the sacred Sharia law which could not be mastered without a throughout a through skill of Arabic. Al-zhar University founded during the tenth century in Cairo and the Sunni religious scholars at Damascus, Tripoli and Aleppo where many of the Ulema were trained still Arab during the Ottoman period. The religious and legal officials of the Ottoman government throughout the empire were mostly Arabs. In the capital the highest regions dignitary the Sheik Al-Islam was usually an Arab. So important at was his office that its sanction was required to remove the Sultan. Arab troops and high ranking offices distinguished themselves in battles for the Ottoman Empire; Arabs became prime ministers, generals and governor in the Ottoman Empire. The Arabs were in all ranks of the state services. They generally shared with the Turks the rights and responsibility of government without any racial distinction.

Ottoman control over the Arab provinces of the Empire varied on form and intensity through the four century of Ottoman control. When local sheiks and emirs became fully autonomous paying only formal homage to the ottoman Rashas sent to govern them the Sultan's suzerainty became on more than a shadow. In Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq local Arab rulers carved nearly independent principalities for themselves. Until the rise of the committee for Union and progress the Arabs enjoyed by a number of rights without discrimination

3.2.1 Committee of Union and Progress

The Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) began as a secret society established as the "Committee of Ottoman Union" in 1889 by the medical students İbrahim Temo, Abdullah Cevdet, İshak Sukhumi and Hüseyinzade Ali. It was transformed into a political organization by Bahaeddin Sakir aligning itself with the Young Turks in 1906, during the period of the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.

Revolutionary Era: 1906-1908

The Committee of Union and Progress was an umbrella name for different underground factions, some of which were generally referred to as the "**Young Turks**". The name was officially sanctioned to a specific group in 1906 by **Bahaeddin Sakir**. The organization was based upon

the revolutionary Italian Carbonari. The CUP had built an extensive organization, having a presence in towns, in the capital, and throughout Europe. Under this umbrella name one could find ethnic Albanians, Bulgarians, Arabs, Slavs, Jews, Greeks, Turks, Kurds and Armenians united by the common goal of changing the régime. After the 1908 revolution, in the absence of this goal the revolution began to fracture and different allegiances began to emerge. The evolution of CUP was interestingly also supported by the French government. Abdul Hamid II was quite successful in suppressing the CUP, and even approached the French and German governments to assist in the suppression of this political movement.

The Young Turk Revolution played a significant role in the evolution of Committee of Union and Progress from a revolutionary organization to a political party.

Change through revolution

The revolution and CUP's work had a great impact on Muslims in other countries. The Persian community in Istanbul founded the Iranian Union and Progress Committee. Indian Muslims imitated the CUP oath administered to recruits of the organization. The leaders of the Young Bukhara movement were deeply influenced by the Young Turk Revolution, and saw it as an example to emulate.

Second Constitutional Era: 1908-1912

The first election to the Ottoman Parliament after the Young Turk Revolution netted the Committee of Union and Progress only 60 of the 275 seats, despite its leading role in the revolution. Other parties represented in Parliament at this time included the Armenian nationalist Dashnak and Hunchak parties (four and two members respectively) and the main opposition, the Liberty and Entente party, sometimes referred to by Ottoman historians as the "Liberal Union".

As a result of the "Law of Associations", which shut down ethnically based organizations and clubs, by the time of the second general election in 1912, the smaller ethnic parties had coalesced with the Liberal Union. At this election, a total of 67% or 184 seats were won by the CUP. In most republics this is the margin required for wholesale transformation of the constitution, but of course the Ottoman Empire was technically a constitutional monarchy, although it is unlikely Sultan Mehmed V could have prevented the revision of the constitution. This Parliamentary session was very short due to the outbreak of the First Balkan War sensing the danger; the government won passage of a bill conscripting dhimmis into the army. This proved too little and

too late to salvage the Ottoman toehold in southeast Europe; the Ottomans lost Albania, Macedonia and western Thrace.

On 5 August 1912, the government shuttered Parliament. Just prior to that it had succeeded in passing the "Law for the Prevention of Brigandage and Sedition," a measure ostensibly intended to prevent insurgency against the central government which assigned that duty to newly created paramilitary formations. These later came under the control of the Teşkilat-i Mahsusa.

Coup and Aftermath: 1913-1918

In spite of parliamentary elections, non-partisan figures from the pre-revolutionary period known as the "Old Turks" still dominated the Ottoman cabinet, known as the Sublime Porte. The Grand Vizier Mehmed Kamil Pasha and his minister of war Nazim Pasha became targets of the CUP, which overthrew them in a military coup d'etat on 23 January 1913.

The emerging government could hardly be called constitutional. Indeed, 1913 was a period of government by assassination as Nazim and then his successor Mahmud Sevkett Pasha were both slain, Nazim at the very instant the CUP seized power. The following year, new legislation made the CUP the Empire's only legal political party; all provincial and local officials reported to "Responsible Secretaries" chosen by the party for each vilayet.

Absent the wartime atmosphere, the CUP did not purge minority religions from political life; at least 23 Christians joined it and were elected to the third Parliament. This is one possible motivation for the entry into the war, another being the "pan-Turkic" ideology of the party which emphasized the Empire's manifest destiny of ruling over the Muslims of Central Asia once Russia was driven out of that region. Notably, two principal leaders from this time, Enver Pasha and Ahmed Djemal, would in fact die in the Soviet Union leading Muslim anti-Communist movements years after the Russian Revolution and the Ottoman defeat in World War I.

The CUP especially distrusted the Armenians population, and began plotting their extermination almost immediately. Indeed, the first major offensive the Turks undertook in World War I was an unsuccessful attempt to drive the Russians from the portion of partially classic Armenia which they had taken over in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. After the predictable failure of this expedition, the CUP was involved in the genocide of between 1 and 1.5 million Armenians from

1915-1916. As explained in the key indictment at the trial (in absentia) of the Three Pashas (Enver, Cemal, and Talaat); the Armenian Genocide massacres were spearheaded by the Teşkilat-i Mahsusa under its leader, the Turkish physician Behaeddin Shakir.

As the military position of the Central Powers disintegrated in October 1918, the government resigned. A new Grand Vizier, Damad Ferid Pasha, negotiated the Armistice of Mudros at the end of the month. The position of the CUP was now untenable, and its top leaders fled three days later.

British forces occupied various points throughout the Empire, and through their High Commissioner Somerset Calthorpe demanded that those members of the leadership who had not fled be put on trial, a policy also demanded by Part VII of the Treaty of Sevres formally ending hostilities between the Allies and the Empire.

