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The objective of this study is to describe and analyze the management of communal conflict in the Middle East, focusing on the Kurds. To this end, an effort is made to examine (1) the means that have been used to manage the Kurdish conflict by Middle Eastern countries; (2) the degree of success or failure of applied measures and (3) possible explanations for the first two questions.

The Ottoman Empire, which at one time included most of the Middle East, managed communal conflicts by the means of dhimmis and millet systems until the beginning of the 20th century. The emergence of nationalism and the principle of self-determination coupled with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire caused these systems to fail. From World War I until 1975, suppression and other violent means were the prevalent means used by Middle Eastern countries to manage the Kurdish problem. Preventive and peaceful measures, on the other hand, were devised to appease the Kurds; or the Kurds have been exploited for foreign policy objectives as well. Therefore, management of the Kurdish conflict has been such an integral part of international relations of the region.
that at times it has been dependent on the interaction of the host countries and other countries over which the Kurds have no control.

Over the long history of the Middle East, violent and suppressive means and techniques have been used more than non-violent and preventive measures to manage communal conflict. Although the suppressive and violent measures have been successful in the short run, they have failed to manage communal conflicts in the long run. The lack of preconditions for the use of non-violent measures, clash of nationalism, violent transfers of power, lack of unity among communal groups and lack of support of a superpower are some of the important factors which explain the application of suppressive and violent measures in the Middle East.
PREFACE

The Middle East has been one of the most politically unstable and divided regions in the world. It has also been an arena of violence from the days of its earliest recorded history to the present time. The existence of wide varieties of religious, linguistic, and ethnic groups has resulted in communal conflicts for centuries. With the region's long cultural history and its numerous communal groups, management of communal conflict has a significant impact on its politics.

This research focuses upon the problems that arise when different communal groups come together and interact productively or tragically. The modes of conflict management vary, but usually one group dominates or attempts to dominate the others. I have paid special attention to the salient aspects of conflict resolution measures in the Middle East because its management is one of the neglected areas in the study of the region. Hopefully, this research will contribute to the successful management of communal conflict in the region and thereby promote a peaceful and stable world.
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CHAPTER I

MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNAL CONFLICT

A Statement of the Problem

The Middle East has been an arena of conflict for centuries. At times wars and violence have changed boundaries overnight. Even today many conflicts have not been officially resolved. These long and often serious conflicts among communal groups in the Middle East have persisted in spite of the strongly integrative character of Islamic religion and culture. For centuries, the Islamic religion has had the role of moderating (as well as causing) communal tensions among the peoples of the Middle East. While racial conflict has not been a problem, communal conflict pervades the region.

I find Milton Esman's definition of "communal group" as "competitive group solidarities within the same political system based on ethnic, linguistic, racial, or religious identities" to be satisfactory for my purposes (13, P. 49). It is generally believed that religion, language, and race singly or in combination form the core of communal groups' identities and values (33). Communal conflicts originate from the desire to preserve the basic religious, linguistic, or racial characteristics which communal groups possess. The difficulty of communal conflict management rests on the
presence of differences in religion, language and race. The chances of communal conflict are great in any society which is divided by one or any combination of these factors. These elements of the communal identity are "non-compromising." As long as they retain political salience, they cannot be traded away or bargained with (3; 9; 10; 11; 12; 14; 15; 17; 21; 29; 34; 36).

Over the long history of the Middle East, violent and suppressive means and techniques have been used more than non-violent and preventive measures to manage communal conflict. Although the suppressive and violent measures have been successful in the short run, they have failed to manage communal conflicts in the long run. The lack of preconditions for the use of non-violent measures, clash of nationalism, violent transfers of power, lack of unity among communal groups and lack of support of a superpower are some of the important factors which explain the application of suppressive and violent measures in the Middle East.

Management of communal conflict has been a crucial problem for most Middle Eastern countries, particularly in the immediate post-independence period. The traditional focus of international relations has ignored the role of communal groups, and the role of smaller states has been down played in respect to big-power relations. Furthermore, the literature on the Middle East tends to obscure the human realities behind political problems. Given that little
attention has been paid to the issue of management of communal conflicts in the Middle East, this research attempts to analyze the different means of communal conflict regulation in the Middle East, focusing on the Kurdish conflict.

A full study of different communal groups in the Middle East would require several volumes. Hence, this study will be confined to the management of Kurdish conflict in Iran, Iraq, Turkey, and Syria. Since the U.S.S.R is not part of the Middle East, discussion of the Soviet Kurds is not included in this research. It is limited to manifest conflicts involving the Kurds which were severe and intense in terms of causing instability, threats of secession, threats to the values of a dominant group, and threats to the legitimacy of an existing government or political system. Selection of this case satisfies four criteria. First the Kurds share common attributes and are a relatively homogenous communal group. Second, they are located in the heartland of the Middle East. They form substantial minorities in Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria and the Soviet Union. Third, the Kurds are one of the largest communal groups who have been consistently denied the right of self-determination in the Middle East. Fourth, in all these countries, the loyalty of the Kurds has been preserved by force. By selecting one communal group resident in several states and by comparing the policies of these states we can
find patterns of management of communal conflict in the Middle East. However, some reference will be made to other communal groups and conflicts and to the general history of the Ottoman Empire and the Middle East as well.

The time period under consideration extends from the post-World War I (formation of the Turkish Republic in 1919) to 1975. During this period the ideas of self-determination and popular sovereignty became widespread in the region, making communal groups possible candidates for statehood. However, because of the historical significance of the Ottoman Empire, I provide an historical background of the treatment of communal groups by the Ottoman Empire so far as data are available.

Communal conflicts can be studied from two points of view. First, political scientists may direct their attention to the causes of communal conflict and the impact of socio-economic and political factors on the causes of such conflicts. Second, the resolution of communal conflict is often a subject of study for political scientists. Management of communal conflict is regarded as a process of conflict resolution. In this case, conflict management is an active continuous process. There are many strategies and procedures that can be employed to manage communal conflicts once they are set in motion. In this dissertation the second perspective has been employed; the focus is on the management of communal conflict in the Middle East.
The main goal undertaken is to analyze the apparent patterns of management of communal conflicts. Accordingly, the dependent variable is "management of communal conflict in the Middle East". This main question is studied specifically in the form of three subordinate questions: 1) What means or measures have been used to manage communal conflict? 2) Whether the applied measures have been successful or not? 3) What are the reason(s) for the choice of these measure(s) and for their success or failure? The first question helps us to identify the applied communal conflict resolution measures while the second allows us to see how and to what extent the means resulted in success or failure. The criteria for success or failure of a policy will be based on the termination or repetition of a conflict. Therefore, "success" of a policy means resolution of a conflict or the disappearance of it for the time period of this research. Repetition and or duration of conflict in the same time period are appropriate criteria for the "failure" of a policy. Finally, the third question is the basis for examining the reason(s) for the patterns of conflict management.

Management, regulation, or resolution of communal conflict, in this research, refers to all preventive/non-violent and suppressive/intervентive or violent regulatory policies, processes, acts, and practices by a political system towards a communal group, which are potentially
capable of resolving communal conflict. Therefore, these policies provide a framework within which communal conflict is managed peacefully or violently (27). "Non-violent management" refers to a policy, process, act or practice which is marked by the absence of mass violence or forceful repression (27). Indicators of non-violent behavior are, for example, cultural assimilation, amalgamation, integration, confederalism, federalism, coalition, proportionality, compromise, depolitization, concession, etc. (27, pp. 20-41). Violent management refers to a policy, process, act or practice which associate with direct or indirect use of armed forces. Indicators of violent behavior are, for example, execution of communal group leaders, imprisoning communal group leaders, deporting the leaders, disarming the communal groups, secession, assassination, revolt, genocide, forcible domination, fighting, torture, destruction of property, restriction of activities, segregation, discrimination, prejudice, exclusion, forced migration, etc. (25, pp. 10-11; 20, p. 255). These indicators are explained in more detail in the next chapter.

After explaining the methodology and the importance of the subject, along with the major scholarly work done to date and defining the population of this research in the first chapter, an effort is made to provide an analytical framework for the study of communal conflict resolution in
the second chapter. To accomplish this, the means of communal conflict resolution are conceptually classified. In the third chapter, an examination of the history of the Ottoman Empire provides an appropriate background to see how communal conflicts were managed during its approximately four hundred year rule (1516-1918). Having looked at the Ottoman Empire in historical perspective, we examine how communal conflicts are managed in the selected case of the Kurdish people's conflicts in the twentieth century. Chapters four through seven provide the historical evidence for the question of how the Kurdish conflict has been managed in Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria. Finally, in the last chapter, conclusions are drawn as to the three research questions posed above, and some propositions based on these conclusions are put forth.

Methodology

An historical and comparative approach is used in this dissertation. The questions are studied by means of analysis and comparison of policies of Middle Eastern countries towards the Kurds. In this research original (primary) documents such as public statements of the central authorities and of different communal groups, treaties, different related laws, local newspapers and publications, records, diaries, constitutions, and other, governmental documents, and excerpts from relevant texts are used in order to expand
knowledge and understanding of the management of Kurdish conflicts in the Middle East. Most of the writings in the West about the Kurds are about those in Iraq. The Kurds in Iran, Turkey, and Syria are often treated marginally. Books by and about the Kurds of Iran and Turkey are not always available in Western libraries. Because of the lack of official documents about the Kurds, information from books is used, and is supplemented by other sources, such as The New York Times and the documents section of the The Middle East Journal. Also, some classified documents from the United States National Archive for the years 1945 to 1950, edited and published by David F. Andrews in The Lost People of the Middle East, are used. All documents in this book were from previously confidential and secret records in the archives of the United States Government. The author's knowledge of four languages (Turkish, Persian, Arabic and English) provides a basis for studying different sources.

In the conceptualization of the source materials I rely on the literature of conflict resolution, nationalism, and ethnicity. These three areas of social sciences provide some information about communal groups and conflict regulation. The first source of information is the literature on political conflict. If the causes and correlates of conflict are accurately identified, presumably stability is promoted by avoiding them. Most of these studies cluster under the heading of conflict resolution and deal with
individuals, small groups, or international actors. Only limited attention is paid to conflict resolution between ethnic minorities and nation-states.

Another major source of information for the subject matter is the literature on nationalism and national integration. The literature on nationalism is the largest on the relationship between national or communal conflicts and questions of international peace and war.

Another source of information about communal conflict management consists of ethnic, sociological, and anthropological studies. The scope and definition of ethnicity and anthropology have varied considerably. Opinions differ on many details of the subject area. However, in this field of study, scholars try to record and explain the culturally significant behavior of a particular society. This set of literature can be divided into two categories: 1) theoretical and 2) area or case studies, of which the Kurdish case in this research is an example. Therefore, political science furnishes the focus, anthropology and sociology provide the conceptual framework, and history affords the evidence for this research.

This research will, hopefully, enable us to draw some inferences and raise critical questions about the management of communal conflicts not only of the selected case of the Kurds, but of other political systems confronting similar problems elsewhere in the Middle East and beyond.
Certainly, the Kurdish case does not present a scientific sample of communal conflicts in the world or in the Middle East. The Kurds reside in states which range from traditional social and political systems (Iraq and Syria) to relatively modern ones (Turkey). These states include relatively stable systems (Turkey) as well as highly unstable ones (Syria, Iraq and Iran). There are political systems which have remained quite authoritarian (Iran, Iraq and Syria) and some which are relatively open and competitive (Turkey). Some have undergone political revolution (Iran and Iraq) while others have experienced more gradual institutional change or evolution (Turkey). Some of these factors may limit the possibilities for generalization of the results. I realize the limitations of the case study when making generalizations and conclusions.

The limitations of this project include selection of the Kurdish case, possibly biased data, lack of data, the values of the author, and the limitation of time in which the research has to be done. The existing data are sparse and propositions have not been widely examined. Especially in the case of the Kurds, most of the writings are emotional, subjective, and unsystematic. More data about the Kurds as well as other groups must be collected and the kinds of propositions cited in Chapter VIII must be tested in other Middle Eastern countries. The development of a theory of communal conflict regulation would be premature at this
time. Therefore, it should not be expected that this dissertation will make it possible to explain or predict communal conflict regulation in the Middle East. The aim of this research is to make a beginning in the formulation of meaningful categories, systematic classification and to put forth propositions which might be useful in future work. This type of information should not only increase our understanding of how some Middle Eastern societies have managed communal conflict but may also contribute to the construction of more peaceful societies in the world. The subject of management of communal conflict constitutes the most important aspect of conflict theory in terms of internal (public) and external (foreign) policies.

The Importance of the Subject

There have been few societies on any continent which have been free of communal conflict. The evidence suggests that its frequency and intensity has been increasing in the period covered by this study. The Kurdish uprising in Iraq, Turkey, Iran, and Syria, the war in Lebanon, the Arab and Israeli conflict, Greek and Turkish conflict in Cyprus, the growing assertiveness of Kurkish, Baluch and Arab minorities in post-Shah Iran attest to it in the region under study here. Elsewhere the communal animosity in Northern Ireland, the conflict between Flemings and Walloons in Belgium since 1830, the Quebec separatist movement in Canada, the Hindu-
Muslim conflict in Pakistan, the Basque separatist movement in Spain, the separatist tendencies of minorities in Yugoslavia, India, Malaysia, Nigeria, all demonstrate how struggle for communal identity can trigger political conflict. The magnitude of the threat to the stability of the particular state varies among cases substantially. The list of troubled states indicates the growing tendency of peoples to perceive human relations from the communal point of view.

The international system has grown from around twenty independent states in the Napoleonic period to more than 160 today. It is obvious that multicommmunalism is the rule rather than the exception. As Clifford Geertz points out, these communally structured collectivities can be considered "as possible selfstanding, maximal social units, as a candidate for nationhood" (13). According to Walker Connor:

> Of a total of 132 contemporary states, only 12 (9.1 per cent) can be described as essentially homogeneous from an ethnic viewpoint. An additional 25 states (18.9 per cent of the sample) contain an ethnic group accounting for more than 90 per cent of the state's total population, and in still another 25 states the largest element accounts for between 75 and 89 per cent of the population.... In some instances, the number of groups within a state runs into the hundreds, and in 53 states (40.2 per cent of the total), the population is divided into more than five significant groups. Clearly then the problem of the ethnic diversity is far too ubiquitous to be ignored by the serious scholars ... (8, p. 320).

Abdul Said and Luiz R. Simmon, in *Ethnicity in an International Context* claim that "[T]he most significant
violence after 1945 has found its _causus belli_ ethnic, tribal, and racial disputes that have often exerted a spillover effect in international politics" (32, p. 16). Therefore, the involvement of communal groups in struggles for power is obvious and the political importance of communal tensions in the modern world is beyond dispute.

Middle Eastern societies are composed of individuals who form communal groups on the basis of religion, language and ethnicity (5; 25). Conflicts are endemic among these groups as each struggles for power, for scarce resources, and for the ability to express its needs. The existence of such differentiations has often been associated with the instabilities of the region. The importance of these communal groups varies among and within Middle Eastern societies. Some are important because they pose a real or latent threat of secession. Some are considered a threat to regime stability. Others may pose a threat to the values of a dominant group, or may rival the state for legitimacy (27).

The communal groups want to remain both durable and audible in the international context. It is clear that communal conflicts will continue to play an important role in determining the present and the future of the Middle East. It is apparent too that strategies for dealing with the perceptions and expectations of communal groups will greatly influence the course that politics in the Middle East follow over the rest of the twentieth century (4).
Peace in the Middle East is impossible without resolving the Kurdish conflict.

During the last decades, political scientists, sociologists and anthropologists have shown particular interest in the study of communal conflict, its resolution and the implications of such conflict for the problems of national integration, modernization, and the development and maintenance of democratic institutions. Thus Samuel Huntington, for example, argues that:

Ethnic or religious groups which had lived side by side in traditional society become aroused to violent conflict as a result of the interaction, the tension, the inequalities generated by social and economic modernization (22, p. 39).

In the light of such arguments regarding the importance of communal conflict, concern has increasingly been directed toward the problem of "managing" or "regulating" conflict in plural societies. Accordingly, several authors have undertaken to explain the stability and effectiveness of political systems in certain segmented societies, such as Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, by focusing on the cooperative behavior of elites. The "consociational" approach to communal conflict, as put forward most notably by Arend Lijphart, stresses the crucial role of these elites (24, pp. 207-225).

Sidney Verba has observed that intense conflict within plural societies in various European countries has been avoided by means of a protective compartmentalization of
those communal groups. Such policies, he argues, may work best "where governmental aspirations are low ... if politics involves the resolution of grievances". But he cautions that "when elites see their task as the transformation of a society in fundamental ways" pluralist protection is likely to give way to "the next stage ... repression" (39, p. 127).

Eric Nordlinger argues that when intense communal conflicts are successfully regulated one or more of six conflict-regulating practices (stable governing coalition; the principle of proportionality; mutual veto; purposeful depoliticization; compromise on decisive issues; and concession) are always employed. These tactics have been used in Belgium since 1830, Austria between 1945 and 1965, Holland between 1390 and 1917, nineteenth-century Switzerland, and contemporary Malaysia and Lebanon. But successful or unsuccessful regulation ultimately depends on the purposeful behavior of political elites (27, pp. 20-41). He rejects deliberate efforts to create an integrative national identity or overriding loyalty to the nation. The major problem in applying his study to the present work is the restriction of his research to "open" regimes and the limitation of his examples to small countries with only two important conflict groups. This excludes the Middle Eastern countries, some of which have authoritarian regimes and different problems of communal conflict.
Milton Esman attempts to classify communally plural societies by "regime objective." Then he tries to "identify some of the conflict management methods that may be instrumental to these objectives," and finally to "indicate the limited utility of a number of policies and circumstances for which much has been claimed in the literature" (13, pp. 49-73). The main thesis of Esman's argument is that the important purposes of conflict management in the context of communal pluralism are the authoritative allocation of scarce resources and opportunities among competing communal groups and prevention or control of overt hostility and violence. The processes employed depend on the objectives of the regime. Then Esman identifies four classes of regime objectives: 1) institutional dominance, 2) induced assimilation, 3) syncretic integration, and 4) balanced pluralism. Finally, he indicates some processes and criteria of conflict management that each of them is likely to employ (13, p. 56).

Rabushka and Shepsle argue that in the absence of important cross-cutting cleavages, culturally diverse and democratic nation-states will inevitably develop intense communal conflicts which will dominate the political arena and result in chronic instability in pluralistic societies. Countries included in this examination are Guyana, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Malaysia, Ceylon, Trinidad, Cyprus, Rwanda, Zanzibar, Lebanon, Sudan, South Africa, Switzerland,
Rhodesia, Ireland, Burundi, and the Congo (31). They suggest that there are six ways of managing communal conflict: 1) denial of independence, 2) restriction on independence, 3) restriction on free political competition, 4) restriction on the scope of government, 5) creation of homogeneous societies, 6) creation of permanent external enemies (31, p. 217).

The Kurds (Population of the Research)

The Kurds are one of the oldest and most significant communal groups in the Middle East. In fact, they are the fourth largest communal group in the area. Only the Arabs, Turks, and Persians, in that order, outnumber the Kurds. The Kurds are the descendants of the Madais mentioned in the Bible (30, p. 26). The Kurds claim that their name means "lion". But their adversaries call them wolf, since both the Persian and Turkish word for this animal is koort.

Kurdistan, which means the land of the Kurds, is a geographical expression which neither has an actuality on the map nor constitutes a political entity. But, when Kurdistan is mentioned by a Kurd, he refers to the area which is identified by the following borders:

To the West: A line starting from the Kurd-Dagh (Syria), running in a northerly direction through the region of Killis, Marash, Albistan, and Divrik to the Kelkit river. South-West of this line, there are scattered Kurdish settlements as far as the Gulf of Alexandrette.

To the North: A line following the Kelkit
river, running east through the town of Baiburt and Lity to Kars. North of this line scattered Kurdish settlements reach the Black Sea near Terizond.

To the East: A line starting from Kars in a southeasterly direction, then running along the western shore of Lake Urmia, Luristan, the Bakhtiar country to Sehneh and Kermanshah.

To the South: From Southern Luristan a line running north west through Khanakin and Kifri to the Jebel Hamrin; from there to the west, south of Mount Singar to the Euphrates in Jerablus (1, p. 18).

However, these are not precise borders, since many non-Kurds such as Armenians and Christians live within this area and many Kurds outside it. Kurdistan falls mainly within the political frontiers of Turkey, Iraq and Iran, with much smaller areas in Syria and the Soviet Union. (see the map on the page 19). Altogether Kurdistan, which never formed a single state, is estimated to to comprise an area of about 135,100 square miles (7, p. 1025).

The most important and populous towns of Kurdistan are:

in Turkey: Diarbekr, Mardin, Kharput, Maltia, Erzerum, Erzinjan, Mush, Van, Bitlis, Khozat, Maden, and Jeziret ibn Omar (now Cizre); in Iraq: Sulaimaniya, Kirkuk, Zakhi, Ebril, Ruwandiz, Koi Sanjak; in Iran: Sannandaj, Saqqiz, Kermanshah, Mahabad, and Bokan; in Syria: Jazireh, Hamat, Kurd-Dagh, Ain-Arab, Aleppo, and Damascus.

Kurdistan is an agrarian region, producing all kinds of cereals, flax, tobacco, sesame, all kinds of vegetables, almonds, figs, nuts, olives, apples, pears, apricots, peaches, prunes, cherries, grapes, pomegranates, mulberries,
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etc. (1, p. 19). It is rich in waterfalls, and mineral resources, especially oil, iron, tin, coal, sulphur, lead and silver. Iraq's and Iran's mineral deposits, especially the rich oil resources, are chiefly in the Kurdish region. The area which the Kurds occupy provided about 70 percent of Iraq's crude oil export in 1974. Iraq had proven reserve of 31.5 billion barrels and production of 2 billion barrels per day (26, p. 4). There are several textile factories in the large centers and home industry is widespread. The area of Kurdistan includes plains, mountains, and high plateaus such as Kiarbekr, Passen, Mush, Kharput, Jezireh, the valley of the Tigris and Euphrates.

The only significant economic development was based on construction of military bases, especially in Iran and Iraq. There were very few industrial jobs, except in the oil industry, and few of them were filled by Kurds. Some light industries produced consumer goods. Therefore, Kurdistan was in a very traditional stage of economic and social development.

The Kurdish language, a branch of an Indo-European tongue, is closely akin to Persian. It is divided into two distinct dialects, none of which has been nationally adopted. 1) Kurmanji is spoken by the majority of those in Turkey and the northern part of Iraqi Kurdistan. 2) Sorani or Mokrian is spoken in the area which extends from Sulaimaniya into Iranian Kurdistan. The Kurdish language
has no script of its own. The Arabic script is used in Iraq, Iran and Syria, Roman in Turkey and Russian in the U.S.S.R. (23, p. 1; 15, p. 13).

Virtually all Kurds (99%) belong to Orthodox Islam, most of which are Shaefeite Sunnis (28, p. 33). The Shii are around several hundred thousands, residing mainly in Dersim, Elazig and Maras. Approximately 30,000 Kurds are Nestorian and Assyrian Christians, and 40 to 50,000 Yezidis (the old Zoroastrian) (35, pp. 226-227).

No exact census of the Kurdish population has ever been taken. The fact that the Kurds are divided among five states makes it difficult to estimate their total number. Furthermore, most of these states do not recognize a specifically Kurdish nationality or even communal identity. Consequently, estimates of their numbers vary according to the personal bias of various writers. The governments of Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Syria try to minimize the number of Kurds in order to prove their political insignificance.

Estimates used here indicate that there are about fourteen million Kurds in the Middle East. More than seven million are in Turkey; three million are in Iran; two million in Iraq; half a million in Syria and 100,000 in the Soviet Union. Almost another million live in various parts of the Middle East (6, p. 22). The following table shows the distribution of Kurdish people in the Middle Eastern countries.
TABLE I

KURDISH POPULATION ESTIMATE FOR 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Kurds</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>40.2 million</td>
<td>7.5 million</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>10.5 million</td>
<td>2 to 2.5 million</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>34.0 million</td>
<td>3.5 million</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>6 million</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5 to 14 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Kurdish sources tend to present a larger figure (twenty million or more Kurdish population) (35, pp. 228-228). In proportion to the general population of Iraq the Kurds form a larger communal group there than in the other countries. The Kurds of Iran make up no more than ten percent of its population, and the Kurds of Turkey are no more than nineteen percent of Turkey's population, while they constitute about twenty-three percent in Iraq. The Kurds of Iraq are more geographically concentrated than in other countries. They comprise a distinct minority second only to the Turks in Turkey and the Arabs in Iraq. Kurds comprise around eight percent of the Syrian population, but they sit on Syria's important oilfields.
Throughout their history, the Kurds basically lived under tribal dynasties or in recent times under an ill-fated Kingdom or a Republic. Their lives were usually controlled by feudal landowners or "Aghas". Because of the general isolation of Kurdistan, feudalism, tribalism, religion has remained a strong force among the Kurds. The leadership of the Kurdish community is hereditary and has lain traditionally with large landowners (Aghas) and religious dignitaries (Shaykhs).

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, Kurdistan was divided into a number of local units which loosely united numerous tribes under the nominal sovereign of the Sultan or Shah. These local units disbanded, but the tribes remained largely unaffected by central authority (2, pp. 17-19). At that time the Kurds were tribes which were backward and lacked an intellectual elite to spread new nationalistic ideas.

Nationalism and other related political thoughts made slow progress in Kurdistan. The national consciousness started at the beginning of the twentieth century. The first Kurdish political organization was founded in 1909, called "Kurdistan Toali ve Teraki Jamyate," (Society for the Rise and Progress of Kurdistan). Later on, their nationalist hopes centered around a new organization, called Khoyburn (Independence), which was founded in 1927. Between 1927 and 1942, several other Kurdish political organizations such as
the Hiya (Hope) Party, the Rezgari Kurd Party were established. The first modern Kurdish political party began in Iran in 1942, which was called Komola (Committee of Kurdish Youth). When the Soviets occupied northern Iran, Komola changed its name to the Kurdish Democratic Party. In 1946 the party established the Kurdish Republic of Mahabad. When the Republic dissolved, the party operated overtly or covertly in Iraq, Turkey, Iran, and Syria as well. The Kurdish Democratic Party called for a free, social democratic form of government, a massive expansion of the economy, for land reform, for an intense growth of education at all levels, and for the liberation of Kurdish culture in all its forms. The party's militants were called the "Pishmarg," meaning "those who face death." The leadership of the party was associated with the name of Mulla Mustafa Barzani from its establishment until 1977 when he died in the United States. None of the rival Kurdish tribal leaders could overcome Barzani, who enjoyed the support of the most of the tribes. With his Barzani tribe, he expanded his influence and dominance until he became the acknowledged leader of Kurdish nationalism and autonomy.