UNIT-FOUR

ZIONISM AND ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

4.1. Zionism Movement in the World

Zionism is the Jewish national movement of rebirth and renewal in the land of Israel - the historical birthplace of the Jewish people. The yearning to return to Zion, the biblical term for both the Land of Israel and Jerusalem, has been the cornerstone of Jewish religious life since the Jewish exile from the land two thousand years ago, and is embedded in Jewish prayer, ritual, literature and culture.

Modern Zionism emerged in the late 19th century in response to the violent persecution of Jews in Eastern Europe, anti-Semitism in Western Europe. Modern Zionism fused the ancient Jewish

biblical and historical ties to the ancestral homeland with the modern concept of nationalism into a vision of establishing a modern Jewish state in the land of Israel.

The father of modern Zionism, Austrian **journalist Theodor Herzl**, consolidated various strands of Zionist thought into an organized political movement, advocating for international recognition of a "Jewish state" and encouraging Jewish immigration to build the land.

4.2.The Haskalah

Haskalah, the Jewish Enlightenment, was a movement among European Jews in the 18th–19th centuries that advocated adopting enlightenment values, pressing for better integration into European society, and increasing education in secular studies, Hebrew language, and Jewish history. *Haskalah* in this sense marked the beginning of the wider engagement of European Jews with the secular world, ultimately resulting in the first Jewish political movements and the struggle for Jewish emancipation.

Leaders of the *Haskalah* movement were called ***Maskilim***. The Haskalah marked the beginning of a move away from traditional religious orthodoxy and created a need for Jewish national feeling to replace religion as a unifying force. Initially, however, the trend was toward assimilation into European society. The liberal Jewish reform movement in Germany sought to reduce Judaism to a religious denomination, allowing Jews to adopt German culture. The achievement of political equality by European Jewry began in revolutionary France in 1791 and spread over most of Europe during the next few decades.

Origins of Haskalah

As long as the Jews lived in segregated communities, and as long as all social intercourse with their Gentile neighbors was limited, the **rabbi** was the most influential member of the Jewish community. In addition to being a religious scholar and "clergy", a rabbi also acted as a civil judge in all cases in which both parties were Jews. Rabbis sometimes had other important administrative powers, together with the community elders. The rabbinate was the highest aim of many Jewish boys, and the study of the Talmud was the means of obtaining that coveted position, or one of many other important communal distinctions. Haskalah followers advocated "coming out of ghetto," not just physically but also mentally and spiritually in order to assimilate amongst Gentile nations.

The example of Moses Mendelssohn (1729–86), a Prussian Jew, served to lead this movement, which was also shaped by Aaron Halle-Wolfssohn (1754–1835) and Joseph Perl (1773–1839). Mendelssohn's extraordinary success as a popular philosopher and man of letters revealed hitherto unsuspected possibilities of integration and acceptance of Jews among non-Jews. Mendelssohn also provided methods for Jews to enter the general society of Germany. A good knowledge of the German language was necessary to secure entrance into cultured German circles, and an excellent means of acquiring it was provided by Mendelssohn in his German translation of the Torah. This work became a bridge over which ambitious young Jews could pass to the great world of secular knowledge. The *Biur*, or grammatical commentary, prepared under Mendelssohn's supervision, was designed to counteract the influence of traditional rabbinical methods of exegesis. Together with the translation, it became, as it were, the primer of Haskalah.

Language played a key role in the haskalah movement, as Mendelssohn and others called for a revival in Hebrew and a reduction in the use of Yiddish. The result was an outpouring of new, secular literature, as well as critical studies of religious texts. Julius Furst along with other German-Jewish scholars compiled Hebrew and Aramaic dictionaries and grammars. Jews also began to study and communicate in the languages of the countries in which they settled, providing another gateway for integration.

4.3. Types of Zionism

The Zionist Movement was produced by various philosophers representing different approaches concerning the objective and path that Zionism should follow. The principal common goal was the aspiration to establish an independent state for the Jewish people. However, the method of action needed was in dispute. There were two main approaches to the *modus operandi*:

- **Political Zionism** - led by Theodor Herzl and Max Nordau. This approach opined that negotiation is first needed between the superpowers regarding a charter over the Land of Israel.
- **Practical Zionism** - led by Moshe **Leib Lilienblum** and **Leon Pinsker** and molded by the Hovevei Zion organization. This approach opined that firstly there is a need in

practical terms to implement Jewish immigration to the Land of Israel, Aliyah, and settlement of the land, as soon as possible, even if a charter over the Land is not obtained.

UNIT-FIVE

CONFLICT AND WARS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

5.1. Arab Israel war of 1948.

The origin of the problem went back to almost 2000 years AD when most of the Jews were driven out of Palestine which was then their home land by the Romans. In fact small communities of Jews side behind in Palestine and over following 1700 years there was a gradual trickle of Jews returning from the exile until the end of the nineteenth century. There were never enough Jews to make the Arabs who now looked on Palestine as their homeland feel threatened

In 1887 some Jews living in Europe founded the world Zionist organization at **Basle** in **Switzerland**. Zionist were people who believed that Jews ought to be able going back to Palestine and have what they called a national home land. Jews had recently suffered persecution in Russia, France and Germany and a Jews state would provide a safe refuge for Jews from all over the world. The problem was that Palestine was inhabited by Arabs who were alarmed at the prospect of losing their land to the Jews.

Britain became involved in 1917 when foreign minister **Arthur Balfour** announced that Britain supported the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine. After 1919 when Palestine became a British mandate large number of Jews began to arrive in Palestine and the Arabs protest rated bitterly to the British that they wanted:

- An independent Palestine for the Arabs
- An end to the immigration of Jews

The British government stated (1922) that there was no intention that the Jews should occupy the whole of Palestine and that there would be no interference with the rights of the Palestine Arabs. The British hoped to persuade Jews and Arabs to live together peacefully in the same state: they failed to understand the deep religious gulf between the two.

Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany after 1933 caused a flood of refugee and by 1940 about half of the population of Palestine was Jews. In 1937 the British peel commission proposed

dividing Palestine into two separate state, Arab and one Jews but the Arabs rejected the idea. The British tried again in 1939 offering an independent Arab state within ten years and Jews immigration limited to 10000 a year this time the Jews rejected the proposal.