In addition to the Kurdish Democratic Party and its branches, there was an external network of Kurdish organizations. The International Kurdish Society (Amsterdam), the Deutsch-Kurdischen Gesellschaft (Hamburg and Braunschweig), the Committee of Solidarity with the Kurdish Revolution
(Paris), the Association of Kurdish Students in Europe (fourteen branches), the Committee for the Advancement of Kurdistan in the United States and the United Kingdom, the Committee for the Defense of the Rights of the Kurdish People and the Association of Kurdish Refugees in Sweden are examples (38, pp. 7-8).

The Kurdish conflict has been fueled by such conditions as poverty, hunger, insufficient schools and teachers, poor communications, deplorable health conditions, low prices and inadequate marketing facilities for agricultural products, inefficient and dishonest administration, failure of the central government to spend in Kurdistan as much money as it takes out in taxes, and attempts to suppress the use of Kurdish language in Kurdistan.

Kurdistan has been strategically important in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It was a center of dispute for Czarist Russia, Great Britain and later France and Germany. Great Britain regarded Kurdistan as a means of blocking entry to Iraq in case of possible Russian or French aggression. After the First World War, Kurdistan has been an area of interest or disputes among Britain, France, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Syria. After the Second World War, the United States, for political, social, economic and strategic reasons in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, has shown an interest in the Kurdish conflict. Kurdistan was
considered to be important for the Russians for the following reasons.

1) Kurds might be a target in any coup the communists might try in Iran and Iraq.

2) Kurdistan was part of the Soviet Union's natural way of entry into the Persian Gulf, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East generally (37, p. 38).

The intention here is not fully describe the sociological aspects of the Kurds or the history of the Kurdish national independence. Rather, this brief introduction to the history of the Kurds provides a background to follow the discussion in the next chapters.
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CHAPTER II

MEANS OR TECHNIQUES OF MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNAL CONFLICT

Introduction

As with many other issues of political science, the study of communal conflict faces the absence of satisfactory theory. Furthermore, there are only a few general works about management of communal conflict which have been done at different levels of analysis in different regions of the world.

Scholars such as Nordlinger and Rabushka and Shepsle, utilizing a pluralistic approach, focus on the democratic societies or what they call open regimes (30; 35). In my opinion they do not provide an appropriate explanation for management of communal conflict in undemocratic societies or closed regimes such as the Middle Eastern societies. Esman’s discussion has some relevance to the management of Kurdish conflict, which will be discussed in chapter VIII. Lacking a firm theoretical guidance, I make an attempt to select areas of priority and to cite the studies containing the most relevant conceptual and theoretical inventories about management of communal conflict. Then, by combining the literature on conflict resolution, nationalism, and
ethnicity, I prepare a classificatory framework for the study of management of communal conflict.

In the first chapter, management of communal conflict was defined as all non-violent and violent regulatory policies, processes, acts, and practices by a political system which is potentially capable of resolving communal conflict. These policies provide a framework within which communal conflicts are managed peacefully or violently. Management, in the literature of conflict resolution, is defined as "the collective effort to "prevent" nonlegitimate communal conflict from developing, and if already developed, to "intervene" to return it to the level of legitimacy" (19, p. 16). Communal conflict may be defined as legitimate when it is endorsed, or permitted by the acceptable norms of a society or a community. The property of legitimacy may be attributed to both the ends and the means of communal conflict. On the other hand, communal conflicts that are prohibited or disapproved by the acceptable norms of a society or community are defined as nonlegitimate (19, p. 260). As Lewis A. Coser puts it, "Nonlegitimate conflicts are those that exceed the limits imposed by societal consensus" (7, p. 234). Concepts such as violence, political conflict, rebellion, and aggressive war are some of the indicators of nonlegitimate communal conflict.

According to the definition given above, management may take either of two forms. These are: first, preventive and
non-violent measures; secondly, suppressive/interventive or violent measures. Therefore, in the first part of this section, an effort is made to elaborate on preventive and non-violent techniques. Then suppressive and violent measures are explained.

Preventive/Non-Violent Means of Management of Communal Conflict

Preventive or non-violent means are basically associated with measures such as pluralism, federalism, consociationalism, millet system, and national integration and assimilation. These practices can be categorized under two strategies of prevention of communal conflict which are

1) Pluralistic and Federative Approach;
2) Nationalistic and Integrative Approach.

The significant feature of this classification is that it is an institutional approach. Therefore, these mechanisms and techniques may be called institutionalized measures. The concept of institutionalization refers to a set of binding social norms that endorse, regulate, and reward legitimate communally related struggle as one way of preventing non-legitimate conflict. According to Dahrendorf:

The first and foremost form of conflict regulation appears to consist in the operation of certain institutions which provide the framework for discussions of and decisions about conflicting issues. In general these institutions may be described as parliamentary or quasi-parliamentary
bodies in which conflicting interest groups or their representatives meet in order to carry on their conflict in a relatively peaceful and patterned manner (8, p. 228).

The presence of institutional arrangements is a reflection of the bargaining process as well as a means of managing communal conflicts. However, the presence of such institutional measures does not generally guarantee that communal conflict will be avoided or prevented by these measures (19, p. 213).

**Pluralistic and Fedrartive Approaches**

Pluralism and federalism are commonly used strategies for the management of communal conflict. A distinction has to be made between pluralism and federalism. Pluralism is a broader category of which federalism is one sub-classification. The millet system and consociationalism are two other types of pluralism. Where these measures have been adopted, they have been designed to accommodate a variety of communal groups in a single state.

According to pluralism, "a society is made up of heterogeneous institutions and organizations that have diversified religious, economic, ethnic, and cultural interests and share the exercise of power" (20, p. 164). The major assumptions in pluralism are that communal groups can live together in a system where their leaders compete actively in the decision making process for the allocation of values. Furthermore, the new political leaders of
communal groups can have access to power through the same political process. No communal group should try to dominate the other communal groups or the democratic political system (20, p. 164).

According to Henry S. Kariel, six general propositions are integral to any pluralism:

1) individual fulfillment is assured by small governmental units, for they alone are representative; 2) the unrepresentative exercise of governmental power is frustrated when public agencies are geographically dispersed; 3) Society is composed of a variety of reasonably independent religious, cultural, educational, professional, and economic associations; 4) these private associations are voluntary insofar as no individual is ever wholly affiliated with any one of them; 5) public policy accepted as binding on all associations in the result of their own free interaction; and 6) public government is obliged to discern and act only upon the common denominator of group concurrence (20, p. 164).

In plural systems communal groups are permitted to organize and articulate their cultural and political interests and to cope with the inevitable competition and conflict that ensues among them. Thus pluralism plays two functions in a society. It mobilizes individuals to become active in political affairs, and it mediates political influence between the citizens and the government. Open and fair competition is supposed to produce both justice among groups and efficiency for the society.

Federalism has been defined in many ways. All, however, contain the notion that in federalism an individual and territory are governed by two governments. It does not
imply domination by one government over the other. On the other hand, it does not accept secession. Federalism or territorial autonomy refers to the process by which a number of groups enter into agreement for working out solutions, adopting joint policies, and making common decisions on joint problems (12). This is one of the important techniques of conflict management which is feasible or appropriate when the members of communal conflict groups are geographically concentrated. Milton Esman argues that such areas of concentration can be granted broad powers of governance to regulate and allocate many of the resources and opportunities that concern their residents, including educational opportunities, civil service jobs, and economic privileges. The language and religious practices of the regionally dominant group can be given exclusive or equal status with the national language or religion.... The allocation of these opportunities and resources can be determined either by fixed shares through constitutional provisions or established conventions or by more flexible bargaining processes (13, pp. 63-4).

He adds that "open competition is a feasible method of communal conflict management in open societies only when (1) ethnic solidarities and divisions are not intense (Brazil, Peru), or (2) the dominant ethnic groups benefit from open competition, while the disadvantaged groups have no capacity to change the rules of the game to their advantage" (13, p. 61).

Federal ideas have been systematically conceptualized in two different ways. First, federalism has been conceived as a means to unite a people already linked by bonds of
nationality through distribution of political power among the nation's constituent units. Secondly, federalism has been conceived as a means to unify diverse peoples for important but limited purposes, without disrupting their primary ties to the individual polities that constitute the federal system.

The applicability of federalism is questioned by such scholars as Nordlinger. He argues that "the territorial units may make extravagant and even incompatible demands on the center which the polity cannot accommodate, thus escalating rather than regulating communal conflict" (30, pp. 104-110). Federalism requires organizing national unity for common purposes while preserving diversity for other purposes in the same society. The success of a federal system requires that the value consensus that holds the system together must be stronger than the diversity of local values which tend to pull it part. Yet those who emphasize local values must have confidence, demonstrated in practice, that the central government will respect them. The need of balancing unity and diversity makes a federal system difficult to operate effectively. In the words of Kariel, "while diversity is a potential threat to unity, uniformity is a threat to freedom" (20, p. 164).

Theories of federalism do not provide a complete and absolute pattern for the distribution of powers between a central government and communal groups. The specific
The distribution of powers in a federal system depends on the conditions and circumstances of a country. The distribution may change over time if the system is flexible enough to permit it. There is a close connection between the development of democracy and the development of local government in a federalist system.

In order to materialize pluralistic and federative approaches in a society, one or more of the following measures should be used: a) proportionality, b) depoliticization, c) mutual veto, d) concession, e) consociationalism, and f) millet system (30).

**Proportionality.**-- Proportionality can be applied in several forms. One is that elective and appointive government positions may be distributed in proportion to the population size of the communal groups or to their relative electoral strength (30, p. 22). Another application of this principle is that it may be applied to the government's allocation of scarce resources to the communal groups in accordance with their relative size. In short, the forms that proportionality may assume are numerous, and include governing coalitions, proportional representation, quotas for access to education, employment, licenses and public contracts, fixed shares of public expenditures and investments, and official recognition of plural group
symbols such as language, holidays, and religious practices (30, pp. 22-24).

Proportionality can be distinguished from the majority principle of "winner take all." The main difference is that all communal groups can influence a decision in proportion to their numerical strength. In the words of Eric Nordlinger, "the principle serves as an effective conflict-regulating practice insofar as it reduces the degree and scope of competition for governmental power, administrative positions, and scarce resources" (30, pp. 22-23).

There are questions of what the appropriate criterion of proportionality should be. Among other criteria, numbers, need, and performance have been mentioned. If numbers are accepted, there comes the question of the adjustment of proportionality with each census. For example, in Lebanon there has been no formal census since 1932, since this might upset conventional proportions on which the politics of Lebanon have been based. Measurement of needs and performance is not easy. In some cases there is the possibility of the combination of these criteria. For instance, the Lebanese apply the principle of proportionality in Parliament based on joint communal lists, as opposed to systems in which individuals vote only for their own communal representatives (30, pp. 22-24).
Proportionality is sometimes described as a "quota system." Its aim is to prevent the majority from depriving a minority of its proportional share in the legislative, administrative, and judicial bodies. This technique guarantees the minority's presence at different levels of decision making (12, p. 101). This mechanism does protect a communal group against some aspects of the majority's intolerance. But it also perpetuates separate status even when proportionality is adopted as a temporary measure of conflict regulation.

Depoliticization and De-emphasis of Communal Conflict. Depoliticization and de-emphasis are key managerial policies which prevent communal groups from participating in politics. Depoliticization can be effective in maintaining communal conflict at a low level of intensity. Sometimes, governments try to create apathy or quiescence through manipulation of symbols. For example, the passage of legislation gives symbolic reassurance that something has been done and reduces political activity as larger diffuse communal groups lapse into political quiescence (30, pp. 26-27).

Mutual Veto. Mutual veto is a technique which assumes that governmental decisions cannot be taken unless they are acceptable to all major communal groups. The mutual veto
technique may be limited to those decisions which impinge upon communal values and interests (30, pp. 24-25).

**Concession.**—One of the techniques which Nordlinger discusses is concession. This is a technique that refers to the granting of concessions by one of the groups, as opposed to compromise. Concession is especially significant when it is made by a stronger group. Concession offered by conflict groups which are as powerful as their opponents is not usually effective in preventing communal conflict (30, p. 29).

**Consociationalism.**—Consociationalism is a form of pluralistic approach which is widely used in Western European countries. Based on consociationalism, strongly divided societies can be governed by a conscious effort on the part of political elites. In order to be successful in these efforts, they must regulate political life by forming some kind of elite coalition. Elites must therefore ignore the assumption of simple majority rule. They must rely on forms of proportional representation. Governmental power must be narrowly reduced so as to allow communal groups autonomy in arranging their own affairs. Mutual vetoes and concurrent majorities are important in matters that might affect values which are important to any or all of the subgroups in the society. To prevent stagnation, such
societies must develop procedures of purposive depoliticization. Therefore, carefully articulated compromise can be offered as the only possible solution which can find acceptance by all (24; 25; 26; 34).

**Millet System.**—The millet system, which was used under the Ottoman Empire, is another form of pluralistic approach. The word "millet", from the Arabic milla, occurs in the Quran with the meaning of religion. It was later extended to mean religious community, especially the community of Islam. In the Ottoman Empire it came to be applied to the organized and legally recognized religious communities, such as the Greek Christians, the Armenian Christians, and the Jews (23, p. 335).

According to the millet system, each communal group had the right to coexist with the others on equal terms, regardless of size. Each communal group had its system of cultural values and loyalties, often different from each other. Through the heads of the millets the central administration reached the individual members of a millet without tampering with their religious beliefs (4, pp. 227-231). The main characteristics of the millet system is well summarized by Luke:

The heads, both central and local, of the millet were chosen by the millet, but subject to the Sultan's approval.... The heads of the millet represented their flocks in their general and personal affairs vis à vis the Sublime Porte.... The millet were autonomous in spiritual and in
certain administrative and judicial matters. Their jurisdiction embraced, in the religious sphere, clerical discipline; in the administrative sphere, the control of their properties, including cemeteries, education and churches; in the judicial sphere, marriage, dowries, divorce and alimony, civil rights and, in some millets, testamentary dispositions. Sentences pronounced by the courts of the millets, if within their competence, were executed on their behalf by the State (27, pp. 97-8).

Each communal group was authorized to use its own language, to establish religious, cultural, and educational institutions, and to collect from its members the taxes levied by the imperial government. The judicial autonomy of the millets was substantial in disputes affecting members of the same community. The jurisdiction of religious courts was restricted to questions of personal status such as marriage, divorce, and inheritance. Thus, the autonomous administrations of the Christian and Jewish millets exercised civil and religious authority.

Nationalistic and Integrative Approaches

According to Chong-Do Hah and Jeffrey Martin, the literature on nationalism may be categorized into two kinds of theories. One set views nationalism as a process of successive integration of communal and social groups. These are called integration theories of nationalism. They may also be considered as preventive and non-violent approaches to the management of communal conflict. The other set views nationalism as a process of conflicting relations among
communal groups. These theories are called conflict theories of nationalism (16).

The literature on integration theories of nationalism has focused primarily on the nature and extent of the person's identification with national or communal entities (1; 2; 10; 18; 32). According to Hah and Martin, there are two theories that explain national integration. The first one looks at nationalism as a process of social communication with special attention given to communal group organization. The second theory explains nationalism as the consequence of an erosion of primordial loyalties, with a special emphasis on the society as the arena for nationalism (16, p. 366).

According to the social communication theory of nationalism, the transmission of communal characteristics is one of the main functions of mass communication. Through communication, society's inter- and intra-communal cohesion increases, the bases of common norms and experience widen, and the animosity between members of a communal group may decrease.

Karl Deutsch is possibly the most prominent figure who discusses the social communication theory of nationalism. Deutsch's theory is quite complicated and elaborate. Here only its relevant parts to the management of communal conflict is developed. He proposes that in order to explain the impact of communal differentiation on national
Integration and stability, we have to look at two important factors in a society. The first one is social mobilization. The second factor involves the concept of assimilation.

According to Deutsch,

nationalism essentially consists of wide complementarity of social communication. It consists in the ability to communicate more effectively, and over a wide range of subjects, with members of one large group than with outsiders (9, p. 71).

Based on the premises of Deutsch's theory, the level of social communication correlates with the concept of nationalism. In other words, the communal group with the highest level of social communication is the most nationalistic. This communication is not restricted to messages sent through the various channels of mass media. Rather it includes factors such as mobility, migration, student exchange, newspaper readership, and informal communication (9).

Deutsch's theory may explain the growth of nations in some western societies. But it has little to say about societies for whom the maintenance of communal identity is more important than national identity. Thus, communication plays a pervasive role not only in social mobility and nation building, but also in stimulating communal consciousness. Communication may have a reverse effect on the process of nationalism. It may bring not only awareness about differences of the members of one's own communal group, but it may also bring an awareness of other communal
groups' differences. Recently, a group of scholars argued that development in social communication, transportation, and technology tends to increase rather than decrease conflict between communal groups. A leading scholar among this group is Clifford Geertz. He argues that in most newly independent states of Asia and Africa there are "two powerful, thoroughly interdependent, yet distinct and often actually opposed motives" which encourage their people: 1) the search for identity and 2) the desire to build an efficient and modern state (15). These two forces may create contradictory political trends in the direction of unity and fragmentation among communal groups.

Lucian Pye attributes the inability to resolve communal conflict to the presence of primordial cleavages. He has pointed out:

The possibility of an insurrectionary movement arising and then employing organized violence depends upon the existence of sharp divisions within society created by regional, ethnic, linguistic, class, religious, and other communal differences that may provide the necessary social and demographic basis for supporting the movement ... (31, p. 136).

According to Myron Weiner, integration refers to the "process of bringing together culturally and socially discrete groups into a single territorial unit and the establishment of a national identity within that unit" (39, p. 53). Based on this definition, factors such as race, geography, religion, and common values and culture cannot explain the rise of nationalism. Rather, the process of
modernization, the differentiation and specialization of institutions, and an expansion in the level of social mobilization are the main explanatory factors.

Secondly, integration is occasionally used to refer to the problem of establishing national central authority over subordinate communal groups or their regions. Thirdly, the concept of integration may refer to the problem of linking the dominant group with the other subordinate communal groups. This gap may vary from society to society. Subordinate communal groups may themselves try to integrate and organize in order to influence the dominant communal group. The response of this group may be violent or non-violent depending on the perceived threat to its hegemony. In the case of a state not being able to integrate different communal groups, we may witness the disintegration of that society (39).

Fourth, the concept of integration may apply to the minimum value consensus necessary to maintain order among different communal groups. Values may include political goals such as justice and equality, the achievement of specific level of economic development and social welfare, and the sharing of common history, symbols, and culture. Or sometimes values are concerned with the means of achieving goals and resolving conflicts (39, pp. 153-165).

Therefore the policy of integration as an approach to management of communal conflict may include a vast range of
relationships between communal groups. It may refer to diverse communal loyalties coupled with the development of a sense of common nationality, i.e., unity without uniformity. It may imply the integration of communal groups into a common territorial framework with a government which can exercise authority. National integration may refer to the link between dominant and subordinate groups. It may refer to the common purpose of different communal groups. All of these different implications of integration have one common thread. They are all attempts to explain how to resolve communal conflict and thereby hold societies and political systems together. National integration promotes communal groups committing themselves ideologically to the creation of a overarching nationalism, national symbols, and national identity. It frequently requires the use of authoritarian controls to repress all political expressions of component group identity and to promote and reward the expression of the integrative identity in all the institutions of society.

Milton J. Esman elaborates on this point:

While official doctrine proclaims the equality of all citizens regardless of ethnic origin and their right freely to compete as individuals for all educational, economic, and political opportunities afforded by the society, the political elites carefully check their ethnic arithmetic to assure that their own membership is roughly representative of the component ethnic groups and that benefits in practice are distributed among members of ethnic groups with reasonable equity to prevent the surfacing of conflicts resulting from these issues during the transitional period when traditional solidarities retain their salience. The aim, however, is to substitute the new
national loyalty for the inherited parochial identities (13, pp. 58-59).

Thus there are a different ideas among these scholars as to the concept of conflict management and, in particular, the kinds of responses most likely to produce unity in a state holding different numbers of communal groups.

Assimilation.— In order to achieve national integration, the dominant communal group may attempt to assimilate the other communal groups. Assimilation is the process whereby groups with different communal characteristics come to have common characteristics. It applies to the merging of one communal group with another in which one of them loses its language, culture, and communal consciousness (11). George E. Simpson in The International Encyclopedia of The Social Sciences defines it as follows:

Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons or groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in common cultural life (37, p. 438).

Assimilation refers thus to the fusion of cultural heritages, and must be distinguished from amalgamation, which denotes the biological mixture of originally distinct racial strains. It must be distinguished, too, from naturalization, a political concept denoting the act or process of admitting an alien to the status and privileges of a citizen. Assimilation may also be distinguished from
acculturation which refers to cultural change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more cultural systems or the transference of individuals from their original societies and cultural settings to other sociocultural environments. Finally, assimilation may be distinguished from accommodation, a process of compromise characterized by toleration (37, p. 438). These terms are related but are not interchangeable.

Governments, by resorting to assimilation, affirm the theory of the modern state as the home of a single nation, speaking a common language and sharing a sense of common destiny. Members of minority communal groups are not condemned to permanent inferiority. They are encouraged to participate in the institutions of the dominant group and preferably be absorbed by intermarriage. Cultural assimilation in its more extreme form can result in the forging of uniform identities, practices, and values for all citizens in the country (11). In general, there are two public policy strategies for the achievement of national integration. One is the elimination of the distinctive cultural traits of communal groups in favor of a national culture, usually that of the dominant group. This is what Deutsch calls assimilation. The second strategy is the establishment of national loyalties without eliminating subordinate cultures of communal groups. In practice, dominant communal groups rarely follow either policy in an
unqualified manner. In other words they pursue policies on a spectrum somewhere in between.

Suppressive and Violent Means of Management of Communal Conflict

The intervention into and suppression of communal conflict constitutes an alternative to the prevention and resolution of such conflict. The resort to intervention and suppression suggests the failure or neglect of preventive tactics (19, p. 257). Interventive-suppressive and violent measures refer to those activities of a government which are directly or indirectly concerned with its armed forces or military. The essential function of such oppression is to maintain and perpetuate the domination of the dominant group. The interventive and suppressive actors and their supporters believe that the use of force is legitimate, justified, and in the public interest. On the other hand, the challenging communal actors disagree with this judgment (19).

In any nonlegitimate communal conflict situation, the authorities have access to a variety of suppressive tactics. These tactics usually start with suppressive measures and ends with coercive measures. It is worthwhile to think of violent means in terms of suppression and coercion. Such measures may be used alone or, more frequently, in conjunction with each other in order to be effective. This fact
provides the authorities some choice in the manner of suppressing the communal conflict. Many circumstances may influence the decisions made and the tactics chosen. Some of the common types of interventive and suppressive tactics together with some of the specific tactics in each type, will be discussed in the following section.

Interventive and suppressive tactics may be categorized under two basic approaches:

1) Interventive and Suppressive Approach
2) Coercive and Violent Approach

This classification serves to simplify the subject matter but its categories may overlap one or another.

**Interventive and Suppressive Approach**

The following behaviors characterize the suppressive measures: infiltration of organization by agents; co-optation of leaders and members; taking of ideas, programs, and plans; exposure of organizational secrets; neutralization and or takeover of organization; dependence; hostile propaganda; and discrimination (19, p. 265; 28, pp. 11-12).

Infiltration and co-optation refer to the penetration of a communal group by the dominant group and to the use of side payments to dominated communal group elites or potential elites for the achievement of this penetration. Dependence is another indicator of suppression, referring to
the reliance of a communal group on the dominant group for important economic and political resources. Propaganda is the intentional manipulation, by means of symbols such as words, gestures, flags, images, monuments, music, etc., of a people's beliefs, values, and behavior (38, p. 579).

Discrimination, segregation, or prejudice, which may be used interchangeably, mean the act, process, or state of being separate or set apart and the drawing of distinctions. It is a form of isolation which places limits or restrictions upon contact, communication, and social relations among communal groups. Systems of discrimination vary according to the criteria which distinguish the discriminated communal groups, whether religious, ethnic or linguistic. Patterns of discrimination vary in their incidence and nature with the type of society. Discrimination, furthermore, is essentially a pattern of accommodation, which assumes a wide variety of forms and is the product of many complex motives. Discrimination may touch upon every phase of life. Segmentation is a variation of discrimination which refers to the isolation of a communal group from the general population and dividing a communal group internally (21, pp. 439-451; 22; 40).

Coercive Approach

When a condition of hostilities exists between the central government and a communal group, the coercive
approach comes into play. The basic characteristics of this approach are threats and harassment, imprisoning, arrest and detention, police and court abuse, denial of the use of streets, parks, meeting halls and other facilities, blockage of access to the mass media, deportation of communal group leaders, forcible domination, torture, restriction of activities of a communal group, expulsion, and forced migration, isolation and subdivision of the crowd, removal of crowd leaders and unruly individuals, distraction of crowd attention and lowering of crowd excitement, and shows of strength (19, p. 265; 28, pp. 11-12). The objective of the use of the coercive measures may range from the total destruction of a communal group to more limited purposes.

Communal conflicts are often resolved when one communal group expels another from the territory in which it resides. Mass expulsion is a widely used form of coercive approach. It is often carried out in an atmosphere of massacres, riots, and other forms of violence. There have been, however, instances where the dominant communal group has shown consideration for those who were being expelled, permitting them to convert their properties into movable wealth and affording them protection from mob attack. Mass expulsion has often been applied when other methods of conflict management have failed. Physical violence is the final stage of coercive approach. Physical violence is associated with the following behavior: execution,
assassination, genocide or annihilation, disarming, attacks
with lethal weapons, attacks with nonlethal deterrents,
breaking and entering premises, destruction and or seizure
of property, and finally fighting (19, p. 265).

Among the several ways in which a conflict between
communal groups may be managed is for one group to
exterminate the other. Genocide or mass killing has been
used either to assure communal homogeneity or to punish
communal groups for an alleged collective guilt of collusion
with the enemy. Article II of the Genocide Convention of
December 9, 1948 defines genocide as any of the following
acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in
part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such:
1) Killing members of the group; 2) Causing serious bodily
or mental harm to members of the group; 3) Deliberately
inflicting on the group the conditions of life calculated to
bring about its physical destruction; 4) Sterilization or
transfer of children of the group to another group (3, p.
476). The Convention proclaims genocide, whether committed
in time of peace or war, a crime under international law
(12, p. 83).

It is evident that all these tactics are instruments of
intervention and suppression on the part of governmental
authorities. It cannot be assumed that conflict suppression
is always successful. Sometimes the use of force in
communal conflict does, in fact, terminate nonlegitimate
communal conflict. More often, though, it has a contrary effect. Violent means may promote counteraggression. This creates a need to use more and more violence, ending by engaging all the energies of the state in a violent struggle with rival communal groups. Finally, communal groups may resort to secession in order to resolve the conflict.

Secession and Partition

When the preventive, suppressive and coercive measures fail to manage a communal conflict, the failure of these measures may result in secession or partition. When a communal group finds it impossible to coexist with another communal group within the same framework, it may decide to dissolve the political bonds which have connected it with another. A formerly subnational communal group subsequently emerges as a new territorial nation-state. Secession can occur wherever a political boundary does not coincide with religious, linguistic, racial or ethnic boundaries. In the words of I. Duchacek,

"territorial self-determination is always secession because no group lives in a vacuum and, therefore, in order to exercise its right to independence, it always has to secede from some territorial framework, be it a province, a nation-state, a federation, or a colonial empire (12, p. 69)."

Communal groups who do not have "countries" tend to feel an infringement of basic human rights in a world of nation-states. For example, a communal group may be submerged in other people's countries (Turks of Iran), a
communal group may be divided among two or more countries (Kurds and Armenians), and a communal group may be denied the control of the governments of their own countries (Palestinians). Therefore, these groups may tend to revolt against these denials. But territorial and political independence often cannot be achieved without armed conflict between the deprived groups and other groups. Even after prolonged periods of apparent assimilation among other groups, many communal groups continue to think of themselves as separate and distinct (Kurds in Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, Muslim and Christians in Lebanon). This feeling of distinctness becomes a separatist movement when a formal demand is made for territorial secession to form a state (36, pp. 305-310).

Actually most of the communal groups are by now identified with the territory of a particular nation-state. But in many cases the historic demarcation of borders ignored 'natural' lines of division between different communal groups. Political lines often do not match communal identities. This may result in irredentism or partition. Irredentism is the struggle of a communal group for reunification, and the irredenta is a territory regarded as lost or stolen in which a portion of the communal group resides (36, pp. 310-315).

Many communal groups blame their problems on past imperialism. Borders violate communal identities primarily
because they reflect the points at which advancing armies of colonial powers stopped, or where "deals" between Big Powers dictated. They seldom reflect "natural" lines of communal identities. In some cases, precolonial societies of the Middle East simply did not have officially drawn boundaries. When colonial powers came, they drew lines that seemed administratively, economically or politically convenient, but which often ignored communal identities. Communal groups were often divided. Part of this was not chance but was calculated on the basis of divide and rule. Therefore, unresolved irredentist and separatist issues are threats to the territorial integrity of many countries. For example, Israel is regarded by Arab nationalists as a land stolen from the Arab nation; Kuwait has been claimed by Iraq; Cyprus is regarded as part of Greece by Greek Cypriots (36, op. 305-315).

The means by which success has been achieved in secessionist movements have been just as different as were the varieties of these movements. In most cases it took violent and military action to achieve secession. The best examples of such cases in the Middle East are Israel and Cyprus.

The issue of secession is viewed differently by communal groups and the government. The communal groups view the right of national self-determination as an absolute right. The government subordinates it to other values such
as unity, internal order, territorial integrity, the
text of the government finds secession a justifiable demand, it
will try to resist it because it fears a chain reaction (a
312-315).

Secession is a frequent and extreme solution of
communal conflict. However, dissatisfaction is one thing,
and secession is another. In most cases, the communal
group’s emotions may call for secession, whereas its
economic pragmatism prevents such a separation. Another
reason why a dissatisfied communal group may not persist in
secession is the efficiency of the central coercive power.
In other words, what could be considered desirable may not
be feasible because of risks involved.

The Idea of National Self-determination

Secession and partition are justified based on a
nationalism which is different from the nationalism of a
dominant communal group. Secession is an aspect of
nationalism closely related to self-determination and is a
source of international tension and conflict. Conflict
theories of nationalism are used to rationalize secession
when demands for separate existence have not been met.
The focus of nationalism is on the forces of diversity among communal groups favoring movements of self-determination, cultural autonomy, political separation, and language maintenance. The roots of these ideologies date back to the idea of the creation of the nation-state. The inclusion of the principle of self-determination for communal and ethnic groups in the peace treaties of World War I reflected and inspired strife for cultural autonomy and the nationalist movements of many communal groups around the world.

Walker Connor pinpoints the concept of "national self-determination" as the underlying cause behind much of the unrest that troubles today's multi-communal states. He traces the evolution of the idea from Locke and Rousseau, through Marx, to Woodrow Wilson. Connor notes that the hypocrisy of statesmen advocating self-determination for colonial territories while denying the same option to communal groups within their own countries (6, pp. 1-12).

Connor claims that self-determination as a device of management of communal conflict has been unsuccessful because less than ten percent of all states are essentially homogeneous. On the other hand, "a much more salient factor accounting for the poor record of self-determination to date is that those in authority are hardly apt to be sympathetic to the separatist aspiration of national groups" (5, p. 11). In fact, those communal groups desiring separation are
considered treasonable by the central authority. As Connor has noted:

The presumption that state is a given and must not to be compromised therefore causes governments to resist, if need be with force, an attempt to dismember the state in the name of self-determination (5, p. 14).

Connor maintains that the level of success of a communal group in this regard depends on factors such as 1) the form of government, 2) the percentage of the state's total population represented by the communal group, 3) the group's relative representation in key governmental positions, 4) the group's strategic significance, 5) the relative balance of political forces within a state, and 6) the degree to which the government is a willing or unwilling agent of the aspiration (5, pp. 14-15).

The problem of how an ethnic group is recognized, and how its boundaries are defined with sufficient exactness as to permit the political and legal implementation of the doctrine of self-determination, still remains unsolved. Several criteria are suggested, of which the following have been the most commonly used, either singularly or in combination: 1) a territory occupied by an ethnic unit which at one time was politically united; 2) the manifest will of a population regarded as belonging to a particular ethnic group; 3) a distinctive language; and 4) a common racial origin. When applied to concrete situations, none of these criteria proved to be unequivocal. Furthermore, conclusions
differed widely and often contradicted each other (14, pp. 78-79).

The suppressive and coercive measures are an alternative to preventive measures of managing communal conflict, and the resort to them is an indication of the failure of preventive measures. The purpose of application of suppressive and coercive measures is to perpetuate the domination of one group over another. If the use of such measures resolves the communal conflict, the territorial integrity of a state will be maintained. If the use of such measures fails to resolve the communal conflict, the result may be secession, partition and disintegration of a state. However, in any communal conflict, the dominant communal group has access to a variety of suppressive and coercive measures. Many internal and foreign policy considerations may influence the application of such measures. Since the conditions and considerations differ from one society to another, each has to be studied separately. Therefore, in the following chapters the case of the Kurds will be studied.
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CHAPTER III

MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNAL CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

The part of the Middle East covered in this study was united in one political framework only once, during the Persian Empire, between the sixth and fourth centuries BC. Then during the Islamic Empire of the seventh and eighth centuries, the region, excluding Anatolia, was united once more. Finally the Ottoman Empire ruled most parts of the Middle East from the early sixteenth century to 1918, but never Iran (32). Due to importance of the management of communal conflict by the Ottoman Empire during its approximately four hundred year rule (1516-1918), we will briefly discuss the Empire's policies towards the communal groups, emphasizing the Kurds.

Management of Communal Conflict By the Ottoman Empire

Throughout their history the Kurds have been subject to the different Empires that have dominated Kurdistan. They were ruled by the Seleucids, the Parthians, the Sassanians, the Armenians, the Romans, the Byzantines, the Arabs, the
Seljuks, the Mongols and finally the Ottoman Empire. The Kurds had been a buffer communal group between opposing empires in the Middle East. In the seventh century they were overcome by the Arabs, and accepted Islam.

By the sixteenth century, the greater part of Kurdistan existed under Ottoman rule. During the rivalry and conflict between the Persian and Ottoman Empires, the Kurds were involved directly in their battles. Each Empire tried to gain the loyalty of the Kurdish chiefs in order to use them and their followers as border guards against the other (16, p. 22). The early period of Kurdish life was distinguished by tribal warfare and struggle.

When the boundaries were eventually drawn between the two Empires during the seventeenth century (a treaty of 1639), the majority (three-fourth) of the Kurds remained under the Ottoman rule including the territories now known as Iraq and Syria (5, p. 6; 29). One of the reasons for this arrangement was that the Kurds, like the Ottoman rulers were Sunni Muslims, while the Shah of Iran was a Shii (Shiite). This factor played an important role in bringing the Kurds over to the Ottoman side. As a result, Hakim Idris, who was the ruler of Bitlis, set up a semi-autonomous Kurdish state which eventually protected the Ottoman frontier all the way from Georgia to the Southern Zagros (16, p. 23). It should be noted, however, that the Kurds did not act as a single political unit. It was common
practiced for each tribe to pledge its allegiance to the side offering the best terms. As a result, there was no definite sense of Kurdish unity.

The whole Kurdish area was ruled under three types of administration. First, there were cities and semi-urban centers which the Ottoman and Persian empires ruled directly through appointed Kurdish officials. Secondly, outside the towns, Kurdistan was divided into large territories and districts which the two empires ruled indirectly through princes and tribal chiefs. The third type was the nomadic tribes which the two empires had little control over.

Viewed in historical perspective, there was no conflict or contradiction between one's position in a communal group and one's allegiance to the state, in the early stage of the Ottoman Empire. The reason for this compatibility was that the notion of the state as the symbol of one's cultural, linguistic, and religious identity had not yet emerged.

The Ottoman Empire was a universal empire holding together in a single framework many communal groups in the different regions. Communal groups such as the Kurds, Greeks, Turks, Arabs, Serbs, Bulgars, Rumanians, Armenians, Maronites, other Christians, Coptics, Jews and so on, which were scattered all over the Middle East, northern Africa and southern Europe, were ruled by the Ottomans (19; 22; 30). There is no scientific knowledge about the communal groups under the Ottoman Empire. Figures usually are derived from
estimates by Europeans. The following table illustrates the
division of the Empire's peoples into communal groups for
the mid-nineteenth century (22).

### TABLE II

**COMMUNAL GROUPS WITHIN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE**

(the mid 19th century)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communal Groups</th>
<th>Sub-Groups</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish group</td>
<td>Ottoman Turks</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14,020,000)</td>
<td>Turkomans</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greco-Latin group</td>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,520,000)</td>
<td>Kutzo-Vlachs</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic group</td>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,550,000)</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatians</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cossacks</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lipovans</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian group</td>
<td>Circassians</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,020,000)</td>
<td>Lazars</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian group</td>
<td>Gypsels</td>
<td>212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(212,000)</td>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian group</td>
<td>Kurds</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,620,000)</td>
<td>Druze, Yazidis</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semites</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,511,000)</td>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syrian-Chaldaenas</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maronites</td>
<td>293,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Haddad, William W. and Ochsenwald, William, eds.,
Nationalism in a Non-national State: the Dissolution of
the Ottoman Empire, p. 29.

As Table II indicates, the Ottoman Empire was composed
of a large number of communal groups. These groups
tolerated each other, but did not intermingle. Each one of them looked at the rest with suspicion and even hatred.

Under the millet system different communal groups possessed considerable degrees of autonomy. This autonomy was given religious sanction by the Islamic doctrine of the "people of the book". Each of these communal and religious groups was called a "millet" which means "minority". The millet system allowed the communal groups such as the Christians and Jews to maintain their communal life and social position. The millet system enabled the Ottoman Empire to hold different communal groups in a single political framework, and to avoid interference in their religious and cultural affairs. The leaders of the groups provided useful channels for implementing government decisions. Each millet had the right to deal with religious matters concerning the church and priesthood, with matters relating to the individual and the family such as marriage, divorce, engagement, and inheritance. Membership of each group was defined by acceptance of its doctrinal basis, regardless of origin or language. Based on the millet system, each communal group was officially recognized.

There were also several linguistic groups which enjoyed a degree of self-government and lived together in a series of groups or sub-groups (12; 17, p. 335).

Despite the tolerance of the millet system, the Ottoman Empire was a Muslim state. The Ottoman rulers used the
title of "Sultan" or "Caliph". His authority was exercised within the limits of the religious laws, and was used for the extentions of Islam. In other words, his power was used to protect Islam against attacks from outside, to maintain orthodox belief and law, to organize and protect the pilgrimage and the other ritual acts. The decrees and laws issued by the Sultan were the major source of legislation in the Ottoman state. These laws responded to the objective needs of the administration. The Sultan could issue the decrees and laws on the basis of the hukum, i.e., the privilege of taking necessary measures to discharge the administrative duties. This was an essential understanding of authority and of the Sultan's role in the Ottoman Empire (2, pp. 227-231).

The power of the Sultan was exercised through two parallel organizations. On the one hand, there was a religious organization for interpretation and application of the religion. This organization decided the compatibility of the Sultan and his officials' behavior with the Sharria or Muslim religious laws. On the other hand, there were the military organization, which kept order and defended the boundaries of the Empire. The military was composed of professionals, which were called the Janissaries (20).

Finally, there were local ruling groups controlling the machinery of local government. These ruling groups were loyal to the Sultan but possessed a force, a stability, and
to some degree an autonomy. It was only through the
mediation of these groups that the Ottoman Empire kept
control of its subjects. The functions of the local rulers
were to control the Janissaries, keep the nomads back,
supervise the mountain-chiefs, give firm administration—
but also keep their provinces within the Empire. They
collected and paid the land tax, and furthered the greater
interest of the Sultan in the Persian, Arabian, and Egyptian
frontiers (13).

Known as the millet system, the Ottoman approach
towards communal groups was not, in principle, new. It was
a logical extension of the Islamic dhimmi concept and had
roots going back to Roman times, when subject people were
allowed to retain their own laws provided they paid taxes
and fulfilled other obligations (7, pp. 212-213).

The millet system evolved on the basis of two
principles. First, as Sir Harry Luke puts it, "the millet
system was the result of the extension of the idea of
extraterritorial to religious-communal groups". Secondly, the
attitude of Islam towards non-Muslim groups influenced the
millet pattern of conflict management. According to Islam,
there are three categories of communal groups. The first
groups comprise Muslims which is called umma. Muslims live
in Dar-al-Islam or in the area where the law of Islam
prevails. The basis of such a community is ideological and
religious. The primary purpose of government is to defend
and protect the faith, not the state. For the first group, Islam controls all aspects of their life (2, pp. 227-228).

The second group includes "people of the book" (ahl-al-kitab) or "protected people" (ahl-al-dhimmi). According to the Quran, these people comprise Jews, Christians, Sabeans, and Zoroastrians. Concerning the status of dhimmis in Islamic society, the Muslim ruler guarantees their lives, liberties, and to some extent, their property, and allows them to practice their religion. The dhimmis, in return, agree to pay the special poll-tax, the land tax, and to obey certain limitations (2, pp. 228-230; 27).

The third group comprises the population of Dar-al-harb, who are polytheists or pagans. There can be no compromise with this group. The logic behind this attitude is the idea of holy war or djihad. According to Islam, the polytheists should disappear from the Islamic scene either by extermination or conversion (2, pp. 233-231).

In relations with the first two groups, the Ottoman rulers followed the basic idea of ruling as previously practiced in Islamic history. That is to say, the ruler regulated the different orders of each society in the light of principles of justice, enabling each to act in accordance with its own nature, live in harmony with others, and contribute its share to the general welfare. This philosophy enabled the Ottomans to preserve the customs and laws
of different communal groups. Until 1826 the Ottoman authorities made little effort to establish effective control over the Kurdish areas. The Kurds under Persian rule were equally independent of the central government.

The Collapse of the Millet System and the Emergence of Nationalism

By contrast to the modern nation-state, the millet system did not include the economic welfare of its people as a responsibility. Hence the religious basis of the Ottoman Empire did not imply any notion of participation in the decision-making processes of the Empire. The corruption of the Ottoman administrative taxation system, which in the Empire's later years accounted for many of the difficulties encountered by the sultans, affected all communal groups.

The collapse of the millet system began along two lines: first, by fragmentation inside the system of government, which resulted in the central government's loss of control over the communal groups; secondly, by the forces of society coming out of the framework imposed by the government.

Since the seventeenth century, a process of disintegration could be noticed in the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan's power weakened, and different communal groups challenged the authority of the central government. In the provinces, there was a growing decentralization. Some
provincial rulers such as those in Tripoli, Tunisia, and Algeria became independent. Other local governments such as Cairo and Baghdad were in the hands of groups of Mamalukes, self-perpetuating military elites. In the mountains, the feudal lords of Lebanon extended their control over the Biqa plain lying between them and Damascus. The lords of Kurdistan moved down towards the Euphrates. In central Arabia, the Wahhabis occupied the holy cities and rejected Ottoman sovereignty (9; 13).

Changes in the Ottoman Empire were spectacular. The political supremacy of Muslims over other communal groups, especially Christians, the existence of an Islamic orthodoxy with the Sultan as its defender, and the primacy of religious over ethnic or other loyalties, all were changed. Inside the Muslim community, the conception of the Sultan as the defender of Islamic orthodoxy was changing. The Sultan was not only the Caliph, and guardian of the holy places and the organizer of the Pilgrimage, he was also the custodian of doctrinal orthodoxy. The struggle between the Sultan and the Shah in Iran changed such conceptions. Also, the Sultan was not able to secure the roads to the holy places anymore.

Despite all these problems, the Ottoman state still maintained its economic system because of its monopoly of trade on the Black Sea. Indeed, while the Mediterranean trade was dominated by the West, the Ottomans kept control over the Black Sea trade until 1774, following the peace
treaty of Kucuk Kaynarca with Russia. The loss of the Black Sea had disastrous economic and political consequences. According to the articles of the treaty, Russia had the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Empire as the protector of the Ottoman Christians. Article VII stated that:

The Sublime Porte promises a lasting protection of the Christian religion and of the Churches of that religion. She permits the Minister of the Imperial Court of Russia to represent on every occasion the cause of the Church constructed at Constantinople... as well as the cause of those who serve the Church and she promises to give her attention to these observations as coming from a respected person and belonging to a neighboring and sincerely friendly Power (11, p. 917).

The role of Russia as a protector of the Christians had an important implication. It helped Russia to claim the leadership of the Balkan Christians (14, p. 52).

Another important change was the growing trade with Europe. To protect trade and merchants consuls were appointed by the European Powers. But they came to serve another purpose. Consulates were appointed for the Christian and Jewish population of the commercial cities. Similarity of religion enabled the European Powers to put forward claims to protect those of the same religion as themselves, and the "capitulations" gave some ground to these claims. As Hourani points out:

The French Capitulations gave them the right to protect Latin priests and chapels, and Europeans of Latin Catholic faith, and from the middle of the seventeenth century they began to extend this
right to Eastern Catholics, and to a lesser extent to Eastern Christians as a whole (10, p. 67).

However, not only were France and Russia successful in carrying out the system of the Capitulations, but other European countries as well. For example, the British government established a close relationship with the Orthodox in the seventeenth century. Then in the eighteenth century, they obtained protection over them and Catholics. The Austrian government and the Italians maintained an interest in the Roman Catholics and Uniates. The influence of the European Powers increased in religious, economic, and political areas (9).

By 1800, the Empire was not able to deal with the communal groups easily anymore. Therefore, the pressure from the European powers and the troublesome communal groups resulted in some preventive and non-violent reforms in the Ottoman Empire. Between the 1820's and 1870's, there was a period of reform and change, known as the Tanzimat. The main goal of the reforms was to create a new framework of centralized administration and laws in order to be able to deal with the communal groups. These preventive reforms were a successful means of managing communal conflicts for the time being. For example, if we compare the Empire of 1870 with what it had been in 1820, there is no doubt that the methods of administration and justice had changed. The communal groups other than the Muslims were freer.
Provinces as far as the Hijaz and Tripoli of Africa were once more controlled from Istanbul (15).

However, in these reforms we can notice several important points. The Tanzimat promised equality between different communal groups in an effort to establish Ottomanism, Osmanlik, as a common tie to all subjects (13, p. 85). As Karpat points out:

The idea of Ottomanism, that is recognition of equal status to all subjects in the form of modern citizenship, was one of the major principles through which the Ottoman statesmen of the Tanzimat era wanted to achieve integration. Ottoman citizenship was a new legal category of secular identity, and created a new status for the citizen. The membership in the millet was superseded, in fact depriving it of its formerly legal aspect and reducing it to a mere religious affiliation. In other words, the state intended to assume the legal, cultural, and educational responsibilities of the millet and leave it as a religious organization (13, p. 38).

The intention of the Ottoman rulers was to manage communal conflict by proclaiming the equality of all Ottoman subjects regardless of creed. Restrictions on the dress of non-Muslims were removed, the foundations of secular legal and judicial systems that would apply to all subjects were laid, non-Muslims became regular members of governmental advisory councils, and a few secular schools accepting Muslims and non-Muslims on an equal basis were opened. Differences of religious belief and practice were respected. The reform program also promise the reorganization of the millet system, the land code, and the establishment of a modern army and school.
The drive for reform came along with the adoption of a written constitution setting up a chamber of deputies, to include representatives of all peoples of the Empire. Article 8 of the Ottoman constitution stipulated that all subjects of whatever religion or sect were to be called Osmanlis, without exception. The constitution then went on to elaborate the rights of all Osmanlis. The constitution and the Parliament of 1876-78 tried to represent proportionally different communal groups by choosing 130 deputies as Ottomans. Of the 119 deputies elected to the session, four were Jews, forty-four were Christian, and seventy-one were Muslims. One deputy represented roughly 18,750 male Jews, one represented 107,557 male Christians, and one deputy represented 133,376 Muslims. In the second session the Muslims remained underrepresented (26). Furthermore, the representation process also took linguistic groups into consideration. There were sixteen Arabs, four Albanians, thirty-seven Turks, and one Kurd among the Muslims. The Greeks, Jews, Armenians, Arab Christians, and Bulgarians among the non-Muslims were given representation roughly in proportion to their total number (26). By the end of the nineteenth century, all the vestiges of the millet system were wiped out and the principle of provincial representation was enforced.

The effects of the reforms were different from what had been expected in some respects. First, the reform broke the
rigid localism still persisting among various communal groups, and it facilitated communication between various social classes belonging to the same communal group. Second, the reform provided a mechanism by which the lay members of the communal group participated in decision-making. Third, the reforms of the millets, by limiting the power of the clergy, destroyed an important channel of influence through which the Ottomans had maintained their power over the non-Muslim communal groups. Fourth, the new millets were reorganized mostly along linguistic and religious affiliations. In fact, it is basically after this period that we can see the frequent use of the terms Ekalliyet (minority) for Christians, and millet-i-Muslime for Muslims. From now on, one was faced not with religious communities but with nationalities. Thus, the idea of nationalism emerged and developed. Individuals began to look at their government in terms of their new religious and national identity. The sense of religious differences acquired a political meaning (9; 10; 13). Therefore, the Ottoman Empire started to face communal conflicts. For example, in an effort to ensure the complete control over its communal groups, the Empire decided to subjugate the Kurdish local units. These reforms, which in Kurdistan meant the end of the quasi-independent principalities, were not carried out peacefully. The reaction to the Sultan's decision was a series of revolts led by the tribal leaders
(1826, 1834, 1853-55, 1880, ...). Over all more than fifty conflicts have been recorded which were managed by violent and suppressive measures. The Sultan's practice of replacing Kurdish governors by Turks was another reason for the Kurdish revolts of that time (12, P. 4).

One must add here the significance of the revolutions of 1848 in Europe in spreading nationalistic ideas, and the role of the European powers within the communal conflicts in the Ottoman Empire. The European idea of nationalism started to spread through schools, books, and travel, and through the examples of successful nationalistic movements. The pressure of European powers was one of the factors that weakened the central government. Hourani states that:

Thus in the 1770's, after defeat by Russia, the idea that the Empire was doomed, and Dar al-Islam would be swallowed up by the Muscovites, spread throughout the Europe. This sense of decay weakened the sense of loyalty (10, p. 55).

In some of the regions direct European control was established, such as the rule of France in Algeria in 1830 and in Tunisia in 1881, the rule of Britain in Egypt in 1882, and of Italy in Libya in 1912. Even in those parts which remained under the Ottomans until the end, European influence was pervading. Oriental Christians and Jewish merchants mostly had foreign protection, and whole communal groups had links with one or more European powers, for example, the Catholics with France and the Orthodox with Russia. In addition, spheres of influence had been
established by 1914, such as the French in Syria and the British in southern Iraq.

The revolution in communications and transportation during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries disrupted the older patterns. These developments stimulated and awakened communal consciousness. Nations emerged from various communal groups. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the growth of nationalism increased in the Asiatic parts of the Ottoman Empire. From the beginning, this nationalism was closely related to linguistic groups. It had a liberal flavor. Common demands of the nationalistic movements were for constitutional governments, individual liberties, and the equality of all communal groups and nations in the Ottoman Empire. For example, at the end of 19th century, a Kurdish national committee was formed in Istanbul, with a program of autonomy and independence for the Kurdish provinces (31, pp. 30-32).

The emergence of nationalistic movements that resulted in the formation of nation-states in the Ottoman Empire were not uniform and differed from one place to another. Nationalism has been a creative and unifying factor in some cases. In others it has been an immensely disintegrative factor. The Ottoman Empire in modern times has found nationalism in its twin aspects to be favorable at times and inimical to communal groups.
The involvement of the European Powers in the political, social and economic life of the Empire, the spread of nationalistic ideas, and revolt of the communal groups were all factors which resulted in the collapse of the Empire. The evidence of such a collapse can be seen in the violent insurrection of the Kurds during the nineteenth century.

Let us examine some of these conflicts, and the policies of the Ottoman Empire towards them.

Throughout the nineteenth century, there were frequent conflicts between Ottoman authorities and the Kurds. The objective of these revolts was the creation of an independent Kurdistan. These conflicts were basically led by big land-owners whose main concern was to preserve and extend their own privileges. Most of these conflicts were handled violently by the Ottoman troops because Kurds lacked political experience, a unified program or military strategy.