The Second World War made the situation much worse: there were hundreds of thousands of Jews refugees from Hitler's Europe desperately looking for somewhere to go. In 1945 the USA pressed Britain to allow 100,000 Jews into Palestine: this demand was echoed by David Gurion one of the Jews leaders but the British, no wanting to offend the Arabs, refused.

David Ben-Gurion (1886-1973), Israeli statesman and the first prime minister of Israel (1948-1953, 1955-1963) Ben-Gurion dedicated his life to establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine and were regarded as the father of his country.

The Jews, after all that their race had suffered at the hands of the Nazis were determined to fight for their national home. They began a terrorist campaign against both Arabs and British. One of the most spectacular incidents was the blowing up of the king David Hotel in Jerusalem which the British were using as their headquarters, 91 people were killed and many more injured. The British responded by arresting Jewish leaders and by turning back ships such as the Exodus crammed with Jews intending to enter Palestine. The British weakened by the strain of the Second World War, felt unable to manage Earnest Bevin, the labor foreign secretary asked the UN to deal with the problem and in November 1947 the UN voted to divide Palestine setting aside roughly of it to form an independent Jewish state. Early in the British decided to come out altogether and let the UN carry out its own plan. Although fighting was already going on between Jews and Arabs, the British withdrew all their troops.

In May 1948 Ben Gurion declared the Independence of the news state of Israel. It was immediately attacked by Egypt, Syria, Jordan Iraq and Lebanon. In the Arab-Israeli War of 1948-1949 Arab forces (including the armies of Egypt, Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq as well as Palestinian guerrillas) had expected an easy victory over the small and isolated Jewish state, but despite heavy casualties Israel won. Israel also increased the land under its control far beyond what it had been given by the partition plan. The region just west of the Jordan River known as the **West Bank** came under the control of Transjordan (which was renamed Jordan in 1949). Egypt gained control of the Gaza Strip, a small region bordering the southern end of

Israel's Mediterranean coast. The demoralized Arab world was unwilling to accept the Israeli victory, and shortly after the war the Arabs began to regroup for more fighting. The war had also created a large population of Palestinian Arab refugees who fled Israel for camps maintained by the UN in neighboring Arab states. With the exception of Jordan, Arab countries generally refused to allow Palestinians to settle outside the camps or to be granted citizenship. As a result, the conflict between Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs continued to fester.

What was the outcome of 1948 war?

Most people expected the Arabs to win easily, but against seemingly overwhelming odds, the Israelites defeated them and even captured more of Palestine than the UN partitioned had given them. They ended up with about three-quarters of Palestine plus the Egyptian port of Elat on the red sea. The Israelites won partly because they fought desperately and partly because the Arab states were divided among themselves and poorly equipped, King Abdullah of Jordan was more interested in seizing the area of Palestine west of the river Jordan so that he could make it part of his own than in giving it to Palestinian Arabs. The most tragic outcome of the war was that the Palestinian Arabs became the innocent victims who found themselves without a state or homeland, some were in the new Jewish state of Israel, others who lived in the area seized by King Abdullah, found themselves living in Jordan. After some Jews had slaughtered the entire population of an Arab village in Israel nearly a million Arabs fled into Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria where they had to live in miserable refugee camps. Jerusalem was divided between Israel and Jordan. The USA, Britain and France guaranteed Israel's frontiers but the Arab states did not regard the ceasefire as permanent. They would not recognize the legality of Israel and they regarded this war as only the first round in the struggle to destroy Israel and liberate Palestine, on this way the first Arab-Israel war was ended.

4.2. The Suez Canal Crisis of 1956

The Suez crisis began as a result of the increasingly independent and assertive leadership role played by Egyptian prime minister (later president) Gamal Abdel Nasser. When he came to power in 1954, Nasser followed a pro-Western diplomatic course. He soon diverged from this path, however, emerging as a prominent figure in the Nonaligned Movement.

In September 1955 Nasser arranged to purchase large amounts of Soviet weaponry from Czechoslovakia, a Communist country, at the same time, he secured promises from the U.S. and

British governments to help fund a huge construction project on the Nile River, the Aswan High Dam.

The U.S. secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, was not pleased by Nasser's simultaneous overtures toward an Eastern-bloc nation, and he successfully maneuvered to block the funding of the Aswan dam project. Nasser responded in July 1956 by nationalizing the Suez Canal, transferring ownership of the company that controlled the daily operations of the canal from its British and French owners to the Egyptian government. He declared that he would use the company's profits of \$25 million per year as an alternative source of funding for the dam. Nasser defended this action by stating that the canal was Egyptian property, and he pledged to compensate the company's shareholders and to keep the waterway open to the shipping of all nations (though Israel remained excluded under an earlier Egyptian policy).

The British and French governments found the prospect of losing control of the canal unacceptable, because the waterway provided a strategic conduit for huge amounts of oil shipped from the Middle East to Europe. Britain and France demanded that Nasser back down, and when diplomacy failed, they turned to Israel for a military ally. Israel at this time was already considering military action against Egypt. Since 1949 Egypt had forbidden the passage of Israeli ships and any ships carrying cargo to or from Israel through the Suez Canal. Since 1951 it had blockaded the **Strait of Tiran** at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba, completely cutting off Israeli access to the Red Sea. Also, in previous years, guerrillas had staged numerous raids on Israel from the Egyptian-held Gaza Strip.

After several months of secret planning with Britain and France, Israel initiated what would be known as the **Suez-Sinai War** by invading the Sinai Peninsula on October 29, 1956. In one day, the Israeli forces swept across the Sinai to within a few miles of the Suez Canal. On October 30, as planned, Britain and France issued an ultimatum demanding that both Israeli and Egyptian forces withdraw from the Suez Canal so that a combined British and French military contingent could establish control along the length of the canal. Nasser refused to comply, and on October 31 British and French forces bombed Egyptian military bases, destroying much of the Egyptian air force on the ground. The Egyptian army in the Sinai was routed, and within a week the Israelis controlled almost the entire peninsula. British and French forces began to occupy the

canal. In retaliation, Nasser ordered the sinking of 40 ships in the Suez Canal, effectively blocking the waterway.