One of the important Kurdish conflicts of the nineteenth century broke out in 1806. The Ottoman troops overcame this conflict and tried to reinforce their presence in Kurdistan. Excessive taxation, pillage and the military occupation itself provoked uprisings and conflicts in several provinces of Kurdistan in 1815. When Abdurranman Pasha declared himself the independent ruler of the Southern Kurdistan, the Turkish army defeated him in 1826 and Sultan
Mahmud II extended the Ottoman civil administration in Kurdistan (16, p. 23). Another wave of conflicts began in 1828-29 and was suppressed by the Ottoman army. However, these movements and conflicts lacked precise goals and were managed by violent means quickly (4).

In 1833, rebel Kurdish troops brought the whole of southern Kurdistan under its control. The Kurdo-Ottoman war continued throughout the summer of 1834. The battles were long and bloody as the Ottoman soldiers had to fight for thirty or forty days to take control of every small part (3, pp. 22-27).

Again the Kurdo-Ottoman war broke out towards the end of July 1836, and once again, the Ottoman troops defeated the Kurdish uprising. After 1843 certain Kurdish tribes, mostly led by Badir Khan, revolted against the Ottoman rule. These tribes planned to establish a Kurdish state, and they fought the Ottoman army for four years. Finally, Badir Khan surrendered to Osman Pasha in 1847 and was sent into exile (16, p. 23).

The first sign of Kurdish nationalism occurred in 1880, when a Kurdish Sheikh named Ubeidullah managed to rally a number of tribes under his banner. He moved his fighters toward the town of Urmiyh in Iran. As the Persian troops approached the Kurds, Sheikh Ubeidullah's fighters could not resist, and he was forced to withdraw quickly into Turkey again. Ubeidullah was exiled to Mecca where he died.
Finally, one of the important Kurdish revolts of the nineteenth century involved both the Ottoman Kurds and those of Iran. During these years, the Persian government demanded payment of taxes from the Kurds, but they refused. Faced with their refusal, the Persian authorities sent in the army. At the beginning the Kurdish troops made significant progress, but, lacking discipline and carried away by their easy victories, they became ineffective, and the Persian army was able to restore its control over the Kurdish region (4, pp. 6-8).

Along with the policies of suppression and coercion, the Ottoman rulers sought to assimilate the Kurds as much as they could. They hoped that by allowing Kurds to participate in the decision making process, they would be integrated into the system. The Ottomans used a Pan-Islamist appeal and opened the gates of the imperial palace for the exiled Kurdish leaders. The policies of integration and assimilation enabled the Empire to employ the Kurds as a good support force for an eventual conflict with the Russians or European Powers. In addition, Kurdish forces were means of repression of national movements of other communal groups which were struggling against Ottoman rule, such as the Armenians, the Arabs, the Albanians and even the Kurds themselves. For example, in 1871, the Ottoman army established Kurdish units, which were used
primarily to control Kurdish regions in the Ottoman Empire (1, p. 71).

The Kurds of the nineteenth century had no political organization or clearly defined political program. Kurdish modern intelligentsia began to emerge only towards the end of the nineteenth century. Until the Young Turks' revolution, the pioneers of the Kurdish national movement were scattered in different groups (23, p. 280).

The Kurdish leaders supported the Young Turks' regime in the hopes that the demands of the Kurdish communal group would be met. The Young Turks introduced some constitutional reforms in the Ottoman Empire. There were Kurdish representatives in the newly organized Ottoman parliament. Taking advantage of the relatively liberal climate during the Young Turk's uprising, Kurds founded several associations in Constantinople, Baghdad, and Mosul, published a Kurdish language journal and opened several Kurdish schools. One of the chief aims of the Young Turks was the preservation of the Empire's integrity, and later they gradually adopted a rigid policy of Ottomanization. They banned all non-Turkish schools, associations and publications. Subsequently, the leaders of Kurdish organizations were imprisoned or executed (23, p. 281). There was also a campaign directed against the Kurdish chieftans by forces loyal to the Sultan, who accused the Kurds and the Young Turks of ruining Islam and the Empire.
Even during the Young Turks' rule, there had been several revolts in Kurdistan. Between 1909 and 1918, there was cooperation between Kurdish militants and Armenian and Arab patriots in their common struggle against the Young Turks. In all cases, evidence indicates that the Ottoman army was sent to put down the revolt, and the conflict between the Kurds and the Turks continued.

Management of the Kurdish conflict During The First World War

The Ottoman Empire took part in the First World War on the side of Germany. Throughout the four years of the War, the Ottoman rulers attempted to encourage Kurds to take part in the war based on their religious duties and responsibilities (holy war). Some sections of the Kurdish population participated in the war while others did not. They suffered heavy casualties defending the Ottoman Empire. Even before the war, a Kurdish Sheikh with 1,500 troops controlled Damascus for the Sultan (1, p. 71; 16, pp. 25-26).

During World War I, the Czarist government tried to convince the Kurds that the war would provide an opportunity for Kurds to gain their national independence (24, p. 19; 25, p. 28). By the end of the First World War, Russian forces attacked Kurdistan from Iran, where they had been since 1919. The Kurds were massacred by the Russians. In the words of Derk Kinnane, "pestilence, famine, the
slaughter of flocks and the killing hardship of migration in severe winter were the price paid by the Kurdish tribesmen for the glory of fighting the Jihad for their Sultan" (16, p. 26).

The Ottoman's war with Russia was ended by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918. The Ottoman Empire came to its end militarily on October 31, 1918 when an armistice was signed with the British. During the war, the Entente powers debated the division of the territories that would emerge from the fall of the Ottoman Empire. Numerous demands for the Ottoman Kurdish territory were received and dealt with. The entire Middle East, and particularly Kurdish territories, were the center of discussion among the Allies. By 1918, British, French, Italian and Greek troops had occupied three-quarters of the Turkish territories. The period from October 1918 to 1921 was a total political vacuum. The Ottoman army disintegrated, and the government barely extended its authority beyond the limits of the capital.

In the spring of 1918, the Kurds, under the Sheik Sharif Pasha's leadership, set up a provisional government with its capital in Sulaimaniya. General Sherif Pasha represented the Kurdish people in the Paris Peace Conference in 1918. The British, however, were opposed to this development. In the end, the Peace Conference divided Kurdistan into three districts: Mosul, Kirkuk, and Sulaimaniya. The Kurds revolted against the imposed British
rule in Kurdistan in May 1919. Some of the Kurdish leaders were arrested and imprisoned by the British. All of Kurdistan was placed under British rule (21, p. 56).

Britain performed many studies in Kurdistan and was well aware that it was rich in oil. Therefore, it sought to secure the support of the local population. From early 1918, Britain initiated meetings and contacts with Kurdish leaders in order to discuss the creation of an autonomous or independent Kurdistan (28, pp. 192-193).

At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, France gave its approval to the formation of a Kurdish state, providing it did not include any of the Kurdish territories bordering Syria. These territories had been granted to France in the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 (among France, Britain and Russia) (25, p. 29). The Kurdish and Armenian delegations had already settled their difference in an agreement signed in Paris on December 20, 1919 by General Sherif Pasha for the Kurds and Boghos Pasha for the Armenians.

The participants in the Sevres Conference were Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Japan, Armenia, Hedjaz (today's Saudi Arabia), the United States (observer), and a Kurdish delegation acting as an observer in the discussion concerning Kurdistan and Armenia. The result was a lengthy treaty of 433 articles signed by the Allies and the Sultan at Sevres on August 10, 1920. This Treaty incorporated as
Part I the Covenant of the League of Nations. Article 22 stated that "certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized" (11, p. 2070).

Part III of the same Treaty, among other stipulations, provided for the recognition or creation, not only of the Arab states of Hijaz, Syria, and Iraq, but also of an Armenia and a Kurdistan. Articles 62-64 of the Agreement were related to Kurdistan and read as follows:

Article 62
A Commission, having its seat in Constantinople and made up of three members appointed by the Governments of Britain, France and Italy, will, during the six months following the implementation of the present treaty, prepare for local autonomy in those regions where the Kurdish elements is preponderant lying east of the Euphrates, to the south of a still-to-be established Armenian frontier and to the north of the frontier between Turkey, Syria and Mesopotamia, as established in Article 27 II (2 and 3).

Should agreement on any question not be unanimous, the members of the commission will refer it back to their respective Governments. The plan must provide complete guarantees as to the protection of the Assyro-Chaldeans and other ethnic or religious minorities in the area. To this end a commission made up of Britain, French, Italian, Persian and Kurdish representatives will visit the area so as to determine what adjustments, if any, should be made to the Turkish frontier wherever it coincides with the Persian frontier as laid down in this treaty.

Article 63
The Ottoman Government agrees as of now to accept and execute the decisions of the two commissions envisaged in Article 62 within three months of being notified of those decisions.

Article 64
If, after one year has elapsed since the
implementation of the present treaty, the Kurdish population of the areas designated in Article 62 calls on the Council of the League of Nations and demonstrates that a majority of the population in these areas wishes to become independent of Turkey, and if the Council then estimates that the population in question is capable of such independence and recommends that it be granted, then Turkey agrees, as of now, to comply with this recommendation and to renounce all rights and titles to the area. The details of this renunciation will be the subject of a special convention between Turkey and the main Allied powers.

If and when the said renunciation is made, no objection shall be raised by the main Allied powers should the Kurds living in that part of Kurdistan at present included in the Vilayet of Mosul seek to become citizens of the newly independent Kurdish state (11, pp. 2077-2078).

There were other provisions in the treaty which would have reduced Turkey to colonies of the major European powers. Therefore, the treaty was rejected by Kemal Ataturk. As far as the borders of the future hypothetical Kurdistan were concerned, many regions with Kurdish population were arbitrarily excluded. These regions, which accounted for about a third of the area of Ottoman Kurdistan, were directly or indirectly annexed to the French-controlled Syrian Mandate. The independent Kurdistan formed by the Treaty was a country from which two-thirds of its richest territory had been separated (6, p. 23). If the Treaty had been implemented, the Kurdish territories would have been divided into five parts which were shared by Turkey, France, Syria, Persia, and Armenia. Therefore, this arrangement would have left an independent Kurdistan fragmented.
Following the fall and dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, all of its subject communal groups were allowed to establish their own states. The only exception was the Kurdish group, largely because of the political incompetence and historical inexperience of its leaders. As a result, the Kurds of Ottoman Kurdistan were divided among three newly created political entities, that is, Turkey, Iraq, and Syria. The collapse of the Ottoman Empire made the situation of the Kurds complicated, who instead of living under only two governments were henceforth to find themselves divided between five different countries.

To conclude, the management of communal conflict under the Ottoman Empire can be divided into four stages. In the first stage, at the beginning of the Ottoman Empire, the policy of the Sultans towards each communal group was determined by the circumstances in which it had come under their control. In this stage, there was no intense communal conflict.

In the second stage, the conquest of Arab-speaking countries brought about a great change in the situation of the non-Muslim communal groups, called dhimmis. First, the population of the newly conquered countries were predominantly Muslim, so that, whereas the dhimmis hitherto had outnumbered the Muslims. Now the majority of the population of the Ottoman Empire were Muslims. Secondly, from the religious point of view, the consequence of this change was
the adherence of the Sultans to a strict Sunnism. Sunnism had already existed in the Empire, but because of political necessity, it was intensified. Thirdly, the numbers of each of the communal groups, or dhimmi, were increased because of the acquisition of more or less large numbers of co-sectaries resident in the conquered areas. Fourthly, various new types of communal groups were brought under the Empire’s rule. Finally in the second stage, the Islamic Ottoman government was able to manage communal conflicts and groups through the millet system without any major difficulty. The Kurds also benefited from the millet system.

In the third phase, which stretches roughly from 1760 to 1850, the Ottoman government's control over communal groups weakened. There were several Kurdish uprisings during this period. In this stage, the Peace of Carlowitz marks a turning point. It provided for the first large concession of territory in Europe to Christian powers. The whole Orthodox world (always excepting Russia) was no longer under Ottoman rule. The Peace of Carlowitz made the Ottoman Empire dependent in the future on changes in European politics. This dependency forced the Ottoman rulers to re-consider foreign policy and to turn for help to those communal groups that were the most familiar with European affairs.

In the fourth period, which began roughly in 1869, the inability of Ottoman officials to manage communal conflicts,
losing a series of wars with the European powers, and World War I resulted in the disintegration of the Empire into the different nation-states. When the First World War ended, the Ottoman Empire was partitioned based on the secret agreements of 1914–1919. The European powers, especially Great Britain and France, pressed their claims at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Jews set forth their claims to Palestine, and the Armenians, Kurds and Arabs to independent states. As a result, the Kurds were divided among Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Russia.
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CHAPTER IV

MANAGEMENT OF KURDISH CONFLICT IN TURKEY

From World War I Until World War II

Following the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire after World War I, Mustafa Kemal's Turkish Nationalist Party was in power within a year. Kemal appealed to the Kurds and Turks, calling for unity in the struggle to expel the invaders from Turkey. He then set up the Congress of Eastern Vilayets in Erzurum in 1919. Delegates from the five Kurdish provinces participated in this Congress. The Erzurum Congress was considered Turkey's major attempt to integrate the Kurds. The next step was the signing of the Amasya Protocol on October 2, 1919. The first article of this protocol accepted the principle of Kurdish autonomy and recognized the national and cultural rights of the Kurds.

The Kurds who fought during the War presumed that they were going to build a state in which Turks and Kurds would live as brothers and equals as Mustafa Kemal had promised. However, one of the first steps taken by Mustafa Kemal's regime was to declare that it would not recognize any agreement or treaty signed by the existing regime in occupied Turkey. The implication of this announcement for
the Kurdish people was that it meant the refusal of the creation of the independent Kurdistan promised the Sevres Agreement.

The Kurdish people found themselves devoid of any rights in the Turkish state. The Turkish officers suppressed any attempt at forming specifically Kurdish organizations or associations. As C. J. Edmonds put it,

> For the next five years the Kurds were subjected to campaign of intensive propaganda from Turkey: threat of invasion, clandestine correspondence with urban and tribal leaders, open incitements to rebellion, warnings to "traitors", and pervading all the religious appeal for loyalty to the Sultan-Caliph (until the Caliphate was abolished in March 1924) (7, p. 53).

As a result, there were continual Kurdish revolts, either for autonomy or equal treatment by the Turks, but their efforts remained futile (6, p. 11-13).

When Turkey rejected the Sevres Treaty, it demanded that the Allies sign a new peace treaty. As a result, on July of 1923, the Treaty of Lausanne was signed by the Allies (Britain, Italy, Greece, France, Japan, Rumania, the Serbo-Croat-Slovene state) and Turkey. According to this treaty, most of the Kurdish territories were assigned to the Turkish government. The treaty made no mention whatsoever of the Kurds and granted them no national rights. It contained a few stipulations concerning the protection of minorities. Section III of the Treaty (Article 37-45) stipulated that
There will be no official restriction on any Turkish citizen's right to use any language he wishes, whether in private, in commercial dealings, in matters of religion, in print or at a public gathering.

Regardless of the existence of an official language, appropriate facilities will be provided for any non-Turkish speaking citizen of Turkey to use his own language before the courts.

... Turkey commits itself to recognize the stipulations contained in Articles 38-44 as fundamental laws and to ensure that no law, no regulation and no official action will stand in contradiction or opposition to these stipulations, and that no law, regulation or official action shall prevail against them (9, pp. 2316-2319).

Articles 40-45 indicated that the minorities in question were "non-Muslim minorities" such as Armenians, Greeks, etc.. Therefore, the treaty, left open a possible implication that Kurds were considered equal with the Turks. A few years later, when the Turkish government used suppressive and coercive measures to manage the Kurdish conflict, not only were the Kurdish people no longer accepted as equal, but their very existence was not recognized by the Turkish government.

According to the Treaty of Sevres, the Mosul Vilayet (province), the oil-rich region between Turkey and Iraq, was supposed to become a Kurdish political entity. Turkey's claim over the Mosul Vilayet resulted in a dispute between Turkey and Iraq, which was a mandate of Britain. The dispute was referred to the League of Nations. A three-man Commission was assigned to examine the problem in December 1925. The Commission recommended that the Vilayet should be awarded to Iraq on the condition that Kurdish officials be
appointed for the administration of the Vilayet and that the Kurdish language should be the official language of the area. This recommendation was rejected by the Turkish government. Thus, another period of conflict between the Kurds and Turkey started. But by a tripartite treaty, which was signed by Turkey, Iraq, and the United Kingdom in June 5, 1926, the Turkish authorities accepted the recommendations of the Commission in return for a share in Iraq's oil revenue (7, p. 11; 23, p. 70).

In 1924, Turkey became a republic and the Caliphate was abolished in 1925. The new regime in Turkey, led by Mustafa Kemal, was convinced that in order to create a Turkish nation it was necessary to assimilate the Kurds. There followed a series of Kurdish uprisings in Turkey in the 1920's and 1930's. All of them managed by considerable violence and coercion. On March 3, 1924, a decree banned all Kurdish schools, associations and publications. All Kurdish mosques were closed, and Kurdish ceremonies and meetings were banned. As a result of these policies, many Kurds moved to Iran or Iraq. In 1925, there was a major conflict led by Sheikh Said Pirani in Diyarbekir and Siirt. From 1926 to 1927, the Kurdish population of Minis, Vorto, Solhan, Bingol and Gendj rebelled against the Turks. Various tribes met and proclaimed "the independence of Kurdistan" on October 23, 1927 as provided in the Treaty of Sevres. Fighting resumed between the Turks and the Kurds.
With the numerical superiority of the Turks as a determining factor, the Kurds were suppressed after eight months fighting (13, p. 12). The Kurdish leaders, including Pirani, were arrested and tried by martial courts in Diyarbakir (8, p. 25).

During the 1925 conflict, which was a result of the Kurds’ objection to the Republic’s anti-religious policies, 80,000 Turkish troops were sent into Kurdistan. With the approval of the French government, fresh troops arrived from Anatolia, moving through Northern Syria and encircling the Kurdish forces. The conflict was suppressed, and 46 Kurdish leaders were executed. Some 206 villages were destroyed, 8,758 houses were burnt, and 15,200 people were killed, while several thousands sought refuge in Iran or Iraq (4, pp. 389-392; 25, p. 27).

During this conflict, the executive branch of Turkey was given the power to ban officially any organization, movement, tendency or publication believed to endanger the country’s stability and social order. For the first time the secular Republic was fighting in the name of nationalism. Not only did the Turkish authorities sentence and execute Kurds for attempting to create an independent Kurdistan, but also the Kemalist regime introduced the Kurdish movement as a reactionary religious revolt attempting to re-establish the Caliphate and the Ottoman dynasty. In this way, suppressive measures were combined
with propaganda in order to destroy any hope that the Kurds might have had to achieve their objectives by insurrection in Turkey.

The Turkish government began to suspect that the only way to control Kurdistan was to deport and divided the population. During the winters from 1925 to 1928, almost a million people were deported from Kurdish parts of Turkey to West Anatolia. During the deportation, tens of thousands died because of a lack of food and supplies, and because of the long distances they were forced to travel during the middle of winter. Again, some of the Kurds fled to Iran or Iraq.

In other efforts to control the Kurds, Turkish officials denied the existence of a Kurdish communal group. The authorities implemented a policy of Turkification. Kurds are required to go to universal military training, like the Turks. The Kurdish language was not allowed to be used in Turkish public schools (25, p. 27).

In 1927, there were several outbreaks of violence in Kurdish cities against the Turkish government in the Ararat area, Sassoun, Kozlouk, and Permore. The Kurdish forces were led by Shiekh Ihsan Nuri, who organized a resistance movement in Turkey. The Turkish Army, with the support of the Air Force, engaged 45,000 men in the field and moved against the Kurds and defeated them (10, p. 31). The conflict lasted a year and it ended when the resources of the
Kurdish forces were exhausted. The Kurdish leader, Ihsan Nuri, took refuge in Iran. During this conflict, 165 villages were destroyed by the Turkish troops. Around 6,816 houses were burnt, and 8,643 people were killed. Most of who killed were young children, old people and women (8, p. 25).

In this attack, the Persian army cooperated with the Turkish army along their common borders (19, p. 28). On January 23, 1932, Turkey and Iran signed an agreement in which they exchanged certain Iranian and Turkish territories and established a degree of cooperation along their mutual borders. As a result, Turkish armed forces were permitted to use Iranian territory to attack the Kurdish rebels from the rear (19, p. 28).

On May 5, 1932, Turkey passed a law to organize an actual dispersion of the Kurds throughout Anatolia (3, p. 465). The assimilation of the Kurds by force resulted in 1935-3 revolts. Kurdistan itself was repopulated by Turkish immigrants. Toward the end of 1935, the mass deportations were stopped because of the Dersim revolt. Dersim, in north-western Kurdistan, during the 1930's, was the only remaining part of Kurdistan which had been constantly at war with the Turkish government since 1925. It was Sayyed Rida who led the revolts. In 1936, the government declared a state of war in Dersim, and began building military roads in that area. After having hanged Sayyed Rida and ten of his
aides on November 15, 1937, the Turks changed the name of Dersim to Tunceli. Some Kurdish leaders were assassinated. Throughout 1938, the Turkish troops used poison gas, artillery and air bombardment in Dersim. People were imprisoned in caves and barns and burned alive by Turkish soldiers. Forests were encircled by troops and set ablaze to exterminate those who had sought refuge there. Mass suicides occurred as many Kurdish women and children threw themselves into the Mozour River. Dersim was put under martial law from 1937 until 1946. During these years of repression more than one and a half million Kurds were either deported or massacred (10, p. 31).

After the fall of Dersim, the massacres, massive deportations, the militarization of Kurdistan and systematic surveillance of the Kurdish territories were the main policies of the Turkish government toward the Kurds. By setting up military posts and roads, the Turkish authorities succeeded in suppressing Kurdish revolts. Suppression and coercion had proved to be successful measures of managing the Kurdish conflict (11, pp. 57-59).

The Turkish government's policies towards the Kurds between the two World Wars was well summarized in the Memorandum of the Kurds to the United Nations in January 18, 1946.

In Turkey the Kurds have revolted on many occasions between the two world wars. These revolutions reached their climax in the most famous revolt of Sheikh Said in 1925 and that of
Ihsan Nuri Pasha in 1930 and that of Dersim in 1938. But the dictatorial Kemalist government which was the nucleus of Fascism succeeded in suppressing by the support and help of Great Britain and France the revolts and in executing the leaders and dispersing the innocent Kurdish people. It goes without saying that these revolts were an answer to the aggressive and prejudicial policy of the Kemalist government whose sole aim has been the extermination and annihilation of the Kurdish people. It is too hard to give a full account of the way in which that government carried out this policy by massacres and mass emigration of the people from their own homes to other distant places and prohibiting them to speak their maternal language. During the passed 25 years the Kurds have and are suffering severely under the tyrannical regime of Turkey and nowhere their frequent appeals met any consideration (1, p. 87).

From World War II Until 1975

After Ataturk's death in 1938, Ismet Inonu became the President of Turkey. During his rule, shortages and rising prices, heavy taxes, and repressive measures against the minorities all contributed to growing dissatisfaction and demand for liberalization. Following the Second World War and with the presence of Americans in Turkey, Inonu announced his support for a multi-party system. Turkey liberalized its control of political activities. Several political parties were created, and non-Turkish publications were allowed to be published (10, p. 31). In the 1950 election, the first free general election in Turkish history, the Democratic Party came to power with popular support and remained in power until 1950. Celal Bayer was elected President and Adnan Menderes formed the government.
After this, police repression diminished considerably in Kurdish regions. The exiled Kurdish leaders were allowed to return. Schools, roads and hospitals began to appear in Kurdistan. The government failed, however, to implement its liberal principles in the political field. Rigid new press laws were adopted in 1954 and 1956. Critical journalists were prosecuted and newspapers suspended. The popularity of the Democratic Party declined, especially when criticism by the opposition was met with repression.

When Iraq experienced a revolution in July 1958, Turkey took several limited pro-Kurdish measures to discourage any spreading of the revolution. Certain concessions were made to the Kurds by the Menderes regime. For example, it removed restrictions on the use of the Kurdish language.

On May 27, 1960, the Democratic Party government was overthrown by the Turkish Armed Forces, who claimed that they were guardians of the Kemalist revolution. The Democratic Party was banned and its leaders put on trial. Prime Minister Adnan Menderes and two of his ministers were executed on September 17, 1961. Turkey was ruled by a succession of coalition governments until the election of 1965. Despite the political instability, the Turks did not give the Kurds any opportunity to renew demands for their rights. In May 1961, the government charged the Kurdish leaders with forming separatist tendencies and twenty-six of them were sentenced to death (10, p. 32). Extra army units
were sent to Kurdistan, where they arrested and imprisoned many leaders, charging them with being reactionary, making communist propaganda, or seeking an independent Kurdistan. All concessions were cancelled by Prime Minster Inonu (19, p. 70).

When in the Fall of 1960 conflict was initiated by Kurds in Iraq, the Kurds of Turkey helped their brothers by smuggling weapons and money to them (14, p. 5; 15, p. 22). The Turkish government did not want its Kurds to be involved in the conflict, because it was afraid of spill-over effects on them. It installed anti-guerrilla commando units to patrol Kurdistan, and closed its borders with Iraq to prevent arms smuggling and the escape of Iraqi Kurdish rebels to Turkey. This action was taken to intimidate the peasants, and to suppress any tendency of imitating the Kurds in Iraq (19, p. 93). While relations between the governments of Turkey and Iraq were never good, Turkey (encouraged by the growing Iraqi aid, e.g. an oil pipeline to expand the development of the port of Iskanderoun) sealed off its borders with Iraqi Kurdistan to prevent the Iraqi Kurds from fleeing to Turkey (20, p. 10).

When forty-nine Kurdish intelligentsia were put on trial on May 8, 1961, the Kurds demonstrated against this trial in Mardin, Deykir, Siverek, Diyarbakir, Bitlis and Van. They carried signs which read "We are not Turks, we are Kurds"; "Down with Guersel, Menderes, Inonu-- All
Tyrants"; "The Turkish government must recognize our national rights". Consequently, the Turkish army was called in to stop the demonstrations. More than 121 people were shot and 354 wounded in Mardin, around 194 were killed and 400 injured in Diyarbakir. Several hundred people were arrested in different cities. Twenty-three Kurds were charged with attempting to set up a Kurdish state in Turkey in December 17, 1961. All were executed (10, p. 33).