The United States and the USSR were both caught off guard by these developments, since their attention had been focused on the anti-Communist uprising underway since late October in Hungary. Both superpowers demanded an immediate cease-fire along the canal. Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev threatened to use long-range rockets in support of the Egyptian army, while the U.S. government vowed to block all further oil shipments from South America to Europe. This combined pressure, coupled with a strongly worded cease-fire resolution rushed through the UN with the support of both superpowers, forced the British, French, and Israeli governments to relent. They withdrew their forces and agreed to the deployment of a UN peacekeeping force in the Canal Zone. By the end of December 1956, therefore, the Suez Canal and the Sinai Peninsula had been restored to Egyptian control, and Nasser emerged as an Arab nationalist hero. While Israel was not granted access to the Suez Canal, it did regain free use of the Strait of Tiran in return for withdrawing from the Gaza Strip in early 1957.

Who was to blame for the war?

It is possible to blame different countries depending on one's point of view.

- The Arabs blame the Israelites who actually began hostilities by invading Egypt
- The communist bloc and many Arab states blamed Britain and France accusing them of imperialist tactics by attacking Egypt. They accused the Americans of encouraging Britain to attack.
- The British, French, and Israelites blamed Colonel Nasser of Egypt for being anti-western. However even the Americans thought that Britain and France had overreacted by using force and most historians agree.
- Colonel Nasser the new ruler of Egypt was aggressively in favor of Arab unity and independence including the liberation of Palestine from Jews almost everything he did aggravated the British, Americans or French.
- He organized guerilla fighters known as fedayeen (self sacrifices) to carry out sabotage and murder inside Israel and Egyptian ships blocked the gulf of Aqaba leading to Israel port of Eilat.

5.3. The Six Day War

The Six-Day War or June War also known as the 1967 Arab-Israeli War or the Third Arab-Israeli War, was fought between June 5 and June 10, 1967, by Israel and the neighboring states of Egypt [known as the United Arab Republic (UAR)], Jordan, and Syria. The outcome was a swift and decisive Israeli victory. At the war's end, Israel took effective control of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. The status of the territories captured by Israel during the war and the concurrent refugee problem, are central concerns in the ongoing Israeli–Palestinian conflict, raising issues in international law, and having far-reaching consequences in global affairs.

In the years before the Six-Day War, the Arab countries continually refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Jewish state, and Arab nationalists led by Nasser called for the destruction of Israel. Egypt and Jordan supported Palestinian *fedayeen* (guerrillas), who attacked troops and civilians in Israeli territory, then retreated to the Egyptian-controlled Gaza Strip or the Jordanian-controlled West Bank. From its Golan Heights region, Syria regularly shelled Israeli farms. For its part, Israel refused to accept Jordan's control of Jewish holy places in East Jerusalem. Israel also kept tensions high by responding to Arab incursions with reprisals on Arab territory.

In April 1967, after Syria heavily shelled Israeli villages from the Golan Heights, Israel and Syria engaged in aerial clashes. Israel shot down six of Syria's MiG fighter planes, which were given by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Israel warned Syria against future attacks, and both the Syrians and Soviets were alarmed by the warning. Syria appealed to Nasser for backing, and in mid-May the Egyptian army moved 100,000 troops and 1000 tanks into the Sinai Peninsula on Israel's southern border. The United Nations (UN) had earlier stationed forces in the area as observers, but on May 17, Nasser called for the removal of UN personnel from several locations. Within days, all of the observers were removed. On May 22 Nasser announced the closure of the Strait of Tiran, a vital shipping corridor for Israel with links to the Red Sea and major sources of petroleum. A similar closure of the strait had been a major cause of the Suez Crisis in 1956; Israel had made clear since then that it would regard another closure as an act of war. Israel was further alarmed when Egypt and Jordan signed a treaty placing the two armies under a joint command. Despite a flurry of diplomatic effort, war seemed inevitable.

In 1964, Israel began drawing water from the Jordan River for its National Water Carrier, reducing the flow that reached Hashemite territory. The following year, the Arab states began construction of the Headwater Diversion Plan, which, once completed, would divert the waters of the Banias Stream before the water entered Israel and the Sea of Galilee, to flow instead into a dam at Mukhaiba for use by Jordan and Syria, and divert the waters of the Hasbani into the Litani River in Lebanon. The diversion works would have reduced the installed capacity of Israel's carrier by about 35% and Israel's overall water supply by about 11%

Because Israel feared fighting on three fronts (Egyptian, Jordanian, and Syrian), and because it preferred that fighting take place in Arab rather than Israeli territory, Israel decided to strike first. On the morning of June 5 the Israeli air force attacked Egypt, the largest force in the region. The timing of the attack, 8:45 AM, was designed to catch the maximum number of Egyptian aircraft on the ground and to come when the Egyptian high command was stuck in traffic between homes and military bases. The Israeli aircraft took evasive measures to elude Egyptian radar and approached from directions that were not anticipated. The surprise was complete. Within hours of the strike, the Israelis, who focused their attacks on military and air bases, had destroyed 309 of the 340 total combat aircraft belonging to the Egyptians. Israeli ground forces then moved into the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza Strip, where they fought Egyptian units. Egyptian casualties were heavy, but Israel suffered only minimal casualties.

War was not far behind on Israel's eastern front. Israel had conveyed a message to King Hussein of Jordan asking him to stay out of the conflict, but on the first morning of the war Nasser called Hussein and encouraged him to fight. Nasser reportedly told Hussein that Egypt had been victorious in the morning's fighting an illusion the Egyptian public believed for several days. At 11:00 AM Jordanian troops attacked the Israeli half of Jerusalem with mortars and gunfire and shelled targets in the Israeli interior. Israel's air force, having immobilized the Egyptian air force, turned its attention to Jordan. By evening, the Jordanian air force had been largely destroyed, again with minimal Israeli casualties. At midnight Israeli ground forces attacked Jordanian troops in Jerusalem, and by the morning of June 6, Israeli troops had nearly encircled the city.

On the second day of the war the Israeli air force continued its operations against Arab air bases, raising the total number of destroyed Arab planes to 416, which included more than **two-thirds**

of the Syrian air force. With nearly total control of the skies, Israeli fighter planes and bombers were free to support the tank and infantry forces on the ground. Thus Jordanian reinforcements were prevented from reaching Jerusalem, and by 10:00 AM on June 6 the Israelis had taken the Western Wall, also known as the **Wailing Wall**, in the Old City, the holiest site in Judaism. It was the first time in nearly 2000 years that Jews had controlled the wall. Ground battles continued in the Sinai, where Egypt's armies fell back in the face of Israeli advances. On the third day of the war, June 7, Jordanian forces were pushed from the West Bank across the Jordan River. The UN arranged a cease-fire between Israel and Jordan that went into effect that evening.