In 1963, Turkey again cooperated with Iraq to repress the Kurds. Turkish officials intensified their attack against the Kurds when the conflict could not be resolved by the Iraqi government. To avoid possible revolts provoked by events in Iraqi Kurdistan, a presidential decree of January 25, 1967 declared that "it is illegal and forbidden to introduce the country and to distribute, under whatever form, every publication, record or tape registered of foreign origin and in the Kurdish language" (3, p. 465). However, in spite of all these suppressive measures the Kurdish Democratic Party established its branch in Turkey in 1967. The government considered this action as a real threat to its integrity, and put Kurdistan under martial law in 1970.

In 1969 the Turkish anti-guerrilla commandos, who had been trained by American specialists in counter-insurgency, launched a campaign against the Kurdish areas under the pretext of a general "arms search". The following was an
example of routine procedures in these "search" operation. A village is surrounded by armored cars while helicopters moved overhead. The villagers are then collected and forced into specially prepared camps without explanation. Subsequently, the commandos would instruct the Kurds to surrender their weapons. If a Kurd said that he had none, he was severely beaten and humiliated. Then Turkish troops would force him to strip, often raping him or her. Frequently suspects were hanged by their feet from a gallows. Occasionally, strings were attached to the genitals of naked men. Many died from these kinds of torture (5, p. 88).

The Turks were afraid of the danger of spillover effects from the Kurdish revolts in Iraq. They feared that a strong Kurdish nationalism could sweep quickly through the Kurds as a whole. If they obtained wide international recognition and sympathy and enough support to interest the United Nations in their cause, they could have been very dangerous. Therefore, during the revolts of 1960-1970 in Iraq, Turkey developed a rigid attitude toward the Kurds and did not help or encourage them.

The Iraqi government signed an agreement with Iraqi Kurds on March 11, 1970, designed to end the armed struggle and recognize the autonomy of Kurdistan in Iraq. As a result, the Turkish authorities doubled the number of commandos in Kurdistan. Their role was to intimidate the
people in order to discourage them from following the example of their brothers in Iraq.

Following the military coup in Turkey on March 12, 1971, unrest erupted again in Kurdistan between 1971-1973. When certain provinces were placed under martial law, thousands of Kurdish people were arrested and tortured in counter-insurgency centers. Most of those detained were peasants from the countryside, although the jails were also filled with writers and intellectuals. As of 1983, the commandos are still engaged in Kurdistan. Garrisons, military airports and armored units restrict travel in main Kurdish towns. There are occasional military parades to raise the Turkish flag in the central squares (16, p. 4; 17, p. 6; 18, p. 24). Turkey even tried to use the Kurds as a means of foreign policy in its war with Greece over Cyprus. Its leaders tried to organize the Turkish Kurds to fight against the Greeks.

To review Turkey's policies towards the Kurds, one may add that since the World War I, in Turkish Kurdistan, suppression and discrimination covered every aspect of communal and cultural life. Turkish authorities have banned the use of the Kurdish language in public since 1925, at a period when only a small minority (3 to 4 percent) of Kurds spoke any Turkish at all. The use of the Kurdish language in private was tolerated. Despite all suppressive efforts, more than three-quarters of the Kurds in Turkey still do not
speak the official language of the state. Moreover, the
publication of Kurdish books and magazines was illegal. The
growth of schools in which the only language of instruction
was Turkish has, no doubt, helped Turkish officials to
spread the Turkish language considerably throughout Kurdish
areas. Kurds were forced to employ a language in which they
can not adequately communicate. Therefore, any interaction
and communication with courts, administration or other
officials required the use of an interpreter. Ignorance of
the official language severely handicapped Kurds at schools
and exposed them to further humiliation (5, pp. 54-81).

Cooptation was also used by Turkish authorities to
manage Kurdish conflict. They realized that the best method
of controlling the Kurdish communal group was through the
intermediary of their traditional leaders, if their support
could be obtained in exchange for privileges. The authori-
ties tried to coopt the traditional Kurdish chieftains and
notables. They regularly changed the names of all the
Kurdish towns and villages, substituting Turkish names for
the originals. The word "Kurdistan," which had designated
the country of the Kurds since the thirteenth century, was
omitted from all text books (8, p. 26). According to the
Turkish government, "Kurdistan" implied the unity of the
scattered Kurdish people and was therefore subversive.
Kurdistan was called "Eastern Anatolia". The Kurds were
called "mountain" or "east" Turks. They were considered to be only a linguistic minority (5, pp. 89-125).

All historical or sociological research concerning the Kurdish group was forbidden. Turkish officials constructed an historical theory to show that the Kurds were originally Turks (21, p. 33). General Guersal, head of the military junta, in April 1951 declared that "no nation exists with a personality of its own calling itself Kurdish and that the Kurds were not only compatriots but racial brothers of the Turks" (10, pp. 32-22). Research which did not correlate with this theory could not be published. Consequently, Kurdish children learned at schools that they were members of the "pure Turkish race". It was interesting to note that in Iran the Kurds were told that they were the purest Aryans.

Turkish Kurdistan was less developed economically than the western regions. In the Kurdish areas, the illiteracy rate run at some 64-77 percent for men and 91 percent for women, whereas the overall figure for Turkey was 51 percent. In Turkish Kurdistan there was only one doctor for every 10,000 people, one-third of the national average. There were far fewer tractors, motor vehicles, roads and banks than in the rest of Turkey. There was almost no industrialization. Schools were poor and few. The percentage of illiteracy in Kurdistan was 90 percent in 1958 (8, p. 16).
Armed forces were present just about everywhere in Kurdistan (22, pp. 7-9).

In Turkey, a person from Kurdistan could not be appointed to fill a post without the prior approval of the secret police. The Turkish authorities tried not to nominate Kurds for positions in the Kurdish provinces. At least ten Kurdish political parties operated underground in Turkey during 1970's. While most of these parties demanded some form of autonomy, others such as Kurdistan's Workers Party, demanded total independence through an armed struggle (19, p. 19).

Turkey has taken tough measures (called Turkification) to assimilate the Kurds. Compulsory military service plays an important role in Turkification of the Kurds. According to Naamani,

Life in the army, with all its shortcomings and miseries, is still more pleasant and more profitable than life in the soldiers's village. When he returns to his community, he has had contact "with the world", he has some money in his pocket and, most significantly, he speaks Turkish, thus obliterating the most distinguishing trait of his minority status (12, p. 283).

A study of the Turkey's constitution indicates that some of suppressive measures were institutionalized.

Article 57 of the Turkish constitution stipulates that the programs, statutes and activities of a political party must be in keeping with the democratic and secular principles of our Republic, which is based on liberty, the rights of man and indivisibility of the national homeland (5, p. 87).
Article 89, dealing with political parties and associations is quite clear about the principle of indivisibility. It stipulates that

No political party may concern itself with the defense, development, or diffusion of any non-Turkish language or culture; nor may they seek to create minorities within our frontiers or to destroy our national unity (5, p. 87).

However, the legislature indirectly recognizes the existence of people of non-Turkish culture and language living in Turkey. Accordingly, the Greeks, Armenians and Jews were protected by the minority rights specifically granted under the Treaty of Lausanne. The Kurds were thus left as the main target of discrimination.

Other laws were also made to restrict Kurdish cultural or political demands. In particular, Articles 141 and 142 of the Turkish Penal Code stipulates that:

Anyone creating, leading or inspiring associations, whatever their designation, which seek to ensure the domination of a particular social class or to overthrow the country's existing social and economic institutions, is liable to a period of imprisonment running from eight to fifteen years (5, p. 106).

Article 142

Anyone spreading propaganda of any type which seeks to ensure the domination of one social class over another or seeks to overthrow any of the country's existing fundamental institutions, or aims to destroy the social and legal order of the state, will be liable to five to fifteen years imprisonment (5, p. 106).

In May 1971, the official attitude of the Turkish government was well expressed in a speech by Prime Minister
Nihat Erin. "We accept no other nation as living in Turkey, only the Turks. As we see it, there is only one nation in Turkey: the Turkish nation. All citizens living in different parts of the country are content to be Turkish."

Erin even denied the existence of the Kurdish language: a mixture of Persian, Turkish and Arabic, with only three thousand complete Kurdish words" (24, p. 142).

As the evidence shows in the case of the Kurds in Turkey, as soon as the Turkish Republic was founded, it designed its policies to repress the Kurdish people. As a result, revolts sprung up in 1924 (the most serious), 1927, 1930 and 1937. All were harshly suppressed by the Kemalist regime. The existence of the Kurdish identity was denied. The Turks tried to destroy everything which might possibly suggest a Kurdish identity. Severe restrictions were imposed against the Kurds by successive Turkish regimes after Kemal Ataturk, except for the short period of the post-World War. Suppression and coercion were successful to the extent that Turkish Kurdistan has remained subdued since the First World War.
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CHAPTER V

MANAGEMENT OF KURDISH CONFLICT IN IRAQ

From World War I Until World War II

Iraq was one of the countries which came into existence from the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire after the First World War. It was formed from the three vilayets of Mosul, Baghdad, and Basra. After the outbreak of World War I, the British army invaded Mesopotamia and occupied the two important cities of Basra and Baghdad. They then extended their control to Mosul in Kurdistan. Here, Britain replaced the Ottoman Empire. The British, who, at San Remo (May 1, 1920) received from the League of Nations a mandate over Iraq and Palestine, were charged with organizing the land which they had already occupied militarily.

During the War, the U.S. President Wilson in his "twelve point" plan prescribed that the principles of self-determination be observed in dealing with the non-Turkish minorities of the Ottoman Empire. The means for such autonomy were provided by Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations setting up the system of Mandates. However, the British policy was to avoid any commitment to one or more semi-autonomous Kurdish provinces (7, p. 57). The British authorities were convinced that Iraq's native population was not capable of full self-government (17, p.
35). Consequently, the Iraqi Kurds attempted several times to achieve autonomy, but all efforts in this regard were suppressed by British troops from 1919 until their Mandate expired in 1932.

A referendum was held in Iraq to approve the accession of Prince Faisal to the throne of the new monarchy in 1920. The Kurds of Iraq boycotted the referendum. The British did not establish firm control in Kurdistan because of Kurdish resistance to their rule. On the other hand, during this period, the British authorities had promised administrative decentralization and cultural self-expression, so as to encourage the Kurdish tribes to accept the authority of the central government in Baghdad.

The first attempt to achieve autonomy was in May 1919. Shiek Mahmud Barzanji, who had been appointed by the British as governor of Suleimaniya, declared himself a king of Kurdistan. His kingdom lasted about two months. He began to collect taxes and called for a Jihad against the British. The British sent two columns of its army to regain the control of the area. Sheikh Mahmud was arrested and imprisoned. Thus, the initial Kurdish state was suppressed and direct British rule restored (11, p. 32).

In Spring of 1922, the Sheikh Mahmud escaped from prison and made another attempt to control Kirkuk in Iraq. In April 1923, British forces managed to reoccupy the area, and the Sheikh Mahmud took refuge in Iran. After
twenty-five months of bitter and costly fighting, the British army took all of Iraqi Kurdistan under its control. Sheikh Mahmud was again arrested by the British and exiled to India (32, p. 21).

There were hardly any more violent disturbances in Iraqi Kurdistan until 1927, when another Kurdish leader, the Sheikh Ahmed, tried to control the area of Barzan, provoking conflict between the Kurds and the Iraqi government. Again British forces were sent to suppress the Kurds, and they established a police post in Barzan.

Thereafter, British officials and the Hashemite dynasty tried to coopt the Kurds by appointing some of them to governmental and military positions. For example, the governors of the northern provinces were usually Kurds. Hundreds of Kurds were employed by the Iraqi Army (46, pp. 28-29).

In 1926, Iraq, Turkey and Britain signed an agreement to fix the common borders between Iraq and Turkey. This agreement enabled both Iraq and Turkey to have complete legal control over the Kurds in their respective territories (32, p. 22).

In June 1930, a new Anglo-Iraqi Treaty ended the British mandate and recognized the independence of the Iraqi Kingdom. Although the Kurds took part in a common struggle for Iraq's independence, Kurds were not mentioned in this treaty. They expected some form of autonomy when the
British mandate ended. The Kurdish nationalists campaigned to boycott the general election for a new parliament which would be asked to ratify the treaty. Sheikh Mahmud Barzanji, who had escaped from house arrest, rallied some Kurdish forces and demanded autonomy for the Kurds in Iraq. Kurds rose up in response, and once again, the British army was charged with establishing order in Kurdistan (11, p. 34). Sheikh Mahmud eventually surrendered to the British forces and the Iraqi government agreed to allow him to live under surveillance (46, p. 29).

The treaty of independence, however, was ratified and Iraq became an independent state. When Iraq applied for membership in the League of Nations, British pressure forced Iraq to issue a declaration acknowledging the special position of the Kurds in Iraq (17, pp. 39-40). The new regime began to make its presence felt in Iraqi Kurdistan.

There was an uneasy peace between the Iraqi government and the Kurds after Iraq's independence. Throughout the 1920's Kurdish resistance centered around the leadership of Sheikh Mahmud Barzanji. By the early 1930's the heads of the Barzani tribe, Sheikh Ahmad and his younger brother Mulla Mustafa, succeeded to the leadership of the Iraqi Kurds. As a result of 1938 revolt, Mustafa Barzani escaped from Sulaimaniya, where he was detained by the British authorities. As soon as he arrived in Barzan, he gathered
some forces and they attacked a police station. Some 100 armed troops were sent to restore the order in the area.

The Barzani tribe revolted several times in 1938 and 1943 to gain autonomy or at least equality of treatment with the Arabs. The Iraqi army took strong suppressive measures against these revolts. Many Kurdish villages were looted and destroyed by the army (32, p. 25). The Iraqi government took firm control of Kurdish areas such as the Qaraj districts, situated in the heart of Kurdistan, to the Mosul Vilayet. This district had been inhabited by the Kurds for many generations.

On October 12, 1945, a petition was signed by twenty-eight prominent Kurds of Sulaimaniya and submitted to the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France in Iraq. In this petition the Iraqi Kurds claimed that,

The Iraqi and the Iranian Governments—supported by the dictatorial Turkish Government—have sent great armies, equipped with modern arms, against these unarmed people with the resolve to exterminate them for no offense or crime, unless, O God, if we regard their demand for the right of self-determination as an offense, or their complaint against their oppressors and hangmen as a crime.

We therefore, in the name of the Kurdish people who are doomed to annihilation, and, in the name of afflicted humanity, condemn the beastly deeds of the Iraqi and Iranian Governments—with Turkey's support— in Kurdistan. ... We ask them (the signatories of the United Nations Charter), in the name of humanity, for immediate intercession to end these human butcheries and to form an international commission and delegate it to Kurdish in order to investigate the causes of
these massacres and to listen to the complaints
and demands of the Kurdish people (2, pp. 79-80).

Between the two world wars, the British armed forces
played an important role in suppressing the Kurdish
conflicts in Iraq. As G. H. Thompson, the British Charge
d'Affaires in Baghdad, put it in his secret Memorandum,

Britain wished this country to become unified,
peaceful, and prosperous, and that British policy
here was devoted to these ends. ... he considered
the idea of an independent Kurdistan so
impractical as to be ridiculous and that the
minority groups here must be made to realize that
they were Iraqi and that they could not depend on
Britain for support or protection. (2, p. 57)

The British wanted to strengthen their influence in
Iraq by supporting the Iraqi government against the Kurds.

From World War II Until 1958

There was a period of democratic activity in Iraq in
the period following the Second World War. Some Kurdish
organizations were re-activated, all of which supported the
revolt from a local to national level. These included: Hewa
(Hope), Right-wing Nationalists; Shoresh (Revolution),
extreme left; Rizgary (Salvation), a mass democratic party;
and Lashkari Kurd (Kurdish Soldiers), a militaristic
organization. The Kurdish organizations started protesting
against oppression and discrimination in Iraq. They
asserted the existence of the Kurdish nation and struggled
for that nation's right to self-determination. In 1943 the
Kurds initiated another revolt in Iraq. Under the Barzani's
leadership, they fought the monarchist army of Iraq for more than three years (13, p. 56). Then the Iraqi Kurds sent a Memorandum to the United Nations, stating that

Although in Iraq (where our Party struggles) nominally its constitution recognises the rights of the Kurds, the successive Iraqi governments have denied the Kurds their rights and have done their best to suppress every national and democratic movement. When the world war ended in the glorious victory of democracy the Kurdish nation in Iraq renewed its political activity to regain its denied rights but the Iraqi Government supported by British imperialism is trying to put down every national movement which draws the Kurds nearer to liberation and self-determination (2, p. 89).

These initiatives of the Kurds were not in accord with British policies in Iraq. Therefore, the British army supplied tanks, planes, and guns to the Iraqi army, which destroyed and burned around fifty Kurdish villages. According to the Kurdish sources, a military unit was dispatched to the Barzan district. The Kurds could not resist these forces and as a result, some of them withdrew to Azerbaijan in Iran. The Iraqi government set up military courts in all the Kurdish districts to further its control in the area. Hundreds of people were sentenced to death and imprisonment without any proof of guilt, except that they expressed sympathy with the national democratic cause and expressed their disapproval of the government's attitude towards the Kurdish population (2, p. 89).

Subsequently, the Kurdish Democratic Party in Iraq submitted five documents to the representatives of the
United States in Iraq. In the first document, General Barzani urged all Arabs and Kurds of Iraq to stand together and fight "the imperialist and reactionary forces which combine to suppress the Kurdish people". The second document explained the program of the Kurdish Democratic Party and described it as a "peoples' party" defending the interests of the "working class, farmers, intellectuals etc". Its principal objectives were: a) the formation of a Federal Kurdish state within Iraq; b) government ownership of practically everything; c) compulsory free education; and d) the separation of church and state (2, pp. 131-137).

The third document, which was the National Charter of the Kurdish Democratic Party, traced the disappointments of the Kurds since the World War. Then the Party pledged a continued struggle to achieve a "free federal democratic state". The fourth document indicated that the Kurdish Democratic Party represents all the Kurdish people and replaces previous political organizations. The Party was considered the only Kurdish Party in Iraq. According to this document, there should be close cooperation with the Kurdish Democratic Party in Mahabad. Finally, the fifth document indicated that the only alternative for the Kurdish people is the creation of a federal Kurdish government in Iraq, and it urged all the Kurds to continue their struggle towards this goal (2, pp. 138-147).
The Iraqi Kurds attempted to associate with the autonomous Kurdish Republic in Mahabad, Iran. A year later, however, this Republic was itself destroyed by the Iranian armed forces. Barzani and other Kurdish leaders sought refuge in the Soviet Union where they remained for eleven years (19, pp. 59-60). The people of Barzan were detained in concentration camps. Most Kurdish leaders were tried before summary military courts and were sentenced to long prison terms or death (11, p. 43).

From 1946 to 1958 were relatively quiet years, with no major conflict between the Iraqi government and the Kurds. During this period, the Iraqi King, Nuri al-Said, banned all political parties, including Kurdish political organizations. As Letti M. Wenner put it,

the efficient secret police and tight political controls exercised by Nuri prevented any agitation by dissident elements, whose more revolutionary leaders, such as Mulla Mustafa, were safely outside the country (45, P. 71).

Accordingly, the Kurdish Democratic Party in Iraq took no serious action until 1958. Since then, five consecutive Iraqi regimes, i.e., the Hashemite regime, Abd ul-Karim Kassem, Abd ul-Salam Aref, Abd ul-Rahman Aref, and Hassan al-Bakr have all engaged in conflict with the Kurds.

When the Baghdad Pact was signed by Iraq, Iran, and Turkey in 1955, the Kurds denounced the pact as another measure to suppress them. This Pact was for a time the cornerstone of the United States' containment policy in the
Middle East. Although the United States provided the major support for the members of the Pact, it never formally joined the Pact. The revolution of July 1958 resulted in Iraq's withdrawal from the Baghdad Pact, which pleased the Iraqi Kurds (13, p. 90). When Iraq formally withdrew in March 1959, the name of the Pact was changed to the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO).

From 1958 Until 1968

When the monarchy in Iraq was overthrown on July 14, 1958, the majority of the population supported the regime change. The revolution was prepared by a group of "Free Officers," including Abd ul-Karim Kassem. After the take-over, he announced a "Popular Republic" with himself as commander-in-chief, a prime minister and an acting minister of defense, laying a background for a military dictatorship. Abd ul-Salam Aref became his deputy. There was supposed to be an officer's council to include the "Free Officers," but it was not established. Thus, Kassem provided a basis for the officers' complaints at the beginning of his rule (39, p. 181).

In an effort to unify the country, Kassem tried to resolve the Kurdish conflict. After the take over, he released a number of Kurdish leaders and promised that the Kurds would be treated as a equal partners with the Arabs in Iraq. He also added a second star to the Iraqi flag,
indicating recognition of the Kurds. The cabinet appointed by Kassem included figures representing all opposition groups, such as socialists, communists, and the Kurds (though not members of the Kurdish Democratic Party). The new government tried to negotiate with the Kurds, and Barzani was allowed to return to Iraq and reestablished the Kurdish Democratic Party in Iraq. The first task of this party was to coordinate the activities of the Kurdish nationalist movements in Syria, Iran and Iraq. It became increasingly clear in the course of the next few weeks that the July revolution was to be another point of departure in treatment of the Kurds in Iraq. The provisional constitution of July 27, 1958 reestablished all democratic liberties and proclaimed cooperation between all citizens on the basis of equality as Article 3 stipulated, (40, p. 373).

Iraqi society is based on complete cooperation between all its citizens, on respect for their rights and liberties. Arabs and Kurds are associates in this nation; the constitution guarantees their national rights within the Iraqi whole (45, p. 71).

Although the constitution described Iraq as part of the Arab world, it referred to the Kurds as copartners with Arabs within the framework of Iraqi unity and guaranteed the Kurdish communal rights (8). Article 19 declared "there shall be no discrimination on grounds of race, nationality, language, religion or belief" (14, p. 38).

This was a significant development. For the first time, a state which included part of Kurdistan had
recognized the national rights of the Kurdish people in its constitution. The new regime in Iraq legalized the Kurdish Democratic Party, and authorized publications in the Kurdish language (32, p. 65).

For Kurds, however, this liberation was short-lived. There was no freedom of political activity during the last two years of the Kassem period. Kassem tried to weaken all political parties and subordinate them to himself. He also tried to deport the Kurds from the oil-producing region of Kirkuk. In June 1961, the Kurds submitted petitions to Kassem's regime, asking for use of the Kurdish language in public, and sharing oil revenues from the Mosul and Kirkuk oilfields. These petitions were examined by the Iraq Revolutionary Council and rejected. The Kurds then tried to present an acceptable petition for their demands, but received no answer (32, p. 73).

On July of 1959, the Kurds, led by Mulla Mustafa Barzani, revolted in Kirkuk. Barzani established his control over most of the mountainous part of northern Iraq while the Iraqi army held the towns and villages. Kassem's policy was to prevent any emergence of Kurdish nationalism (45, pp. 68-75). The new regime sought to strengthen its authority through military dictatorship. Concessions were revoked, and one by one the political parties, including the Kurdish Democratic Party, were pronounced illegal. The leaders of the parties were arrested or forced underground.
On November 16, 1961, the Central Committee of the Kurdish Democratic Party sent a statement to United Nations Secretary General U Thant accusing the Iraqi government of genocide, and asking for an international commission to investigate the crime. According to "The Statement From The Kurdish Bureau",

Prime Minister Kassem dispatched two Divisions of his army to attack and bombed Kurdish towns and villages. Entire towns and villages have been wiped out in aerial bombardments and some 50,000 innocent men, women and children have been slain. Unable to overcome armed resistance, the Iraqi arm and air force have turned their fury upon innocent civilians (40, pp. 373-374).

The United Nations did not take any action against the Iraqis and replied to the Kurdish requests very vaguely (32, p. 30).

The Iraqi Air Force, consisting of around 300 aircraft, played an important role in the suppression of the Kurds. From September 1961 aircraft attacked villages with napalm and rockets, forcing people to live in caves designed to promote terror. Mulla Mustafa's staff alleged that "in January 1962, 500 Kurdish villages had been attacked and some 30,000 people made homeless, ..." (32, p. 9).

All Kurdistan was bombarded on September 11, 1961. Thousands of civilian Kurds were killed and a great number were imprisoned (13, p. 57). On the other hand, Kassem's government tried to coopt chiefs of some of Kurdish tribes and big feudal lords to appease the Kurds from their struggle for autonomy and self-determination (32, p. 74).
Kassem's attempt to suppress the Kurds by armed forces did not succeed, for four reasons. First, there was no well-organized pro-government group in Kurdistan. Second, Kassem failed to win over any Kurdish faction to his side in his fight against Mulla Mustafa and the Kurdish Democratic Party. Third, Kurdistan was geographically well situated for the Kurdish nationalists' defense of their interests (14, p. 64). Fourthly, the brutal air operation united the Kurdish tribes and gave the revolt the character of national uprising. The Iraqi army faced many defeats by the Kurds. The Kurdish war in Iraq was interrupted by three long periods of uneasy armistice and fruitless negotiations. The Kurdish conflict was one of the major causes of the overthrow of Kassem in February 1963 (18, pp. 55-58).

By the beginning of 1962 Kassem's regime began to show signs of weakness and inability to resolve the Kurdish conflict by suppressive and violent means. The Kurdish war escalated. The suppressed political parties began to find more support inside the Army. These years were important for the Kurdish cause. In the early 1960's Kassem claimed Kuwait as a former district of Basra province. This brought him into conflict with Britain and the oil companies, and Iraq became isolated internationally. His claim to Kuwait was met with opposition from all other Arab countries, even to the extent of sending an all-Arab force to Kuwait. After military force failed, Kassem tried to resolve the Kurdish
conflict by non-violent measures. He announced a cease-fire, an unconditional amnesty for all Kurdish rebels if they would lay down their arms, and abolished the land tax. In April 1962, Mulla Mustafa replied that he would accept the cease-fire only if the Kurds were granted autonomy in the Iraqi Constitution, and then only if the regime was replaced by a democratic government (32, p. 31).

Suppression of Iraqi Kurds was resumed in the spring 1962.

During this conflict, the Iraqi government charged that the Soviet Union was not only supporting the Kurds in propaganda, but was also supplying them military assistance. In May 1963, presumably at Soviet initiative, the Mongolian People's Republic asked the United Nations to refer the Kurdish conflict to the General Assembly. This request was withdrawn in September 1963, however (32, p. 101).