The following day, June 8, Israeli forces reached the Suez Canal. As artillery battles continued along the front, the Israeli air force decimated retreating Egyptians, who were backed up on the few roads through desert mountain passes. As the Sinai shifted to Israeli control, Israel turned its forces toward the Golan Heights. There, on June 9, Israel began a difficult assault up steep terrain against entrenched Syrian forces. Israel sent an armored corps into the front of Syrian lines while infantry forces surrounded the Syrian positions. The balance of power soon shifted to Israel's favor, and on June 10, Israel and Syria made a cease-fire agreement. Israel controlled all of the Golan Heights, including parts of Mount Hermon. Fighting between Israel and Egypt did not formally end for many years, although Israel controlled the Sinai Peninsula.

5.4. Yom Kippur War

Arab-Israeli War of 1973, armed conflict between Israel and the Arab countries of Egypt and Syria, fought during the month of October 1973. Egypt and Syria initiated the conflict to regain territories that Israel had occupied since the Six-Day War of 1967. Although both sides suffered heavy losses during the 1973 war, Israel retained control of the territories.

The conflict began on the Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur and took place during the Muslim holy month of Ramadan; the war is also called the Yom Kippur War by Israelis and the Ramadan War or the October War by Arabs.

Although it brought about no significant changes to territorial boundaries, the 1973 war and its aftermath had far-ranging effects on the participant nations and their relations with world superpowers. Egypt moved steadily away from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), which had provided military and economic aid to Egypt since the 1950s, and into a closer

relationship with the United States. Syria emerged from the war as the staunchest defender of Arab rights and the closest Middle Eastern ally of the USSR. In Israel, the war increased criticism of the country's leaders, who eventually resigned. Finally, the war signaled an increased commitment by the United States to negotiate and guarantee Arab-Israeli agreements. Such agreements would center on the return of Israeli-held lands to Arab control, in exchange for Arab recognition of Israel and security guarantees

In the early 1970s Nasser's successor, Anwar al-Sadat, pushed for Israeli withdrawal through diplomatic means, while simultaneously preparing Egypt's military for war. Each year the UN passed resolutions calling for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories. Israel refused to withdraw, and the United States suffered criticism from the international community for its support of Israel. Meanwhile, the stalemate continued. Arab nations generally refused to negotiate until Israel withdrew. Israel, which refused to withdraw without guarantees of peace and security, fortified its positions in the occupied Arab territories.

Neither the United States nor Israel believed that Arab forces could challenge Israel's proven military power. The USSR, which had supported the Arab nations during previous wars with Israel and had resupplied Egypt militarily, knew that Egypt was preparing for war, but underestimated Sadat's commitment to use a military option against Israel. Furthermore, neither Washington nor Moscow was fully aware of the profound differences in policy between the Egyptian and Syrian leaders. Although the ultimate goal for both leaders was to regain their territories from Israel, Sadat was willing to combine military means with the initiation of a diplomatic process, whereas Syrian president Hafez al-Assad did not want to sign any agreement with Israel that might recognize Israel's legitimacy. Sadat, unlike Assad, also was willing to orient Egypt's foreign policy away from the USSR and toward the United States. With mounting economic pressures at home, Sadat believed that the United States, rather than the USSR, would help Egypt more in the long term.

Despite these differences, mutual frustration and impatience with the diplomatic status quo led Sadat and Assad to plan an attack in collusion. Because the two Arab leaders were focused more on their own particular national interests, rather than on other Arab-Israeli issues such as the

future of the West Bank and Jerusalem and the issue of Palestinian statehood, they omitted Jordan and the PLO from the planning of the war.

Egypt and Syria launched their attack against Israel on October 6, 1973. It was Yom Kippur, the holiest day of the Jewish year. With much of its citizen army in synagogues, its national radio off the air, and its people in a generally relaxed mood, Israel was caught off guard by the coordinated attacks. Israeli intelligence sources had discounted the probability of an Arab assault, and Israel's military was not fully prepared for war. Sadat's armies quickly crossed the Suez Canal. In doing so, Egypt overcame the Israeli string of fortifications along the canal's east bank known as the **Bar-Lev line**, which Israel had believed to be impenetrable. Egypt established strongholds to defend its position. Aware of his army's limited firepower, Sadat did not order an advance across all of the Israeli-held Sinai. Instead, his armies took a small slice of land along the entire length of the canal's east bank. Meanwhile, Syrian forces advanced into the Golan Heights.

During the first week of the war, both Syria and Egypt could have done more damage to Israel's army, taken more territory, and inflicted severe damage on Israeli civilian centers. However, both armies failed to take advantage of their early gains, Israel's lack of preparedness, and initial Israeli losses. Irregular and inaccurate communication between Cairo and Damascus and between Moscow and Arab capitals inhibited additional Arab military successes.

By mid-October, Israel had mobilized its troops and launched a series of counterattacks on both fronts. Despite severe initial casualties, Israeli forces retook the land that Syria had captured and pushed past the Syrian border, soon making their way within artillery range of Damascus. Meanwhile, Israel launched a counteroffensive against Egypt, crossing the Suez Canal, advancing into Egypt, and surrounding Egypt's Third Army. By the end of the war, Israeli forces had advanced to within 100 km of Cairo and 40 km of Damascus. However, Israel saw no political reason to occupy the two Arab capitals.

Camp David Accords, framework for peace in the Middle East signed by United States president Jimmy Carter, Egyptian president Anwar al-Sadat, and Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin on September 17, 1978, in Washington, D.C. Although the accords led to a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, they did not result in peace between Israel and other Arab states. For their efforts to resolve their long-standing conflict, Sadat and Begin received the 1978 Nobel Peace Prize.

UNIT- SIX

ISLAMIC REVIVAL AND IRANIAN REVOLUTION

6.1. Historical background of Iranian Revolution

Foreign interference and territorial encroachment increased under the rule of Nasir al-Din Shah (1848-1896) and his son, Muzaffar al-Din Shah (1896-1906). Both men contracted huge foreign loans to finance expensive personal trips to Europe. Neither ruler was able to prevent Britain and Russia from encroaching into regions of traditional Iranian influence. In 1856 Britain prevented Iran from reasserting control over Herat, which had been part of Iran in Safavid times but had

been under non-Iranian rule since the mid-18th century. Britain supported the city's incorporation into Afghanistan, a country Britain helped create in order to extend eastward the buffer between its Indian territories and Russia's expanding empire. Britain also extended its control to other areas of the Persian Gulf during the 19th century. Meanwhile, by 1881 Russia had completed its conquest of present-day Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, bringing Russia's frontier to Iran's northeastern borders and severing historic Iranian ties to the cities of Bukhara (Bukhoro) and Samarqand. Several trade concessions by the Iranian government put economic affairs largely under British control. By the late 19th century, many Iranians believed that their rulers were beholden to foreign interests.

During the early 1900s the idea gradually spread among Iranians that the only effective way to save the country from government corruption and foreign manipulation was to make the shah accountable to a written code of laws. By 1905 this sentiment had grown into a popular movement, the Constitutional Revolution. Following a year of demonstrations and strikes, Muzaffar al-Din Shah was forced to agree to the creation of an elected parliament (the Majlis) and a constitution that limited royal power, established a parliamentary system of government, and outlined the powers of the legislature.

Britain and Russia, apparently feared that a strong Iranian government might act too independently and threaten their interests in the region, agreed in 1907 to divide Iran into spheres in which each would exercise exclusive influence. Russia then encouraged Mohammad Ali Shah, Muzaffar's successor who resented the constitutional limits on his authority, to dissolve the Majlis. In 1908 the shah attempted a coup against the elected government, bombing the Majlis building and dissolving the assembly. After a year of fighting between supporters of the constitution and forces loyal to the shah, the constitutionalists prevailed and deposed Mohammad Ali, who fled to Russia. His young son Ahmad Shah, vowing to respect the constitution, was installed under a regent.

The restoration of the Majlis and constitutional government failed to end foreign influence in Iran. In 1901 a British subject had been granted an exclusive 60-year concession to explore Iran for oil. Commercially valuable quantities of oil were discovered in southwestern Iran in 1908, and exports began in 1911. In 1914 the British government purchased 51 percent of the Anglo-

Persian Oil Company (formed in 1909; renamed the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, or AIOC, in 1935), and from then on behaved increasingly like a sovereign power in southwestern Iran. Meanwhile, in 1910 Russia assisted Mohammad Ali Shah in an invasion of Iran and an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the government. The following year, Russia occupied Tabriz and forced the Majlis to dismiss American financial advisor William Morgan Shuster, whom the Majlis had invited to Iran to reorganize the national finances; Shuster's reforms strengthened Iran but threatened Russian and British interests.

Who was Reza Shah?

Reza Shah Pahlavi (1877-1944), shah of Iran (1925-41), born in Savad Kouh, Province. Pahlavi entered the Iranian army as a youth, and in 1921 was commander of a Cossack force. A large part of the country was then controlled by Soviet troops whom Pahlavi expelled. In a coup d'état he established a new government in which he was minister of war and commander in chief of the armed forces. In 1923 he became premier, and two years later, when the Majlis, or National Assembly, deposed the reigning ruler, Ahmad Shah, Pahlavi was elected in his stead. His reign was notable for the introduction of Western customs and for his attempts to improve the transportation system and the financial structure of the country. Reza Shah had ambitious plans for what he called the modernization of Iran. These included developing:

- ❖ Large-scale industries
- ❖ implementing major infrastructure projects
- ❖ Building a cross-country railroad system
- ❖ Establishing a national public education system
- ❖ Reforming the judiciary, and improving health care.

He believed only a strong, centralized government managed by educated personnel could carry out his plans. He sent hundreds of Iranians, including his own son, to Europe for training. Between 1925 and 1941 Reza Shah's numerous development projects transformed Iran. Industrialization, urbanization, and public education progressed rapidly, and new social classes a professional middle class and an industrial working class emerged. However, by the mid-1930s Reza Shah's dictatorial style of rule, including the harsh and arbitrary treatment of his opponents and restrictions on the press caused increasing dissatisfaction in Iran.

Throughout his reign, Reza Shah tried to avoid involvement with Britain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Although many of his development projects required foreign technical expertise, he tried to avoid awarding contracts to British and Soviet companies, believing as did most Iranians that this would open the way for their governments to exercise influence in Iran. Although Britain, through its ownership of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, controlled all of Iran's oil resources, Reza Shah preferred to obtain technical assistance from France, Germany, Italy, and other European countries. This created problems for Iran after 1939, when Britain and Germany became enemies in World War II. Although Reza Shah proclaimed Iran's neutrality, Britain insisted that the German engineers and technicians in Iran were spies with missions to damage British oil facilities in southwestern Iran. Britain demanded that Iran expel all German citizens, but Reza Shah refused, claiming this would adversely impact his development projects.

How the world war II make an impact on the Iran?

Following Germany's invasion of the USSR in June 1941, Britain and the Soviet Union became allies. Both turned their attention to Iran. In addition to their suspicions about the role of German technicians in Iran, Britain and the USSR saw the newly opened Trans-Iranian Railroad as an attractive route for transporting supplies from the Persian Gulf to the Soviet Caucasus region. However, Iran's neutrality ruled out this option. In August 1941, after Reza Shah again refused to expel all German nationals, Britain and the USSR invaded Iran. They swiftly defeated the Iranian army, arrested Reza Shah and sent him into exile, and took control of Iran's communications and coveted railroad. In 1942 the United States, an ally of Britain and the USSR during the war, sent a military force to Iran to help maintain and operate sections of the railroad.

The British and Soviet authorities allowed Reza Shah's system of political and press repression to collapse and constitutional government to evolve with minimal interference. They permitted Reza Shah's son, Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, to succeed to the throne after he promised to reign as a constitutional monarch. In January 1942 the two occupying powers signed an agreement with Iran to respect Iran's independence and to withdraw their troops from the country within six months of the war's end. A U.S.-sponsored agreement at the 1943 Tehran Conference reaffirmed this commitment.

How the Iran nationalized the oil company from the British?

In the mid-1940s Mohammad Mosaddeq, an Iranian statesman and a member of the Majlis, emerged as the leader of the oil nationalization movement. This movement sought to transfer

control over the oil industry from foreign-run companies to the Iranian government. Throughout his political career, Mosaddeq consistently advocated three goals:

- ❖ To free Iran of foreign intervention
- ❖ To ensure that the shah remained a democratic monarch and not a dictator
- ❖ To implement social reforms.

He believed ending foreign interference was a prerequisite for success in other areas, and he was convinced that as long as the AIOC controlled Iran's most important natural resource, foreign influence was inevitable. Beginning in 1945 he led a successful campaign to deny the Soviet Union an oil concession in northern Iran. Although he resisted joining political parties, Mosaddeq agreed in 1949 to head the National Front, a coalition of several parties that supported oil nationalization. Within a year the National Front had members in cities and towns throughout the country and had become adept at organizing mass political rallies.