In February of 1963, Kassem's regime was overthrown by a military junta led by General Tahir Yahya, who became chief of the General staff. General Abd ul-Salam Aref, who was Kassem's colleague in 1958, became as the first president of the Iraqi republic. General Ahmed Hassen al-Baker became Prime Minister. This regime was associated with the extreme pan-Arab ideology of the Baath Party (The Arab Socialist Resurrection Party).

Since the Baath Party had a major impact in the Kurdish conflict in succeeding years, its attitude towards minorities and communal groups is worth examining. The Arab Baath
Socialist Party was founded in 1940 by Michel Aflaq and Salan al-Bitar, who were Syrian (1, p. 12). The Party's basic ideas included an emphasis on socialism, Arab nationalism, Arab unity and anti-communism. The Party's slogan was "Unity, Freedom, Socialism." According to the Party's Platform (Article 7),

the Arab world constitutes that part of the globe inhabited by the Arab nation, which stretches from the Taurus Mountains (Iraqi-Turkish border), the Pusht-i Kuh Mountains (Iraqi-Iranian border), the Gulf of Basra (i.e. the Arab Gulf), the Arab Ocean, the Ethiopian Mountains, the Sahara, the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean (1, pp. 167-170).

Thus, according to the Baath Party, Iraqi Kurdistan was a part of the Arab world. The founders of the Baath Party intended to set up the Arab empire of Damascus and Baghdad, which included different minorities and communal groups. The Party was a universal Arab party which was supposed to have branches in every Arab country. However, the Party did not design any measure to regulate communal conflicts or deal with minority problems. In fact, the Party denied the Kurds in the Arab world any right to autonomy. Rather, the Party's plan was to assimilate the Kurds with the Arabs (14, pp. 228-229).

The Baath Party, throughout the Kassem regime, was more concerned with its opposition to Kassem than with the Kurds. The Party regarded Kassem as the prime threat to Arab unity. Meanwhile, Mulla Mustafa and the Kurdish Democratic Party were regarded as Kassem allies. They were also accused,
together with Kassem, of encouraging racial segregation. On the other hand, the Baath Party accused Kassem of escalating the Kurdish conflict in order to divert the people's attention from his hated rule (14, pp. 230-232). Such attitudes towards the Kurds widened the gap between them and the Party.

However, when the Baath Party came to power, the fighting between the Kurds and the Iraqi army stopped. Subsequently, both sides announced a cease-fire. General Yahya visited the Mulla Mustafa in March, 1963, and promised to recognize "the natural rights of the Kurdish people on the basis of decentralization". According to Yahya's plan of decentralization, the country should be divided into six regions. The Kurdish population was divided among two of these regions. The Kurds opposed the plan because they claimed that the plan ignored their desire for unification (8). Therefore, Yahya's plan was never implemented. The Kurdish leaders were arrested by the Iraqi army on June 10, 1963, and Yahya's regime began an attack against the Kurds which was harsher than Kassem's offenses.

In mid-November, 1963, the extreme wing of the Baath Party was replaced by Aref who assumed more direct power, and Tahir Yahya became a Prime Minister. Another brief rapprochement began with the Kurds. Aref ousted the Baath Party and took all power into his own hands. There were negotiations between the representatives of the Kurds and
the new regime. During the negotiations, the Kurds asked that the government formally recognize their right to autonomy immediately, send a copy of the recognition to the U.N., and broadcast it on Baghdad radio. Iraqi Kurdistan should include areas extending to Turkey in the north, Iran in the east, and Syria in the west. Further, the official language of Kurdistan should be Kurdish, which should be also a second language in the rest of Iraq. Next, there should be a Kurdish Vice-President of the Republic. Kurdistan should be given a separate council of ministers and its own national assembly. Defense, finance, and foreign affairs should be handled by the central government. The Kurds demanded the creation of armed units in Kurdistan composed only of the Kurds. Finally, the Kurds should receive not less than two-thirds of the whole national oil revenue (34, p. 19). It was evident in the course of negotiations that the Kurds and the new regime could not find a common ground to resolve their conflict. Even a new temporary Constitution, Article 19 of which dealt with the Kurds, was less satisfactory than Article 3 of Kassem's Constitution. Article 19 stipulated that "this constitution confirms the national rights of Kurds within the framework of the fraternal national unity of Iraqi people" (8, p. 517). The Iraqis were not prepared to make any concession on these demands, claiming that Kurdish autonomy would inevitably lead to the secession of the northern region of
Iraq. Under such conditions no agreement seemed possible (7 pp. 515-516).

Hence, the Iraqi army, convinced that the Kurdish problem could be solved only by suppressive and violent means. The Party's ideology demanded utmost Arabization and unification of all Arab nations. With the help of British military advisors, the Baathist regime resumed a new offensive in Kurdistan on June 10, 1963 (3, pp. 9-15). As a result, several hundred civilians were massacred and buried in a mass grave. The Iraqi government intended to achieve two goals: First, to crush the Kurdish revolt, which would strengthen its internal position. Secondly, it would enable Iraq to score a tactical victory over Nasser by accusing him of backing the Kurds. President Nasser supported the Kurds' national demands, and disapproved of solving the conflict by force (14, p. 146). However, Aref resumed the war, in an attempt to achieve what his predecessors had failed to attain by the same means.

The government's hopes of winning the Kurdish conflict did not materialize. Aref's attitude towards the Kurds became conciliatory. Therefore, he declared his readiness to make peace (32, p. 99). The negotiations started in February, 1964 (34, p. 7). The main points of the Kurdish demands during the negotiations with Aref government were similar to those of the previous November; 1) Full autonomy would be granted to the Kurds in Iraq; and the Kurdish
language would be the official language of the autonomous region. 2) Kurdish political activities should be permitted in Iraq. 3) The Vice-President and Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq would be Kurd; a local assembly would be elected in Kurdistan. 4) The Kurds would be represented in proportion to their percentage of total Iraqi population in the Iraqi legislative and executive branches, and the bureaucracy (proportional representation). 5) Foreign policy and defense would be handled by the Iraqi government. 6) Kurdish army units would remain under Kurdish control. 7) The budget of autonomous Kurdistan would be collected from taxes in the Kurdish region; plus a just share of the oil income (14, p. 157; 34, pp. 7-8).

These demands were not acceptable to the Iraqi government, which feared they would mean the secession of the northern region from Iraq. In October 1964, the Kurds announced the establishment of Kurdish autonomous government. Under Barzani's leadership, the Kurdish government had its own cabinet, judicial branch, and local governments (4, p. 82; 34., p. 9; 38, p. 4).

The de facto creation of autonomous Kurdistan was considered a serious danger to Iraqi's integrity. It was also likely that any concession to the Kurds would mean the Aref regime was subject to coup by the army. As a result, Aref decided to try to manage the Kurdish conflict by the armed force in order to save his regime.
On May, 1965, Aref and Nasser signed a Unity Treaty, which aimed at achieving the total unity of Iraq and Egypt in a series of stages. On October 22, 1965, as a result of Aref's request, President Nasser issued a statement saying that the United Arab Republic fully supported all efforts of the Iraqi government against the Kurdish rebels. Four days later, the Kurdish representatives in Cairo were expelled from Egypt (32, p. 132).

In April, 1965, the Iraqi armed forces launched an attack on the Kurdish region on the three fronts. During the first week of the attack, the Iraqi government employed some twelve infantry brigades, supported by artillery, armor and aircraft. Fighting continued throughout 1965. By continuous attack, the Iraqi army hoped to weaken Kurdish resistance. They even attacked civilian targets, and villages (5). However, by 1966, it was evident that the Iraqi army had failed to resolve the Kurdish conflict by coercive and suppressive measures. In September of that year Tahir Yahya resigned and Abd ul-Rahman Bazzaz, who was the only civilian to hold the office since 1958, succeeded him (14, pp. 174-175).

On April 14, 1966, President Abd ul-Salam Aref was killed in an airplane accident. The fight with the Kurds stopped for the time being. Barzani announced a month-long cease-fire to see how the Iraqi's new president, Abd ul-Rahman Aref, who was Salam's brother, would resolve the
Kurdish conflict. The new president accepted the truce proposal, and he promised that the Kurds would be granted local autonomy (20; 32, pp. 135-137). After the formation of the new cabinet, the provisional constitution provided that:

Iraqis are equal, in their duties and rights, without distinction of race, language, religion or any other reasons. This constitution recognizes the national rights of the Kurds within the Iraqi people in a national and brotherly union (14, p. 192).

Both the Iraqi President and Abud ul-Rahman Bazzaz were interested in solving the Kurdish question in order to strengthen their own position. Although the Iraqi government continually stressed its intention to seek a peaceful solution, it warned the Kurds that its appeals were not made from a position of weakness. The Iraqi army would maintain the integrity of Iraq (14, p. 196; 20).

When the new president had consolidated his own position, he broke his promise, and said that he would not recognize any autonomy or separation. He declared that,

no autonomy will ever be granted to the Kurds ... We shall not bargain over our country ... The government has never envisaged negotiations with rebels. It will not countenance cease-fire (12, p. 5).

Consequently, the Iraqi armed forces began one of its biggest attacks on the Kurds on May 15, 1966. As Gershon Solomon put it,

More than four divisions participated, as well as large auxiliary forces, including the Air Force, the Armored Corps and artillery—altogether over
65,000 troops. This was the largest concentrated attack against the rebels since 1961, in an attempt to settle the issue once and for all by force of arms. The Air Force bombed rebel concentrations unceasingly and destroyed hundreds of villages, using napalm and sulphric acid bombs. The civilian population suffered heavy losses and most were compelled to evacuate the villages and take to the caves scattered over the mountains. The offensive was conducted in the form of a three-pronged attack, its principal purposes being first of all to blockade the Iranian border to the Northeast in order to prevent supplies reaching the rebels form Iran (34, p. 11).

These attacks failed to resolve the Kurdish conflict and several hundred government troops were killed by the Kurds near Mount Hindarin (14, p. 197).


The Iraqi officials realized that their Kurdish policy not only divided the country but was also weakening it financially. They decided, therefore, to resume negotiations with the Kurdish representatives. On June 29, 1966, Iraq outlined its "twelve point program" to resolve the Kurdish conflict. This program, known as the "29 June Declaration," was a major effort, and it has been adopted by
subsequent Iraqi administrations as the basis for a just and peaceful settlement. According to this program,

1) Kurdish nationality would be recognized in the law on decentralization of the administration, in a provisional Constitution then being prepared, and in a future permanent Constitution.
2) Kurdish would be recognized as an official language, along with Arabic, in the predominantly Kurdish areas, and would be taught at the Baghdad University.
3) Kurdish districts would have their own elected councils, which would be responsible for education, health and municipal affairs.
4) Civil servants in Kurdish areas would be Kurds, unless local needs required other personnel.
5) Parliamentary elections would be held within a period to be laid down in the provisional Constitution. The Kurds would be represented in Parliament, the Cabinet, the Civil Service, the Judiciary, and the diplomatic and military services in proportion to their numbers in the population.
6) The Kurds would be free to form their own political organizations and to publish their own newspapers.
7) A general amnesty would be proclaimed after the conclusion of a cease-fire agreement.
8) Kurds who deserted from the Army and the police force would report back to their units within two months.
9) The other Kurds under arms would be formed into an organization attached to the Government, which would help them to return to civilian life.
10) Kurdish civil servants and workers who had been dismissed would be reinstated in their former posts.
11) Money being spent on the campaign against the Kurds would be used for reconstruction of the Kurdish areas, for which a special Ministry would be responsible.
12) The Government would compensate, as far as lay in its powers, widows, orphans, the disabled and other victims (34, pp. 12-13).

In addition to the June Declaration, the Iraqi press reported the inclusion of the three supplementary "unpublished articles." These articles promised: 1) release
of all political prisoners, 2) public and free activities of the Kurdish Democratic Party, 3) unification of all Kurdish regions in one district (4, p. 33).

The "twelve point program" was considered a major concession by the Iraqi government to the Kurdish demands. This was the first time that any government had recognized the bi-national characters of the Iraqi state, and did not make an attempt to assimilate the Kurds. Although Barzani accepted this plan as basis for negotiation, he had little confidence in the stability of the Iraqi regime or in its ability to carry out the program. When the negotiations continued, the Kurdish representatives did not make any compromise on these points. They insisted on maintaining independent Kurdish armed forces and rejected the proposal that they disarm themselves (21; 34, p. 15).

On June 30, 1966, the day after the announcement of the June Declaration, there were two unsuccessful attempts to overthrow the regime. The Iraqi Prime Minister, al-Bazzaz, took advantage of these unsuccessful attempts and blamed the military officers for their negligence and inefficiency (15, pp. 273-280). As a result, officers loyal to Aref restored the regime's control over the country. al-Bazzaz, who played an important role in preparing the twelve point program, resigned because of jealousy of the military and a new cabinet was formed in July 1966 (14, p. 204). He was succeeded by Tahir Yahya. As a result, negotiations between
the Iraqis and the Kurds stopped. Frequent changes of
cabinets or regimes in Iraq made chances of solving the
Kurdish problem based on the "June Declaration" very slim.

When Major General Naji Talib, a member of the original
Free Officers movement, succeeded Tahir Yahya, he did not
recognize the June Declaration as a solution to the Kurdish
conflict. The new prime minister planned to wait and
strengthen his position in order to attack the Kurds at some
appropriate time. The Iraqi officials took an entirely
uncompromising position in regard to the Kurds. However, on
October, 1966, Aref decided to meet Barzani. The two
leaders reached an agreement on several points. They
promised to resume the negotiations. This meeting helped
the conflict to ease temporarily. Because of differences
among Iraqi authorities in regard to the Kurds, however, the
promised negotiations were called off. The Iraqi army
increased its activities in Kurdistan. Once again,
relations between the two sides were aggravated. All the
promises were broken and coercive and suppressive measures
came into play (14, pp. 203-211; 22; 34).

As a result of use of coercive measures, Mulla Mustafa
presented another complaint to the United Nations on
November 18, 1958, alleging that the Iraqi government was
attempting genocide against the Kurds, and asking for a
United Nations mediator to study the problem (32, p. 88).
During the period 1963 to 1968, the Iraqi Communist Party and the Soviet Union supported the Kurds. The Soviet Union condemned the war, describing it as a "massacre", and called upon the Kurds to stand firm in their demands. For its part, the Iraqi Communist Party actively joined in the fighting, and declared that it fully supported the Kurdish struggle. The Communist Party also provided advice and training to the Kurds. The Soviet Union gave support and aid to the Kurds through the Iraqi Communist Party while leaving the door open to any official rapprochement with the Iraqi government.

From 1968 Until 1975

So far all suppressive and coercive measures failed to resolve the Kurdish conflict. There was mutual fear between the Kurds and the government during the first half of 1968. They accepted the existence of each other and attempted to strengthen themselves. The Kurds were assisted by the Iranian government, which was an embarrassment to the Iraqi government. Consequently, the army and opposition parties were dissatisfied with the Iraqi ruler. On July 17, 1968, Ahmed Hasan El-Bakr, at the head of the same officers who were responsible for the policies of 1963, came to power by coup. He proclaimed himself president of the Republic. This was the fourth coup to take place in a decade (24).
After the take over, El-Bakr announced that he wanted to resolve the Kurdish problem peacefully, according to the twelve-point program of 1966 (24). He said that Iraq would respect the Kurdish language and culture, and would grant an amnesty to all Kurdish soldiers and civilians. The government also promised that Kurdish political prisoners would be released. All these promises meant little in practice. According to some observers, El Bakr wanted to consolidate his position, first; then at an appropriate time he would crush the Kurds (8, p. 519).

On September 22, 1968, another temporary constitution was prepared. According to the new constitution,

Article 1: the Iraqi people are part of the Arab nation and that their aim is comprehensive Arab unity and the government obligates itself to work for the realization of this unity.

Article 21: all Iraqis, including Arabs and Kurds are equal before the law and are required to co-operate in safeguarding the homeland, and that their national rights are guaranteed within the framework of Iraqi unity (8, p. 520).

These articles categorized the Kurds more distinctly than former constitutions. On the other hand, the establishment of a regime based on pan-Arabism hindered resolution of the Kurdish conflict.

Once again the Kurds demanded full political autonomy within their region. The al-Bakr government regarded any concession to such demands as a major step toward eventual Kurdish secession. He believed that Iraqis were not
prepared to allow the creation of what they called "a second Israel" at the other end of the Middle East.

By November, 1958, limited fighting between the Kurds and the Iraqi army again broke out. The Iraqi government intended to suppress the Kurds once and for all. In this effort, on June 3, 1959, the Iraqi Army engaged more than 60,000 men in the battle (32, p. 151; 36, p. 35). This was one of the most bitter battles ever fought in Iraqi Kurdistan. Thousands of Kurds were expelled from their lands or massacred. As Gershon Salomon put it,

As in the past, the Iraqi forces did not distinguish between military and civilian objectives. Its planes almost daily raided Kurdish towns and villages and even went as far as to use napalm and gas. The result was a destruction of the Kurdish villages that exceeded everything in the past, and mass murder of peaceful civilians, old people, women and children (35, pp. 36-37).

In spite of these efforts, the Iraqi Army failed to suppress the Kurdish conflict. The following reasons have been suggested: 1) The Iraqi government found the economic, social, and political costs of the war unbearable. In the course of nine years, the war had cost the Iraqi government over one billion dollars (35, p. 39) 2) The Kurds received continuous assistance in manpower, heavy arms and supplies from Iran. 3) The local population supported the Kurdish fighters, providing them food and shelter. 4) The Kurds had high morale and military training. 5) the Iraqi army was not well-organized. 5) The British announced that they
would pull out of the Persian Gulf, directing the government's attention to filling the resulting vacuum. 7) Iraq was isolated from the Arab world by fighting the Kurds. Peace with the Kurds would help to improve the relations with the Arab neighbors.

However, since the Iraqi government could not fight on two fronts: Kurdish and Iranian, El-Bakr tried to resolve the Kurdish conflict by peaceful means. The peace talks started between the representatives of the two parties (10). The disputed points were many and involved many issues.

On March 11, 1970, the Kurds and the Iraqi government signed a fifteen-article peace agreement (23). This agreement was very similar in substance and spirit to the twelve point program which was prepared in 1966. A review of its foremost points indicates that some kind of federal system was designed to manage the Kurdish conflict. Its main provisions were as follows:

(1) Recognition of the Kurdish nation. To this end, the provisional constitution of Iraq is to be amended by a section stating that the Republic of Iraq consists of two main nations, Arabs and Kurds. (2) Recognition of the Kurdish language, in the form of a constitutional amendment lay down that both Kurdish and Arabic will serve as official languages in those districts in Northern Iraq in which the Kurds are in the majority. (3) The legal powers of the districts are to be increased by legal amendment. A new Kurdish district named "Dahuk District" will be formed, with the same enlarged administrative powers and a Kurdish governors. (4) A Kurdish vice-president will be appointed, and the Kurds will enjoy proportional representation on all executive and administrative bodies, including the government and the army. (5) Administration officials in
districts with a Kurdish majority must be Kurds or at least speak Kurdish. (6) The national right of the Kurds to development of Kurdish culture is recognized in every aspect including the establishment of a Kurdish university in the Suleimaniya District, ... (7) All Kurdish students will be permitted to return to their studies, and their educational standards will be improved. (8) The Kurds will be permitted to establish youth and adult organizations, ... (9) A general amnesty will be proclaimed for all who had taken part in the Kurdish rebellion, and Kurdish public servants and soldiers will be reinstated in office. (10) All Kurds who had left their villages will be permitted to return, and for those who are unable to return for different reasons, new housing would be provided. (11) Kurdish soldiers will be granted pensions, and dependents of fallen Kurds will be compensated. (12) A Committee for the Rehabilitation of the Northern Districts and Compensation of War Damage will be established ... (13) Steps will be taken to assure the speedy implementation of land reform in the Kurdish regions in Northern Iraq ... (14) The arms held by the Kurdish fighters will be surrendered to the Iraqi government during the final stage of the implementation of the treaty ... (15) A High Commission consisting of representatives of the central Iraqi government and of the Kurds will be established to supervise the implementation of the treaty (4, pp. 84-35; 5, pp. 163-170; 15, p. 231-240; 36, pp. 35-35).

According to this agreement, the Iraqi government made some important concessions and attempted to design some peaceful and non-violent measures to resolve the Kurdish conflict. For example, it recognized the existence of the Kurdish nation. It opened a university and Kurdish academy of science in Kurdistan. The authorities recognized the linguistic and cultural rights of the Kurds. Furthermore, a general administrative office was set up to develop Kurdish culture. The government of Iraq accepted the Kurdish language in schools, institutions, universities, as well as
in the police and military organizations. Kurdish poets and
writers were authorized to organize a union and publish
their works, and the number of Kurdish programs on
television was increased. The government passed a law
allowing the decentralization of local administration.
General amnesty was given to all civilians and soldiers who
had participated in the violent action in Kurdistan.
Finally, the Iraqi government included five Kurdish
Ministers in the cabinet. However, these Kurdish ministers
did not have decision-making powers in practice. According
to this agreement, the Vice-president would be a Kurd.
Proportional representation would be applied to all military
and civilian executive bodies. A Kurdish district would be
established with local administrative powers and a Kurdish
governor. The Kurdish Democratic Party was officially
recognized in Iraq. All these agreements provided a kind of
federalism, but not autonomy. According to the Kurds,
autonomy meant the establishment of an autonomous local
Kurdish government, with a parliament, law courts and
administration, and a military organization.

In an interview with the correspondents of The New York
Times, Mulla Mustafa Barzani denied claims to independence
for the Kurds. He said that the Kurds were demanding
autonomy and a share of national spending proportional to
their population. He denied also any effort to keep the oil
income from Kurdish oil fields. He added that oil income
should be collected by the central Iraqi government. Iraqi Kurds should receive a percentage of all Iraqi national income, rather than just oil income (33, p. 14).

There was to be a four-year interim period during which the provisions of the agreement were to be implemented. The Iraqi government carried out only a few of the terms of the agreement. However, for example, the essential Kurdish local autonomy and a share of power in Baghdad remained unfulfilled. Kurdish demands for revenue sharing according to their population were unacceptable to the Iraqis. Even more unacceptable were Kurdish demands that they be permitted to operate their own network of international interactions. Many other terms of the agreement were not carried out by the Iraqi government. There were many disputes over the techniques and means of fulfilling the agreement. The Kurds wanted self-rule within a united Iraq, and they sought a fifteen percent share of the Iraqi national budget, which was based on Iraq's oil export. The Kurds said that the oil fields around Kirkuk were in territory geographically, ethnically, and traditionally Kurdish, and thus should be incorporated in an autonomous Kurdistan (27, p. 4).

The new provisional constitution was proclaimed by the Iraqi government on July 17, 1970. This constitution was ambiguous as to the Kurds. A major problem was the Baathist regime's reluctance to share political power. The
government reserved its veto over local legislative and executive councils, and refused to assure a division of oil revenue with the Kurds (44). The Iraqi government considered the Kurdish demands as tantamount to secession. Since 1958, during the twelve years of the Republic's existence, there had been neither Parliament nor elections. One authoritarian and military regime replaced another, ignoring the constitutions, laws and communal rights of the Kurds (25).

In response to Iran's occupation of a few islands in the Persian Gulf during 1971, the Iraqi regime expelled some 50,000 Iranian nationals and 40,000 Kurds from Iraq. Kurds were forced to leave all their belongings there. The Kurds were also forced to give up their lands to the Arab tribes (26).

During 1972 the Kurds began to show serious signs of discontent with the delay in full implementation of the two-year-old agreement. A number of clashes between government soldiers and the rebels was reported. Deteriorating relations with Baghdad brought a threat from the Kurdish Democratic Party to renew the civil war. In this situation, relations between the Kurds and the Iraqi government deteriorated. Thus by 1974 it was obvious that the two sides were near a renewal of their conflict. Tension came to a peak following two attempts by Iraq's secret police to assassinate Mustafa Barzani (26). Soon
fighting broke out between the Kurds and Iraqi armed forces. Arms supplied to the Kurds from Iran was one of the important factors that intensified the conflict. As an introduction to the outbreak of fighting in April 1974, the Iraqi government executed eleven Kurdish leaders. In response, the Kurds executed seventeen Iraqi officers (37, p. 57).

Within the first few days of March, 1974, the Iraqi regime committed three Army divisions (45,000 men), 900 tanks and some 20 battalions of mobile artillery. Iraqi air forces bombed Kurdish towns. According to the Iraqi government, their forces lost 1,650 men, including 58 officers, and 8,000 were wounded. As far as Kurdish casualties were concerned, they were difficult to estimate since Kurdish civilians were major target of attack (27, p. 4).

In this offensive, the Soviet Union encouraged the Iraqi government. Soviet officials openly condemned the Kurds in March 1974, because Iraq was supplying large amounts of oil to Eastern Europe (16, p. 20). By May 1974 the Soviet Union had supplied Iraq with 1,035 tanks, 198 combat aircraft, 1,300 artillery pieces, and 20 small naval vessels (28). There was also a Soviet military training mission in Iraq. Saddam Hossin, the new Iraqi leader, was well aware that failure to suppress the Kurds had brought down previous regimes. Therefore, he
was willing to commit a large proportion of his armed forces to suppress the Kurdish conflict.

From June to December 1974, several appeals were made by the Kurds to the United Nations to find a solution to the conflict. A subcommission on Minorities of the Human Rights Commission decided that the Kurdish conflict was an internal problem of Iraq. Therefore, the United Nations took no action in this respect (29, p. 26).