Conservative political groups, backed by the shah, opposed nationalizing the AIOC, partly because they believed such a course would cause permanent damage to relations with Britain and partly because they distrusted Mosaddeq's populism. However, as the nationalization movement grew, fewer and fewer politicians openly challenged Mosaddeq on the oil issue. In an effort to forestall nationalization, the shah appointed military officer Ali Razmara as prime minister in 1950. This move increased the scale of demonstrations in favor of nationalization and against a government that increasingly was denounced as a puppet of foreign interests. Razmara was assassinated in 1951 after only a few months in office, and the more militant supporters of nationalization celebrated his death. Sensing the popular mood, the Majlis passed a bill nationalizing the AIOC, then took the unprecedented step of appointing Mosaddeq prime minister over the shah's objections.

In response to these events, Britain enforced a blockade on oil exports from Iran, a move that deprived Iran of foreign exchange. Although Iran had not relied on oil revenues prior to 1951, Mosaddeq's development budget anticipated this income; its absence severely hindered efforts to stimulate the economy and implement social reforms. Attempts to secure foreign financial assistance proved unsuccessful because most countries and international financial institutions

feared offending Britain. The escalating crisis also discouraged private investment inside Iran. Mosaddeq, like many other Iranian political leaders, hoped the United States would intervene to resolve the crisis. Initially, the United States tried to mediate a compromise. By 1952 it had persuaded Britain to accept the principle of oil nationalization. However, the various diplomatic efforts ultimately failed to resolve the dispute.

In early 1953, when a new administration came to power in the United States, U.S. policy toward Iran began to change. The United States now became understanding to British arguments that Mosaddeq's government was causing instability that could be exploited by the USSR to expand its regional influence. As the Cold War escalated, world superpowers began to interpret political developments around the globe as “wins” or “losses” for the U.S.-led Western bloc and the Soviet-led Eastern bloc. Although Mosaddeq advocated Iranian neutrality in the Cold War conflict, neither side wanted to “lose” Iran. Consequently, the United States decided to use its Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to help overthrow Mosaddeq. By this time, many conservative politicians in Iran, some senior military officers, and the shah were prepared to work with the CIA to bring down the Mohammed Mosaddeq government. The coup, carried out in August 1953, failed initially, and the shah was forced to flee the country. After several days of street fighting in Tehran, which were instigated by the CIA, army officers loyal to the shah gained the upper hand. Mohammed Mosaddeq was arrested, and the shah returned in triumph.

The Iranian government restored relations with Britain in 1953 and concluded a new oil agreement the following year. Under the new agreement, the concession formerly held by the AIOC passed to an association of British, Dutch, French, and U.S. oil companies; this association was to share the profits of oil operations in Iran with the Iranian government. Although the agreement increased Iran's share of the oil profits, production levels and sale price remained under foreign control.

How Mohammed Reza Shah was consolidated their power in Iran?

Although he had succeeded his father as shah in 1941, prior to 1953 Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi had been overshadowed by Mosaddeq and other politicians and seemed destined to remain a passive, constitutional monarch. Following the coup, however, he moved to consolidate power in his own hands. With the help of the military and later a secret police, the Savak, the

shah created a centralized, authoritarian regime. He suppressed opposition by former National Front supporters and Communists, tightly controlled legislative elections, and appointed a succession of prime ministers loyal to him. In 1961 the shah dissolved the Majlis, instructing the prime minister to rule by decree until new elections were held.

Initially, Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi did not demonstrate the same enthusiasm for development and reform programs that his father had shown. His early reforms were undertaken only with prodding from the United States, which believed that dissatisfied Iranian peasants were susceptible to influence by local agents of the USSR. In the early 1960s more than 60 percent of Iran's inhabitants were sharecroppers who received a subsistence share (usually 20 percent) of the harvest from their landlords. A land reform program implemented between 1962 and 1971 required landlords to sell most of their land to the government, which then resold it to the peasants. Although widely promoted as a major rural reform effort, only half of the peasants obtained any land under the program, and about three-quarters of those receiving land got less than 6 hectares (15 acres).

Mohammad Reza Shah took more interest in industrial and public works projects, and between 1963 and 1978 numerous development schemes contributed to an increase in industrialization and urbanization. The shah presented his program as an integral part of a wider reform effort known as the White Revolution, initiated to prevent a Red, or Communist, revolution from originating at the grass roots level.

In 1963 the shah began a series of social, economic, and political reforms known as the White Revolution. The revolution gave more freedom to women and increased secular education at the expense of religious education. These and other changes questioned the dominant role of Iran's religious leaders, most of whom feared losing power and moral authority under the White Revolution.

The middle class expanded, but much of the urban growth resulted from the migration of poor villagers seeking city jobs. Consequently, slums proliferated on the outskirts of cities. Government policy focused on the creation of modern industrial facilities but neglected the development of social services. The construction activity under the White Revolution stimulated

expectations of political and social change. Oil revenues tripled after 1973 due to higher prices and increased sales, providing ready funding for the shah's programs. However, economic success only caused the shah's regime to become more authoritarian as his confidence in his rule grew.

Because of his collaboration with the CIA to overthrow Mohammed Mosaddeq in 1953, the shah was never able to overcome a popular perception that he was merely a tool for foreign interests. Mosaddeq's dismissal had shocked the nation, and over the years his image as a national hero had grown stronger despite the fact that the shah's government had banned any publications that mentioned his name. Furthermore, because of the CIA's role in the overthrow, most Iranians saw the United States, even more so than Britain or the USSR, as a threat to Iran's national interests. Strong relations between the United States and Iran at the official level, especially an alliance whereby the United States assisted in the buildup of Iran's military, fed the public's fears. In the early 1960s the shah's government drafted legislation granting diplomatic status to U.S. military personnel stationed in Iran. Nationalists denounced the bill as a reversion to the detested extraterritorial legal privileges accorded to British and Russian citizens in Iran before 1925. In addition to the above mentioned problems the government was known for its autocracy its focus on modernization and westernization and its disregard for religious and democratic measures in Iran's constitution.

6.2. The Islamic Revolution of Iran

The leader of the Iranian revolution Shia cleric Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini first came to political prominence in 1963 when he led opposition to the Shah and his "White Revolution", a program of reforms to break up landholdings (including those owned by religious foundations), grant women the right to vote and equality in marriage, and allow religious minorities to hold government office.