The Iraqi government continued the use of suppression and violence. There was no sign of a peaceful settlement. At a meeting of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) in Algiers, Iran and Iraq signed a four-point communique, which completely eliminated the conflict between two countries. The Irano-Iraqi agreement of March 6, 1975 proved once more the inability of the Iraqi government to solve the Kurdish question in a democratic and just manner. The communique provided that

1) the two sides would proceed with a permanent demarcation of their land boundaries on the basis of the 1913 Protocol of Constantinople and the report of the 1914 Commission for Delimitation of the Frontier. 2) they would delimit their river boundary according to the Thalweg Line (the median line of the navigational channel). 3) they would re-establish reciprocal security and confidence along their common frontiers and undertake to exercise a strict and effective control with the aim of finally putting an end to all subversive infiltrations. 4) the two parties would regard these provisions as indivisible elements of a comprehensive settlement, any breach of which would be considered a violation of the spirit of the Algiers Agreement (29).
Following this agreement, the Kurdish leaders had three choices: 1) to surrender to the Iraqi forces before the end of March 1975 when the general amnesty decreed by Iraq would expire; 2) to seek refuge in Iran; 3) or to continue fighting. Consequently, on March 27, 1975, many Kurdish leaders and forces fled to Iran. Barzani was put under house arrest in Tehran on April 23, 1975. According to Iranian sources, the number of refugees fleeing Iraq between March 11, 1974 and April 15, 1975, was 146,792 (4, p. 235). The number of Kurdish refugees in Iran then increased from about 150,000 to over 300,000 in a few days. Several thousand Kurdish troops surrendered to the Iraqi forces. A few thousand dispersed throughout Iraq and went underground (43, p. 44).

Within twenty-four hours of the Algiers agreement, Iraqi tanks and infantry opened an all-out offensive along the entire Kurdish front. The Shah immediately withdrew his forces operating inside Iraq and ceased all aid to the Kurds. Subsequently, Barzani called upon his people to abandon their struggle. The fighting was over. Once more, management of Kurdish conflict was affected by foreign policy considerations of Iran and Iraq.

After 1975 policies of the Iraqi government were well summarized in a letter to Arab Heads of States as follow:

1) Eviction of thousands of Kurdish peasant and workers' families from their villages and towns to places in the south of Iraq. 2) Confiscation of the lands and possessions of the people by force.
3) Setting Arab tribes in the homes of evicted Kurds. 4) The transfer of most Kurdish civil servants, soldiers, and police to the south of Iraq. 5) The transfer of Arab civil servants to Kurdistan with promotion and generous allowances. 6) Ending teaching in the Kurdish language by schools in Kurdistan. 7) Emptying Sulaimaniya University of Kurdish personnel. 8) Changing the Kurdish names of villages and towns in Kurdistan. 9) Neglect of Kurdistan as regards industrial and civil projects. 10) Subjecting the evicted Kurds to bad social conditions (9, pp. 53-54).

The Kurds in Iraq have undergone population dispersion since the conquest of their strongholds in 1975. Approximately 300,000 have been resettled in southern Iraq (43, p. 44). This policy was applied chiefly in areas of Kirkuk, Khanaqeen, Mendilie, Sheikhan, Zakho, Zemar and Erbil. Another 100,000 to 150,000 are said to have fled to Iran to avoid imprisonment (31, p. 7). About 30,000 have been imprisoned and 227 executed (42, p. 33).

The Iraqi government divided the Kurdish provinces and combined them with Arab districts. The new district was given a new Arabic name, Taamim, which means nationalization. The government also abolished the Ministry of Northern Affairs and eliminated all references to the history and geography of Kurdistan in school books. The Kurdish Academy was eliminated. Kurdish was no longer to be the second language of Iraq, and the department of Kurdish studies at Baghdad university was closed. Since then, the Iraqi government has maintained complete control of the Kurds living within its borders. The Kurds had remained largely unassimilated to the Arabic culture in Iraq.
throughout its existence. Since 1975, although the Kurds occasionally have tried to rise up against the government, the attempts have not been significant enough to be considered a major conflict.

Discrimination in education, civil services and other areas became rampant. By 1970, Erbil, the richest of the Kurdish provinces, had only seventy schools per 1000 inhabitants, while the Arab province of Basra had 120 per 1000. The proportion of students from Kurdistan in Iraq's various universities was only 6.4 percent of the total in 1970-71. Kurdish students represented less than two percent of the applicants at the Military Academy and Police College. The percentage of illiteracy in Iraqi Kurdistan was 85 percent in 1958 (11, p. 16). In civil services, out of 500 high ranking Iraqi diplomats attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs only ten were Kurdish. In addition, thousands of Kurds whose families had lived in Iraq for years were denied Iraqi citizenship (19, pp. 62-63).

In Iraq, which was under British mandate between 1922 and 1932, the Kurds on several occasions revolted against the British rule and were suppressed by them. After Iraq's independence in 1932, the Iraqi authorities with the help of British advisors and troops continued to suppress the Kurds. Especially during the decade after 1947, the Iraqi Kurds were brought to heel by the central government. Kurdish national organizations were suppressed and manifestations of
Kurdish political and cultural activity were firmly confined. Kurdish demands were considered as separatist movements by the Iraqi rulers. Any attempt to achieve autonomy was regarded as undermining the integrity of the Iraqi state.

Although from time to time some preventive and peaceful measures were attempted by the government, these measures were not acceptable to the Kurds. If a freedom was allowed to maintain their identity, Iraq prevented the Kurds from exceeding certain limits. Therefore, suppressive and coercive measures were mainly used by the Iraqi government to manage Kurdish conflict.
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CHAPTER VI

MANAGEMENT OF KURDISH CONFLICT IN IRAN

From World War I Until World War II

During the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, Iran was a weak country. Though nominally independent, it was divided after 1907 between a Russian sphere of influence in the north and British sphere in the South. Each part of the country was ruled by one tribe. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Kurdish chiefs ruled large parts of western Iran, but never enjoyed political independence (17, p. 46). The Qajars managed to retain internal power in spite of growing unrest and the increasing power of local tribes. When there was a communal or tribal conflict, the Shah used his army to resolve it.

Toward the end of the Qajar dynasty, there was a constitutional revolution which demanded a less absolute rule and provided a constitution for the first time in Iran's history. Government powers were separated into legislative, executive, and judicial branches. The Qajar shahs, however, did not develop an interest in reforming and centralizing their government. The Kurds of Iran did not cause any trouble for the central government comparable to that of the Ottoman Kurds. They were allowed freedom as
long as their leaders gave symbolic allegiance to the Shahs of Iran. There was only one important Kurdish rebellion in Iran in the nineteenth century, which was led by Sheikh Obeidullah in 1880. The Persian and Turks together put down the insurrection, and the Persian Kurds remained relatively calm thereafter.

Iran did not formally enter the First World War and remained passive during the war while the country was divided between the Russians and the British. Part of its territory was devastated by Turks, Russians, and Kurds. In fact, after 1915, the country was in a state of political, economic, and social chaos (23, p. 19).

At the Paris Peace Conference, Iran demanded the inclusion of all Kurds within its territory because of their common origin. However, the participants in the Peace Conference, led by Britain, rejected Iran's demands. Instead, in 1919 Britain offered Iran a treaty which would have helped solve some of her most urgent problems, but would have put her under pronounced British influence. This treaty was rejected by the Majlis (Iranian Parliament).

During the war, President Wilson announced his "Program of the World's Peace" which was important in terms of the autonomy of minorities in the Ottoman Empire. From now on, the conflict between the Kurds and Turkey, Iran, and Iraq began to develop. When the Treaty of Sevres was signed in 1920, the proposed independent Kurdistan was not created.
On the other hand, during these years the central government was very weak in Iran. Therefore, Kurds felt this to be a good opportunity to demand autonomy.

Furthermore, following the Bolshevik revolution of Russia in 1917, Lenin emphasized the autonomy and self-determination of minorities. Russian forces were withdrawn from an occupation of northern Iran that had lasted since 1909. Then a treaty was signed with Iran on February 26, 1921. Imperialism was denounced and the theme of freedom from oppression for the enslaved peoples of Asia was developed in its articles. Therefore, indirectly the Soviet Union shown some interest in the situation of oppressed communal groups including the Kurds (6, pp. 419-420).

Following the announcement of the Wilsonian principles of self-determination and withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran, Ismail Agha Simko, chief of one of the Kurdish tribes (Shikaks), managed to gain control of the entire region west of Lake Urmia. In 1920 he demanded the independence of all Kurdistan. Simko led 40,000 of his fighters against the gendarmeries in Mahabad in 1921, but his revolt was suppressed by the Red Army, which did not leave Iran until May, 1922 (17, p. 47). When the Red Army left, Iranian armed forces attacked the Kurdish areas and forced Simko to flee to Turkey. The Shah of Iran pardoned him two years later and allowed him to return to Iran (9, p. 11).
1926, after his return, Simko instigated another revolt which was also suppressed by the Iranian armed forces. He fled first to Iraq and then to Turkey (14, p. 94).

In 1925, the Pahlevi dynasty came to power in Iran through a coup supported by the British. The new regime attempted to create a centralized state and to tighten its control over the quasi-independent parts of Iran. The new Shah reorganized the army, equipped it with modern weapons and improved its training. The Kurds of Iran resisted Reza Shah's attempts at centralization and nationalization during the 1920's and 1930's. During the summer of 1930, Simko was invited to attend negotiations with the Iranian military at Ushnu, but was assassinated treacherously by the Iranian army and his followers were imprisoned by the Iranian government (2, pp. 48-54).

Suppression and coercion were major policies followed by the Pahlevi regime toward the Kurds and other minorities in Iran until the beginning of the Second World War. The Kurds were eventually suppressed in the same way as their counterparts in Turkey. Reza Shah Pahlevi, who was embarrassed in his drive for modernization by the existence of Kurdish and other communal groups, attempted to make them settle down by, among other measures, taking the chiefs of tribes as hostages to Tehran, separating them from their followers (21, p. 8). Reza Shah also confiscated tribal
lands and forced the Kurds to abandon their traditional life.

To modernize Iran the Shah had to destroy a deeply rooted social order. Since the Kurds belonged to the Aryan race and spoke an Indo-European language, they were considered as Persians. The new regime banned the use of the Kurdish language and the wearing of Kurdish costumes (17, p. 47). The Kurds were slowly disarmed. Their political freedom and activities were restricted. Kurdish areas were kept under firm control by the armed forces. Hundreds of Kurds were imprisoned and their property was confiscated and distributed to Pahlevi followers. As a result of these policies, Kurds in Iran remained relatively quiet until World War II (9, pp. 12-13).

Since communal groups and minorities were considered an appropriate target for communist influence, Iran, Turkey, and Iraq were suspicious of communist infiltration. To avoid communism, these states overlooked their differences and took harmonious action to prevent communist penetration of their communal groups. Thus on July 3, 1937, Turkey, Iraq, and Persia signed the Saadabad Treaty. Article seven of this document was directed against the Kurds, stating that

Each of the high contracting parties undertakes to take measures, in its own sphere, against the formation or activity of armed bands, associations, or organizations, aiming at the overthrow of established institutions and liable
to affect the order or security of any part or frontier of another party (11, pp. 35-36).

Despite its apparent anti-communist focus, some communal group leaders thought that it was designed to counteract communal groups wanting autonomy or equal treatment with the other parts of society. The Kurds at least regarded the treaty's main objective as being cooperation in suppressing any manifestation of Kurdish aspirations (8, p. 2).

From World War II Until 1947

In World War II, Iran declared its neutrality, though Reza Shah allowed Germany to use Iran as a base for German activities in the Middle East. To prevent the expansion of German influence in Iran, on August 25, 1941, Soviet and British troops invaded from the north and south (17, p. 48). The occupation of Iran had a significant impact on the Iranian Kurds, who were fighting for the allies. According to Kurdish sources, Reza Shah and his government used every possible method of persecution until the occupation of Iran by the Allied forces. It was only then that the Kurds began to believe that the time of their liberation approached, so they supported the Allied cause with all their might and took arms against the government of the Shah (1, p. 88).

When in the early 1940's, Reza shah was removed by the British because of his pro-Nazi sympathies, there was a violent Kurdish uprising. Later on, in 1942, American troops joined the British and Soviet troops. The central
government could not control the country any more because of the foreign troops and because the Iranian army disintegrated (21, p. 8). The army's disintegration caused rifles and munitions to fall into the hands of the Kurdish tribesmen. The Kurdish leaders whom Reza Shah had kept in exile were permitted to return to their homes. As soon as they arrived, they tried to dominate small areas, valleys or towns. Contrary to the orders of the central government and the Russians, the Kurds refused to return the rifles to the Iranian officials. They requested the use of the Kurdish language in schools and freedom in their national affairs (9, pp. 14-24). They began to look to the Soviets with gratitude and hope for granting them autonomy. For around four years, in the area of Kurdistan under the Soviet influence, the Kurds effectively ruled themselves (9, p. 14-24).

With the end of the World War II, various democratic rights were given to political parties in the country, and the hopes of the Kurds to get rid of oppression revived. This was true especially when the Allied Nations promised to grant independence to communal groups based on the provisions of the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow declaration (1, p. 99). In these, Kurds found another opportunity to demand autonomy. The Mahabad area had not been occupied by the Allied armies. In September, 1942, the Kurds of Mahabad initiated the Kurdish political movement, the objective of
which was the autonomy of the Kurdistan in Iran, and then the union of all Kurdish lands in an independent state. It was organized in cells and held bi-weekly meetings. It also published two periodicals, called Nishtiman and Galawesh, which were distributed in Iraq as well as in Iran. They also founded a committee of Kurdish youth, called Komola (9, pp. 34-35). Branches of Komola were organized in a number of Iraqi cities as well as in Turkey (2, p. 37; 9, pp. 33-44).

Since the central government was very weak in Iran during the years 1940-45, management of Kurdish affairs was basically the responsibility of the British and Russian authorities. The two zones of influence met on a line between Saqqiz and Sardasht. The British, whose oil fields were located in Kurdish territories (in Iran and Iraq), were concerned with the activity of the Kurds in Iran. Their agents tried to penetrate into Komola, though the British remained indifferent to Komola and to the hopes of the Kurdish nationalists. According to Kurdish sources, the British supported, morally and materially, the central government in Tehran, in order to frustrate and suppress the Kurdish movement (1, p. 88). However, the members of Komola were aware that their claims would clash with British interests and that they could not hope to gain any support from the British government.
So far as the Soviets' interests were concerned, the Russians moved into Iran to protect the rear of their front in the Caucasus and to secure the supply line from the Persian Gulf along which were delivered American tanks and trucks. After 1942, however, the Soviet Union supported the idea of an independent Kurdistan and encouraged the old policy of helping minorities who felt themselves treated unjustly by the central government. Soviet officials and agents made contact with Kurdish nationalist leaders and members of Komola (29, pp. 250-252). A Soviet-Kurdish cultural society was established in Mahabad and Komola came into the open. Gradually Komola announced its aim and purpose as the establishment of an independent Kurdistan. According to Kurdish sources, Kurds in the Red Army occupation zone enjoyed full rights and freedom to express their opinions and to revive their culture. The Kurds felt that they owed their freedom to the non-intervention of U.S.S.R in their affairs, and its refusal to support the central government (1, p. 83).

In November, 1945, a congress of Kurdish leaders from the Middle East met in Baku, in Soviet Azerbaijan. In Baku the Prime Minister of Azerbaijan, Baghirov, assured them of Soviet interest and friendship towards the Iranain Kurdish movement. Komola was dissolved by this congress, and the delegates announced the formation of the Kurdish Democratic Party. Shortly after the delegates returned, a meeting was
held at Mahabad and the party's Iranian branch was formed. Consequently, Komola's members were absorbed by the new party (25; 29, p. 252).

The new platform of the party was issued by Qazi Mohammed, stating that:

1) The Kurdish people of Iran shall have self-government in the administration of their local affairs.
2) The Kurdish language shall be the official language and shall be used in education.
3) A provincial Council in Kurdistan shall be elected immediately according to Iranian constitutional law and shall exercise its right of controlling and overseeing all public meetings.
4) All government officials shall be Kurds.
5) Revenue collected in Kurdistan shall be spent there.
6) The Democratic Party of Kurdistan shall make efforts to establish complete fraternity with the people of Azerbaijan and minority elements living there.
7) The Party shall work for the improvement of the moral standards, the health, and the economic conditions of the Kurdish people by the development of education, public health, commerce, and agriculture (9, p. 57; 14, p. 85; 17, pp. 50-51).

The new party also issued a manifesto stating that "the Kurdish people now desire to take advantage of the liberation of the world from fascism and to share the promise of the Atlantic Charter." Therefore, when the Kurdish delegates met in January 24, 1946, the first Kurdish Republic was created in north-western Iran. The Kurdish flag was raised. A national parliament of thirteen members was formed. Qazi Mohammed was elected as a president of the new republic (9, pp. 57-61). Consequently, the Kurdish language became the official language in the administration
and in the schools, and several Kurdish periodicals such as Kurdistan, Havar and Hilal were published regularly (2, pp. 102-104; 9, pp. 33-40). Justice W. O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, in Strange Lands and Friendly People, wrote:

The Kurdish costume which had been banned by Reza Shah, came back into use. Schools were provided for every child through the sixth grade. Text books for the primary schools were printed in Kurdish. A newspaper (Kurdistan), a periodical and two literary magazines were published. A constitution was prepared. It proposed a Kurdish state that was republican in character. It pledged the State to defend the interests of Kurdish workers and to create unions for their betterment. It proclaimed that people should be educated irrespective of race, religion or sex. It announced that women should have all the political, economic and social rights that men enjoy (7, pp. 51).

The Kurdish Republic settled its territorial dispute with the Azerbaijan Republic and they signed a Treaty of Friendship and Alliance on April 23, 1946 (17, p. 53). According to this treaty, both of the republics were independent nations with the right to exchange representatives and to make treaties. By the same treaty, they solved their mutual territorial and minorities problems. The treaty prohibited either party from making a separate treaty with the Iranian government (9, pp. 80-83; 11, p. 41; 29, pp. 257-260).

The backbone of Qazi's military power was Mulla Mustafa Barzani, who opposed British rule in Barzan from 1919 until 1935. He was then imprisoned in Iraq until he escaped in 1943. He came to the city of Barzan and gathered several
thousand fighting men. Shortly after his arrival, he put his forces under the command of Qazi. Qazi welcomed Barzani and conferred upon him the rank of Marshal (3; 29, pp. 252-257).

The Republic of Kurdistan was a center for cooperation and solidarity among the various parts of Kurdistan. Hundreds of delegates from Turkey, Iraq, Syria were warmly welcomed in Mahabad. All Kurds considered the Kurdish Republic of Mahabad as a symbol of their aspiration for independence and liberation. Although the republic was short-lived, lasting only a year, it was regarded as a significant achievement for the Kurdish communal group (14, p. 37).

In accordance with the Tripartite Agreement of 1943, Allied troops began to withdraw from Iran six months after the end of the War. But the Soviets did not leave until May 1946, and only after the case was brought up before the Security Council of the United Nations. After the withdrawal of Soviet troops, the Iranian government began to take more effective action to extend its control over the country (14, p. 38). In the changed politics of the world after the war, in August, 1945, the Soviets advised Qazi to contact the central government in Tehran to seek a legal basis within the Iranian state for his regime. Following Qazi's contact with the Iranian officials, an offer were made by the central government to make all Iranian Kurdistan into a
province. Qazi felt that he should obtain Russian approval for this proposal. But the Soviet officials refused to support the Kurdish Republic (17, p. 55). Qazi found himself without support. The Iranian government demanded complete surrender of the republics of the Kurds and Azerbaijan. By the end of November 1946, Azerbaijan was completely in the hands of the Iranian army (9, p. 111-112).

In the fall of 1946, the government of Qavam al-Saltaneh in Iran promoted organized elections throughout the country. The Iranian government wanted its troops in Kurdistan and Azerbaijan to supervise the elections (14, p. 88). On December 13, 1946, the Iranian Army occupied Tabriz. Then the Iranian government, using these circumstances, attempted to eradicate all traces of Qazi Mohammed's regime in Mahabad. The Iranian army, supported by tanks and airplanes, attacked Mahabad on December 17, 1946. Villages were burnt and cities were bombed. Thousands of Kurds were killed. Hundreds of people fled to the mountains, suffering from starvation and dying from cold weather. The government troops resorted to killing, torturing and looting, under the guise of restoring peace and order. The government forces faced no armed resistance. Qazi Mohammed realized that with the Republic of Azerbaijan defeated, armed resistance was useless. By the end of 1946, most of the Kurdish leaders were arrested, but some of them either fled to Iraq or hid themselves in the villages. Qazi
Mahammad and his close aides were condemned to death by an Iranian military tribunal, but because of his popularity, the authorities delayed his execution. The government announced to the Kurdish people that they were to present their grievances and complaints against Qazi and his aides. The military court decided that it had enough evidence, and on March 20, 1947, Qazi his brother and a cousin were hanged. Their bodies were left hanging for several days to teach a lesson to the rest of the Kurds. Mass executions then followed shortly in the other towns of Kurdistan. Thousands of women and children escaped to Iraq (29, p. 267). The Kurdish publications and press were banned and the teaching of Kurdish was prohibited (2, pp. 102-104). All books written in the Kurdish language were collected and publicaly burned (17, p. 55).

The Iranian government ordered Barzani to disarm his forces and return to Iraq. He ignored the order and fighting between two parties broke out. In mid-April, the Iranian Army opened the roads and entered into Saqqiz, Bana and Sardasht. During the month of May, several battles were fought, without a decisive outcome. Finally, Barzani was forced to return to Iraq. Approaching the Iraqi border, the Barzani troops faced Iraqi troops. Turkish troops joined the battle. Thus, the meaning of the Saadabad Treaty was clearly demonstrated (11, p. 42). The Iraqi government did not want him in Iraq and condemned him to death. By June,
1947, Barzani with about four hundred of his followers escaped to the Soviet Union, and remained there until July 1958 (9, pp. 125-129; 14, p. 89). Barzani's land and property were confiscated and distributed to rival tribes who had taken part in suppressing Mustafa's revolt in 1946 (3; 15, p. 22).

The Kurdish Republic of Mahabad failed to survive because as Saif Qazi, who was Minister of Defense for the Republic, put it "we are not the ones who are defeated; our defeat is caused by the defeat of Soviet policy in Iran" (25, p. 51). The Republic was planned and formed with regard to the Soviet Unions' foreign policy considerations. The Soviet Union supplied Qazi Mohammed with weapons, ammunition, and printing facilities, and Soviet political advisors were assigned to assist him. Some Red Army officers were assigned to the Kurdish units. The Kurdish officers of Mahabad dressed in Soviet-supplied uniforms. Some fifty young Kurds went to Soviet Union for political and military training, to return afterwards and assist Qazi's regime. The Soviet Union had promised Qazi both political and military support in case of Iranian attack. When the Iranian armed forces attacked, however, the Soviet Union provided no help.

Professor Richard Cottam, once a political officer in Iran, has argued that "the only real prospect for an independent Kurdistan lies with developments in
international community" (5, p. 26). Therefore, a support of one major power is an important factor in all Kurdish independence or autonomy movements. The best case in point was the Mahabad Republic, which was established with some Soviet assistance and collapsed when the Soviet assistance was withdrawn.

After the suppression of the Kurdish Republic, Kurds in Iran were placed under the firm control of the Iranian government. The government began a program of building up strong military force in the Kurdish region, to prevent dissent or revolt (25).

Suppression, intervention, and the use of violent means were common methods applied in dealing with Kurds since the collapse of the Mahabad Republic. Iran divided Kurdistan into three provinces. Only the central part of it (Sanandaj) was officially called Kurdistan. Today, Iran is the only country to recognize a province by the name of Kurdistan. The Northern part of the original Kurdistan was called western Azarbaijan, and the southern part was called Kermanshah (14, p. 75). Although the Kurdish language was prohibited in Iran, there were several radio stations which broadcast in Kurdish. This policy was said to have had two bases: 1) to propagate the Shah's policies among the Iranian, Iraqi and Turkish Kurds; 2) to convert the pure Kurdish language to a Persian dialect (14, p. 79). The Shah's regime refused to recognize the existence of the
Kurdish people severely repressing even the most minimal demands for national or communal rights. Iran's policy was to create a common national consciousness and a homogeneous society.

In 1946 the Kurds submitted a Manifesto to the Secretary General of the United Nations, complaining about the policies of Iran, Iraq, and Turkey. The Manifesto argued that "while the United Nations enunciated its high humanitarian principles and discussed disarmament, the Kurdish people were living in an atmosphere of terror, massacre, apprehension, famine, poverty, fear and wholesale suspension from work, simply because they asked for bread and democratic freedom." According to this Manifesto,

1) The Kurds do not enjoy the right of publishing newspapers, magazines and various publications in their language.
2) Kurdistan is deprived of higher educational establishments.
3) Not a fils is spent for the development of the state of the Kurds from the oil royalties received from Iraq and Iranian Kurdistan. ...
4) The Kurdish people do not enjoy the right of forming parties and cooperative societies. If a Kurd should dare to mention such things he would jeopardize his life...
5) Kurds are not employed in the Kurdish districts and those employed ignore the Kurdish language.
6) Kurds are not allowed to demonstrate their patriotism nor speak their language in government offices.
7) Kurds are not employed in the various ministries of the governments dealing with the Kurdish people, and those employed are synthetic Kurds and do not truly represent the Kurdish people.
8) The Kurds are not well represented in Parliaments, and are appointed and not elected to such posts...
9) Widespread diseases in the Kurdish districts with no adequate health institutions to take care of the sick.

10) The Turks publicly and unashamedly declare that there is no "Kurdish Cause" in Turkey. Sometimes they call us "Turkish Mountaineers" and sometimes "Tent Living Nomads". By this ruse they aim at hiding, in their belief, the 5 million Kurds from the eyes of the world. ...

(1, pp. 210-215).

The Manifesto then summarized the policies of the Iranian government towards the Kurds, stating that

The world has learned of the conspiracy of the Fascist Iranian government conjointly with the Iraqi Government as usual, and supported by foreign pressure against the Kurdish people. The Iranian government, through the aid of foreign air force, attacked the democratic Kurdistan Republic in Iran and the various peaceful Kurdish districts under the pretext of maintaining peace and carrying out elections. ...

It is well established that the decision of the Iranian government to send its troops to Kurdistan was not to maintain security and to carry out liberties, but to dissolve the Republic and the Kurdish Democratic Party, and to deny the election of Kurdish representatives to the new Iranian Parliament. ...

The Iranian Government's decision to dispatch its forces to Kurdistan, dissolve the Democratic Republic and destroy the social and human reforms carried out by this Republic during a short period which the Iranian Government had not been able to accomplish for centuries, has created great indignation and sorrow in all Kurdish towns in Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Syria because the objective was not to maintain peace or protect elections but to do away with the freedom of the Kurdish people (1, pp. 153-155).

Finally the Manifesto urged the United Nations to

(1) Compel the Governments of Iran and Iraq to withdraw their armed forces from the Kurdish areas, and to avoid further bloodshed;
(2) Send a commission to investigate the attacks on the Persian Kurdish Republic by the armed forces of Iran, Iraq and Turkey;

(3) Place the Kurdish question on the agenda of United Nations;

(4) Grant the Kurds complete independence and democratic freedom under one flag (1, p. 156).

From 1947 Until 1958

Between 1947 and 1952 there was a period of political suppression. Most of the Kurdish Democratic Party's leaders and members were either executed or imprisoned. The Kurds were disarmed and brought to heel. Some 10,000 members of the Talili tribe were removed to the central area of Iran. Several hundred Kurds were detained in concentration camps (23, p. 57). There was an attempt to assassinate the Shah in February 1949. Using this assassination attempt as an excuse, the Iranian government tried to suppress all minorities, including the Kurds. Hundreds were again arrested and imprisoned (14, pp. 39-90).

When Mohammad Mossadeq came to power in 1952, there was a period of political unrest in Iran. Kurdish leaders took advantage to revive their organization and activities in Kurdistan. The Kurdish Democratic Party became active again. Dr. Mossadeq believed that the victory of a nation in its anti-imperialist struggle did not depend on its
movement alone, but on cooperation with other cultural groups which were victims of imperialist domination. At the 1952 election, the Kurdish Democratic Party's candidate for Majlis received between 80 and 99 percent of the vote in Mahabad and its suburbs. The result of the election was, however, announced void by the Iranian government (14, p. 90).

Because of repression, the Kurds of Bokan rebelled during 1952-1953. This conflict spread to the areas between Bokan and Mahabad. Iranian troops were assigned to end the revolt (14, p. 90).

When Dr. Mossadaq's regime was toppled by a CIA-orchestrated coup on August 19, 1953, the relatively short-lived freedom of the Kurds ended. Mossadaq was arrested by loyalist army forces. From that time up to the collapse of the Shah's regime in 1979, the regime was based on an active coalition between government agencies and the army which, under the Shah's guidance and control, was responsible for planning and implementing policies. The Shah, after his return, banned all kinds of associations and political activities and no political parties were allowed to be active until 1957 (14, p. 90). Thousands of people were arrested and hundreds of them were executed, on the pretext that the Kurds refused to pay their taxes or give up their arms. It seems that suppression of the Kurds was the first positive result of the Baghdad Pact signed in 1955 (4,
p. 466). There was yet another revolt in northern Kermanshah by one of the Kurdish tribes, Javanrviz. The Iranian army reacted with a major attack and thousands of soldiers, tanks, and planes were mobilized against the Kurdish villages and towns. Nuri al Saaid, the King of Iraq, helped the Shah to eradicate this revolt (14, p. 90).

As previously noted, Iraq experienced a revolution in 1958. This regime change had a great impact on Iranian Kurds. By December 1959, relations between Iraq and Iran were deteriorating over conflicting claims concerning the Shatt al-Arab waterway. Ever since the overthrow of the Iraqi monarchy in 1958, the Iranian authorities feared that Iraq's military-socialist system might be used as a model by the Iranian opposition, and that Iraq might become a base for subversion of the Iranian government. The latter government decided to use the Kurds as a means of preventing the opposition's making trouble for it in Iraq (14, p. 91; 24, p. 10). Some Kurds had fled from Iraq to Iran after the revolution. Since the Kurdish tribes had been allies of the Iraqi monarchy, they were provided with weapons and money with which to fight Iraq's new regime (27, pp. 400-401). At the same time, Iran took several pro-Kurdish measures, such as allowing the Kurds to operate a radio station under state supervision. The Kurds were also permitted to publish a newspaper, called Kurdistan (15, p. 293). However, all these measures and policies were short-lived. When the
possibility of a communist threat in Iraq went away, Iran began to cut its aid to the Kurds and suppress them by taking away their broadcasting and publication privileges.

In the early 1960's, the Shah initiated a land reform program. His program was opposed by an influential group of big landowners. The Shah, therefore, closed the Majlis and ruled the country by decree. The country was in a state of political turmoil. Opposition to the reform resulted in a series of riots in Tehran, Tabriz, Isfahan, and Mashhad. Hundreds of people were killed and arrested. In 1965, there were more outbreaks of violent opposition to the Shah. Once more, the Kurds took advantage of internal unrest to demand autonomy. The Iranian authorities considered this as a threat to the integrity of the country. Consequently, hundreds of Kurdish workers, peasants, teachers and religious leaders were arrested, and several top leaders of the Kurdish Democratic Party were condemned to death.

As a result of the Free Officers' coup in Iraq against Abd ul-Karim Kassem on February 8, 1963, an armed conflict broke out in Iraqi Kurdistan which attracted the sympathy of the Kurds in Iran. The Iranian army provided Iraqi Kurds with a great amount of supplies, money, clothing and ammunition. There were several reasons for this. First, there was mutual distrust between Iranian Shiis and Iraqi Sunnis. Secondly, Iran was disturbed by the rise in Arab nationalism because of its possible effects in Iran's
Khuzistan. Consequently, Iran supported the Kurds in order to use them to fight Arab nationalism. Furthermore, they intended to make the Kurds of Iraq dependent on Iran. Until 1966 this aid was organized by the Kurdish Democratic Party in Iran, which made a major contribution to the survival of the movement led by Mustafa Barzani in Iraq. The Iranian government, in turn, demanded that Barzani cooperate with Iranian authorities in discouraging Kurdish demands in Iran. Accordingly, the Kurdish Democratic Party stopped its activities in Iran temporarily. There were some concessions from the government to the Kurds during these years. For example, in June of 1963, the authorities allowed a Kurdish language program to be broadcasted for three hours each day. Another concession was the land reform, from which the Kurds benefitted (32, p. 77).

In 1953 after Kassem’s fall in Iraq, the Baathist government broke with Nasser, who was the major advocate of Arab nationalism. Iran stopped helping the Kurds and decided to take concerted action with Iraq and Turkey in suppressing them. This cooperation was short-lived because Abd al-Salam Aref ousted the Baath Party in November 1963 and allied Iraq with Egypt.

In 1965 when the Kurdish conflict intensified in Iraq, Iran refused to observe the 1937 Treaty concerning the Shatt al-Arab waterway and the demarcation of the borders between the two countries. Furthermore, Iran resumed its support of
the Kurds by providing weaponry, money, advice and training. The Kurds were also permitted to receive all kinds of assistance through Iran from their supporters all over the world (15, p. 296). Iran was assured by Mulla Mustafa that revolt and nationalist activity would not spread to Iran. In addition, the Iranian army kept a watchful eye on all Kurdish activities over the borders.

In early 1967, several Iranian Kurdish Democratic Party leaders decided that they could no longer abide by the policy of cooperation between Barzani and the Iranian government and made various attempts to revolt. The Iranian armed forces crushed them and hanged the leaders, displaying their bodies in public. Nevertheless, clashes and conflicts increased in Iran. The center of these conflicts was in the region between Mahabad, Baneh and Sardasht, where violent clashes lasted eighteen months. Several important leaders were killed, causing the movement to collapse and some of its members to flee to Iraq (12).

**From 1968 Until 1975**

In 1968, the Baath Party came to power in Iraq. The new regime asked Iran to stop violating the 1937 Treaty. Iran refused and there were several clashes between the armed forces of two countries. The conflict coincided with plans by the Iraqis to provide the Kurds in northern Iraq with an autonomous status. But the Kurds opposed the
government plan, insisting that it did not fulfill their aspirations for self-rule (18, p. 5). During the 1970-75 years, there was constant war between the Kurds and the Iraqi government, during which Iran increased its assistance to the Kurds. When an agreement was signed in 1970 between the Iraqi government and the Kurds, Iran intensified its support of the Kurds economically and militarily. The Kurdish guerrillas were aided by Iranian guns and ammunition and even public relations.

In 1970 the British authorities announced the withdrawal of their troops from the Persian Gulf. Immediately, Iran renewed its claim to Bahrain and three other islands. This move brought Iran into sharp conflict with Iraq. A military confrontation developed that lasted until after the end of the Kurdish revolt in 1975. It was to Iran's advantage that the Kurdish conflict in Iraq continue, dividing the country, and draining its resources.

During the 1970-75 period, Iran, the United States and Israel supported the Kurds and provided them with advanced artillery, rifles, anti-aircraft guns, and ammunition, but no airplanes or tanks (19, p. 4). The Iranian government also allowed the Kurdish forces a limited amount of refuge in Iran. Medical facilities and humanitarian relief were provided by the Iranians to wounded Kurdish soldiers (30, p. 234). The motive for this support was Iran's dispute with Iraq over the Shatt al-Arab waterway. Iraq had complete
control, according to the 1937 Treaty. Since 1965 Iran had ignored this Treaty and had began to use the waterway as it chose (15, p. 25; 22, p. 12). The conflict between the two countries was later heightened by rivalry in the Persian Gulf. However, the Shah supported the Kurds only to the point where they could defend themselves, but not to the point where they would defeat the Iraqi armed forces and set up an independent Kurdistan. From his viewpoint, Kurdish nationalism in Iraq was a potential threat to Iran's territorial integrity. For Iran, the creation of an independent Kurdistan might provoke uprisings by seven other communal groups (Turks, Arabs, Baluchis, Turkmans, Bakhtiaris, Ghashghaiis, and Luris) within its boundaries.

On the other hand, the Shah claimed that his assistance to the Kurds was designed to offset Iraqi ties with the U.S.S.R. When Iraq signed a friendship treaty with the Soviet Union in May 1972, Russian influence in the formerly British-dominated Persian Gulf increased. During these years the Shah had watched carefully as Iraq came to rely heavily on Soviet military aid and became one of the major powers in the Middle East. The Shah's insecurity was increased by the participation of Iraq's Communist Party in a coalition government in Baghdad. These factors so worried the Iranian leaders that they decided to help the Kurds, hoping to isolate and weaken Iraq (13).
In co-operation with Iran, and as part of its containment policy in the Middle East, the United States helped the Kurds. Mulla Mustafa signed an agreement with an American delegation which visited him in 1969. According to this secret agreement, the Kurds were to receive money and arms from the United States through Iran. Israel also was concerned about the Kurdish conflict, because Iraq participated in all the wars with Israel. According to Israeli authorities, as long as a major portion of the Iraqi army was busy with the Kurds, Iraq could not join other Arab states in an attack on Israel. Israeli interest in the Kurdish conflict began to increase in 1962-63, when it became a significant factor in Iraqi politics. On the other hand, since the end of World War II the Kurds had sympathized with the Jews and their efforts to create an independent state. In their statements, they indicated that the behavior of Iraq, Turkey, Iran, and Syria towards the Kurds was similar to that exercised by the dictators towards the Jews (1, p. 149).

In the beginning Israeli aid to the Kurds was only moral. Occasionally Israeli politicians supported the Kurds' struggle against the Iraqi government. (31, p. 290). A limited amount of financial aid was apparently given through Iran and intermediary organizations in Europe. Then, Israeli assistance to the Kurds was gradually increased. Israel first provided small arms and ammunition,
(19, p. 4) but in 1964 it was extended to providing training and advice. Israel also regarded Iraqi Kurdistan as "another Israel" (15, p. 301). Most of the Israeli aid was delivered through Iran. There was animosity between the Shah of Iran and the pro-Nasser Arab nationalists who dominated Iraqi politics between 1953-1968. Consequently, Iranian and Israeli interests and objectives coincided. This enabled Israel to deliver assistance to the Kurds more easily. As Sa'ad Jawad put it,

It is difficult to assess the extent of the material assistance given by the Israelis to the Kurdish Revolt, but it is an open secret that they sent some sophisticated weapons through Iran, particularly anti-tank and anti-aircraft equipment, accompanied by instructors. It is also known that some Kurds had military training in Israel while several KDP leaders made visits to Israel and high-ranking Israeli officials to Kurdistan (15, p. 303).

On March 6, 1975, Iran and Iraq signed a treaty in Algiers to resolve their differences. This treaty had three parts; first, Iran would stop its support of the Kurds; secondly, the Shatt al-Arab waterway between the two countries would no longer be totally controlled by Iraq or Iran; thirdly, border disputes between the two countries would be settled through a special commission. Following the Algiers agreement, the Shah met with Mulla Mustafa Barzani and told him that Iran would stop all assistance to the Kurds, and that he should stop military operations against Iraq. With Iran's support lost, Barzani announced
that the struggle was over. He became a refugee in Iran, along with many other Kurds (16, p. 19; 20).

This agreement hit the Kurds without warning. Iraq accepted a number of Iranian claims for border adjustments in the Shatt al-Arab river. In return, Iran agreed to seal its frontier against all subversive activities. Within twenty-four hours the Iranians withdrew their troops from the Iraqi border. Also, the flow of weapons from Iran to the Kurds in Iraq was cut off.

To summarize, during the First World War the central government in Iran disintegrated and could not control the different regions of the country. As a result, various Kurdish tribes took advantage of the situation. When the new regime considerably strengthened its power during the 1930's, Reza Shah launched a systematic campaign against the Kurds. At this time, hundreds of tribal chieftains were deported and compelled to live in forced residence in Tehran. They acted as hostages for the good behavior of their tribes. During this period, the Shah's policy was successful in a sense that the Kurds remained relatively passive until World War II.

With the division of Iran between Great Britain and the U.S.S.R in August, 1941, Kurdish nationalism emerged once again and resulted in the establishment of the autonomous Kurdish Republic of Mahabad. The life of this state was
short. It was terminated after slightly less than one year, following the withdrawal of Soviet troops in May 1946.

Although suppression and the use of violent means were common methods applied by the Iranian government in dealing with the Kurds, any help to the Kurds or use of preventive measures by Iran was based on foreign policy considerations, especially with regard to Iraq. The Iranian government's manipulation of its policy toward the Kurds to achieve foreign policy goals was shown most clearly in the signing of the Algiers Agreement with Iraq. The suppression of the Kurds in Iran was not as harsh as in Iraq. But, Iran used the Kurds in foreign policy considerations more than any other country.
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CHAPTER VII

MANAGEMENT OF KURDISH CONFLICT IN SYRIA

From World War I Until 1957

Syria was a part of the Ottoman Empire from 1517 until 1919. Over this long period, Syrian Kurds were under control of Caliphs, and they were managed by the millet system, ruling themselves as long as they paid their taxes on time and did not disturb order and security. According to the secret Sykes-Picot agreement in 1916 among Britain, France and Russia, the territory of Syria was marked as a French "area of influence." In October 1921, the Franklin-Bouillon Agreement was concluded between Paris and Ankara to fix the boundary between Turkey and Syria. According to this Agreement, a segment of the Kurdish population fell within Syrian territory.

After the War, in July, 1919, the "General Syrian Congress" declared Syria's independence. As a result, clashes soon erupted between Syrian and French troops. France and Britain met at the San Remo Conference in April 1920, where they approved France's Mandate over Syria. The League of Nations also endorsed the French Mandate in July 1922. French armed forces then moved into Syria and resumed control.
From the beginning, the Syrian Arab nationalists opposed the French rule. The French authorities tried to weaken Syrian nationalism by basing their rule upon the support of the other communal groups such as the Kurds, Druzes, and Christians. The French authorities divided Syrian territory into separate administrative units, emphasizing separation of communal interests. The Kurdish region became one of these separate units. Under the French Mandate, Syrian Kurdistan became a place of refuge for persecuted Kurds from Kemalist Turkey.

The French authorities regarded the Kurds as a favored communal group, provided that they caused no trouble. The Kurds were considered a useful counterbalance to other communal groups. Although Kurdish political activities were permitted, their freedom was limited. They were not allowed to carry arms. In the words of Edgar O'Ballance, "generally they were left to their own devices so long as they took care not to displease their French overlords" (9, p. 31).

In the years 1937-39, there was a strong independence movement among the Syrian Kurds. At the time, France needed forces to combat the Syrian National Front, and this led them to favor the Kurds. Following Syria's independence in 1946, a serious crisis occurred as a result of the army's defeat in the Palestine War of 1948. Political and military leaders accused each other of responsibility for the defeat. On March 30, 1949, the commander-in-chief of the armed
forces, General Husni Al-Zaim, carried out a coup. Zaim declared that he would eliminate widespread local rulers, institute reforms, and encourage development schemes. He attempted to suppress independence tendencies among the communal groups, beginning with steps to abolish the special status of the Kurds and the Druze. His government reduced and then eliminated communal representation in parliament (6, p. 390). The government decided to Arabize the Kurds. The Syrian constitution adopted a Pan-Arabist ideology and refused to recognize the Kurds' rights as equal to Syrian Arabs or as an autonomous communal group (10, p. 30). In August, 1949, Zaim's regime was toppled by a coup led by Sami al-Hinnawi. This coup brought no change of policies towards the Kurds.

In December of the same year, Colonel Adib Shishakli led a coup against Hinnawi because the Syrian army was against the union of Syria with Iraq. The army's growing intervention in Syrian politics brought about conflict between the military and civilians. As a result, in December of 1951, Shishakli led a second coup and established a dictatorial regime. He dissolved the parliament and abolished all parties. After 1951 Syria lacked political stability, and one government followed another. Consequently, the authorities could not be concerned with the Kurds, and there were no major conflicts between them between 1946 and 1957.
From 1957 Until 1975

In 1957, Dr. Nur ad-din az-Zaza, with the help of a group of intellectuals, workers, and peasants, founded the Kurdish Democratic Party in Syria, imitating the example of the Iraqi Kurdish Democratic Party. Its plan was to obtain recognition for the Kurds as a group entitled to autonomy. The Party advocated linguistic and cultural freedom of expression, land reform and a democratic government for Syria. Between 1958 and 1961, at the time of Syria's alliance with the United Arab Republic, President Nasser consistently refused to recognize the Syrian Kurds as a cultural minority. In 1959 many leaders of the Kurdish Democratic Party, including az-Zaza, were arrested by the government (4, p. 2). The authorities considered the Kurdish situation as a possible "second Israel" in Djezirah, where Syrian Kurds reside (10, p. 30). In September of 1961, a Syrian military junta carried out a coup which resulted in Syria's withdrawal from the UAR. Egypt at first refused to recognize the Syrian action, and in retaliation Radio Cairo supported the Kurdish national demands. The new military regime abolished many of the reforms of the UAR government. In March, 1962, a group of officers carried out another coup in order to establish a more progressive regime.
The Syrian officials decided to establish an "Arab Belt". This involved deportation of several thousands Kurds from the north-eastern part of Syria, called Djezirah, to be replaced by Arabs. The term "Arab Belt" was then changed to a "plan for the establishment of model state farms" and was later extended to the two other Kurdish areas in Syria.

Many Kurds left the northern areas of Syria for Damascus, Turkey and Lebanon to work as construction workers. The Arab belt policy was justified on the ground that the Kurds of Turkey and Iraq were intending to incorporate the Kurdish areas of Syria into an independent Kurdistan.

The government issued a legislative decree (no. 93) on August 23, 1962 for a census of the population in the area of Djezireh only. The census was carried out in November of the same year. As a result, a great number of Kurds were deprived of their Syrian citizenship. An intense campaign in the Syrian Arab press was started for the purpose of nourishing nationalist hatred amongst the Arab majority against the Kurdish population (4, pp. 2-3).

On the other hand, Vanly quotes Syrian Kurds in a "declaration" claimed that following the "Arab belt" plan:

several thousands of Kurdish peasants had to be expelled from the Turko-Syrian frontier region and deported to the interior of Syria, so that Arab peasants would be settled in their place, out of fear that the Kurds might in the future demand independence and separation from Syria. The application of the agrarian reform was suspended and the lands were not distributed to the Kurdish peasants, but were left for the Arab peasants. Moreover, since 1963, the Baathist regime has
practiced a policy of "racial discrimination" which has been growing more pronounced to the point where educated Kurdish elements find themselves excluded from teachers training colleges, from public office and from the Military College. The Kurd's own national language and culture have been suppressed. The Syrian regime continues to withhold the nationality of several thousands of Kurds from whom it was stripped by the reactionary regime of 1962. Hence they become the victims of a tragedy with all its consequences (13, p. 36).

The Baath coup that took place in Iraq in February of 1963 encouraged the Syrian Baath Party to seize power, which it did on March 8, 1963. The Kurds' position worsened when Michel Aflaq's Baath Party came to power. The new regime in Syria tried to establish a united front with the Iraqi Baath Party. The Baathists established a military one-party dictatorship and abolished all democratic liberities. They adopted and extended the above mentioned plans (4, p. 3).

On June 9, 1963, an agreement between Syria and Iraq was signed. According to the Agreement, the two countries would cooperate in order to eliminate elements endangering their existence. According to Syrian officials, the prime and most far-reaching danger threatening Jazireh and the North of Iraq is the Kurdish danger. ... For the Kurdish situation has developed in the same way as the Jewish situation in Palestine. Waves of immigrants have been allowed to break into Jazireh under any and every form and name. There are today more than 160,000 Kurds in Jazireh. They have immigrated according to a carefully worked out plan, the aim of which is to people every vacant corner of their so-called homeland with Kurds. ... the Kurds in Jazireh are even prepared to try and prevent the Syrian army from intervening in favour of the Arabs in Iraq against the movement led by Barzani. ... but today they are anxious and afraid, since
the declaration of military union between the two countries (13, pp. 17-18).

In addition, the Syrian officials argued that:

there is no difference between them and Israel, for "JUDASTAN" and "KURDISTAN" so to speak, are of the same species. To this must be added imperialist considerations and imperialist action against Arab nationalism. Such is the genuine case for drawing up a general plan to combat this pressing danger, and rejecting any improvised or partial solution (13, p. 22).

Therefore, the Syrian authorities declared their readiness to help Iraq in its war against the Kurds (1, p. 9). A Syrian brigade had already moved into western Iraq, ready to take action if required (9, p. 104). When the Iraqi government launched its attack in 1964-5 against the Kurds, Iraqi troops were supported by the Syrian brigade, about 5,000 men (9, p. 107). It was reported that Syrian aircraft were flying with the Iraqi Air Force against the Kurds. When in November, 1963, the composition of the Iraqi government changed, with widespread purging of hardline Baathists, the Syrian brigade left Iraq (9, pp. 107-108). On November 21, 1964, the Syrian government announced that it was prepared to send more troops to Iraq to suppress the Kurds.

It has been claimed that Syria needed Iraqi help in any future conflict with Israel. Therefore, the Syrians used the Kurds in their foreign policy to get help from Iraq or to hurt Iraq by helping the Kurds. In other words, when the governments of Syria and Iraq were in accord, suppressive
and coercive measures could be used against the Kurds; if not, the Kurds could be used against Iraq.

Inside Syria, the Baath government began implementing socialist policies of nationalizing banks and factories and distributing land to the peasants. In April, 1964, a new temporary constitution was proclaimed, defining Syria as a “democratic socialist republic, constituting an integral part of the Arab nation.” The Kurdish minority was not mentioned in this constitution. According to the Syrian authorities, the Kurds did not constitute a nation. They were also considered as a people without distinctive history, civilization, language or even definite communal origin (13, p. 11).

When Syria experienced another military coup on February 23, 1956, the Baathist regime adopted a twelve-point plan, which was initially directed against the Kurds. According to this plan,

1) The State must embark on an operation to transfer the population and disperse it in the interior. Beginning with the most dangerous elements the plan could afterwards be extended over two or three years. 2) Political obscurantism: not to open schools or scientific institutions in the region, since these have produced the opposite results to those anticipated. 3) The great majority of the Kurds of Jazireh are of Turkish nationality. The errors of our civil registration must therefore be corrected, and this is now being done, but in addition it is necessary to expel the elements whose nationality (Syrian) has not been proved and hand them over to the authorities of their country of region. Moreover, the nationality of Syrian elements should be upheld only within reason, after examining the manner in which this
nationality was acquired, as Syrian nationality is properly granted only by presidential decree. ... There is also the case of those who possess two or three nationalities: they must revert to their first nationality. What is important is to take note of the results of the latest census and then continue with the expulsion programme. 

4) Stop employment: opportunities of work should be closed to Kurds, in such a way that they are no longer in a position to move but in a state in which they are prepared to leave the country at any moment. This then is the task of the agrarian reform authorities: the Kurds must be forbidden to possess or to rent (lands), especially since Arab elements are available and, by the grace of God, numerous. 

5) Unleash a vast anti-Kurdish campaign among the Arabs, first of all to condition them against the Kurds, then to undermine the situation of the latter and sow in their midst the seeds of distress and insecurity. 

6) The Kurdish ulemas must be deprived of their religious authority and replaced by pure Arab ulemas. 

7) The Kurds must be antagonised against each other. 

3) Settle Arab nationalist elements in the Kurdish regions, the entire length of the borders. 

9) Proclaim the northern belt a military zone, in the same way as the front, and station there army detachments whose task will be to settle Arab and expel the Kurd, according to the plans drawn up by the state. 

10) Create collective farms for the Arabs who will be settled in the northern belt, in order to train and arm them militarily, exactly like the Jewish frontier colonies. 

11) Disenfranchise all persons in these regions who do not speak Arabic of the right to elect and be elected. 

12) Absolutely refrain from conferring Syrian nationality upon those who want to settle in this region, be their original nationality what it may, always excepting Arabs, etc. (13, pp. 27-29).

A review of the major points of this plan indicates how the Syrian government managed the Kurdish conflict. The plan stipulated that the Syrian government might design policies to transfer and disperse the Kurds, deprive them of educational and employment possibilities, extradite survivors of the uprising in northern Kurdistan to the
Turkish government, expell the Kurds living along the border with Turkey, resettle the Kurds from their region, base a military division in the Kurdish region, assimilate the Kurds to Arabic culture, and organize an anti-Kurdish campaign (3, pp. 216-217).

When the Baathist regime began to implement what they called "Arab Socialism," many of these suppressive/interventive and coercive measures were enacted. The Kurds were classified as non-Syrians. Under the pretext of socialism and reform, 140,000 Kurdish peasantry were forcefully resettled and replaced by Arabs. This was the "Arab Belt" plan mentioned above. In 1967, most of Kurdish lands were nationalized. Since then, the Kurds have been generally subject to continuous administrative surveillance, police attack, and confiscation. Kurdish Democratic Party leaders have been in prison for years. During the 1970's, some 30,000 Kurds escaped to Lebanon to find jobs and safety (3, pp. 217-213).

On May 1, 1969, when the Syrian Baath Party proclaimed a new provisional constitution, the Kurds were not mentioned again. According to this constitution, "Syria was part of the Arab-Syrian region, a democratic, popular, socialist and sovereign state and part of the Arab home land" (11, p. 381). Occasionally, the Syrian authorities denied citizenship to Syrian Kurds. By 