Khomeini was arrested in 1963 after declaring the Shah a "heartbroken miserable man" who had "embarked on the destruction of Islam in Iran.

Most importantly, Khomeini preached that revolt, and especially martyrdom, against injustice and tyranny was part of Islam, and that Muslims should reject the influence of both liberal capitalism and communism with the slogan "Neither East, nor West - Islamic Republic!"

Khomeini's second arrest in June 1963 led to three days of rioting in many Iranian cities; the military suppressed the riots only after more than 600 people had been killed and more than 2,000 injured. Fearing that Khomeini would assume martyr status if he were kept in prison or executed for treason, the shah exiled him to Turkey in 1964. Khomeini eventually settled in the theological center of Najaf in Iraq. From there he maintained regular contact with his former students in the Iranian city of Qum. These students formed the nucleus of a covert anti-shah movement that was growing among the clergy. In 1971 Khomeini published a book, *Velayat-e faqih* that provided the religious justification for an Islamic government in Iran.

The shah also failed to win mass support among the secular middle class of professionals, bureaucrats, teachers, and intellectuals. This social group, created as a result of his father's reforms and expanded during the 1960s and 1970s due to the shah's own development plans, tended to be highly nationalistic and looked back nostalgically to the Mosaddeq period as an era of genuine democracy. Like the clergy and the religiously inclined traditional middle class of merchants and artisans, the secular middle class resented the lack of meaningful political participation and the close ties the shah had established with the United States. They criticized the shah's promotion of Iran beginning in the late 1960s as America's security pillar in the Persian Gulf region. Despite their commonality of views, the secular and religious groups had distrusted one another in the 1950s and 1960s. The growing severity of political repression during the 1970s gradually brought them closer together, however, and by 1977 various secular and religious opposition movements were prepared to cooperate against the shah's regime.

6.3. Opposition groups and Organizations

Other opposition groups included constitutionalist liberals ,the democratic, reformist Islamic Freedom Movement of Iran, headed by Mehdi Bazargan, and the more secular National Front. They were based in the urban middle class, and wanted the Shah to remain to the Iranian Constitution of 1906 rather than to replace him with a theocracy, but lacked the cohesion and organization of Khomeini's forces.

Marxists groups: primarily the communist Tudeh Party of Iran and the guerillas had been weakened considerably by government repression. Despite this the guerillas did help play an important part in the final February 1979 overthrow delivering "the regime its coup refinement.

The most powerful guerilla group the People's Mujahedin was leftist Islamist and opposed the influence of the clergy as reactionary.

Many clergy did not follow Khomeini's lead. Popular Ayatollah Mahmoud Taleghani supported the left, while perhaps the most senior and influential Ayatollah in Iran — Mohammad Kazem Shariatmadari first remained remote from politics and then came out in support of a democratic revolution.

Khomeini worked to unite this opposition behind him (with the exception of the unwanted `atheistic Marxists`), focusing on the socio-economic problems of the Shah's regime (corruption and unequal income and development), while avoiding specifics among the general public that might divide the factions, particularly his plan for clerical rule which he believed most Iranians had become prejudiced against as a result of propaganda campaign by Western imperialists.

What factors makes the down fall of Shah Government?

Many sectors of the population were also becoming dissatisfied with the shah. Students and intellectuals were frustrated by his autocratic rule and by the corruption of the royal family, who had become wealthy from their five decades in power. Many of these dissidents favored some form of democracy as well as a more equitable distribution of the country's income. Members of the traditional middle class, or *bazaaris*, were angry as well, because they had received little benefit from either the White Revolution's development schemes or from the country's rapid, oil-fed growth in the 1970s. Most of the earnings had instead gone to larger companies, especially to ones with international ties or connections to the shah's family. Both bazaaris and fundamentalist Muslims disapproved of Iran's growing ties with the West.

All of these factors contributed to the rise of **Ruhollah Khomeini**, who in the early 1960s was a relatively unknown Islamic Ayatollah, or holy man. Khomeini had several assets that other leaders lacked.

- ❖ First, he was seemingly fearless: In 1963 he was the only cleric to openly attack the shah's White Revolution.
- ❖ Second, he spoke the language of the people, condemning the shah's "injustices" in the name of the "oppressed" masses.

- ❖ Third, and most importantly, Khomeini was able to transform Islam into a mass ideology that appealed to many groups.

In the past, Islam leaders had argued that although Muslims were a righteous who suffered under cruel leaders, it was not their role to overthrow the ruling regime and create an Islamic state. Instead, clerics should defend the religion and await the return of the 12th imam, the messianic figure of Islam whose presence was needed for the establishment of an Islamic state. Khomeini, however, rejected this passive approach. He argued that by overthrowing the shah, Iranians would hasten the return of the 12th imam. Indeed, Khomeini did not discourage Iranians from thinking of him as the messianic imam. Khomeini spread his interesting mixture of revolutionary ideology and messianic revivalism by mobilizing a vast network of loyal disciples. He was also able to galvanize the support of the bazaar middle class, which had close links to the *ulema*, Iran's religious leaders.

In 1978 opponents of the shah had several bloody encounters with his security troops. The most notorious of these clashes was on September 8, when soldiers fired on 20,000 demonstrators in Tehran. Several hundred people were killed and thousands more were wounded in what became known as **Black Friday**. Two months later, young people took to the streets of Tehran, burning shops, banks, liquor stores, and other symbols of Western "corruption." Tensions escalated in December with the coming of Muharram, the sacred month marking the martyrdom of Husayn, an early Shia leader. Emboldened by the strength of the opposition, Khomeini called on Iranians to "begin the month of epic heroism" the month in which the leader of the Muslims taught us to struggle against all tyrants." On December 10 and 11, the two holiest days of the Shia calendar, a group of soldiers rebelled and attacked the officer's mess of the shah's Imperial Guard. With that, his regime collapsed, and the shah fled Iran in January 1979. He died two years later in Cairo, Egypt.

Khomeini returned to Iran on February 1, 1979, and began to establish control over the government. He forced the shah's prime minister out of office and appointed a new prime minister, Mehdi Bazargan. Bazargan was known as a liberal who favored democracy; so many observers believed the new government would represent a wide range of opinion. In a late March

referendum Iranians voted on a new form of government, and in April, with overwhelming public approval, Khomeini declared the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran.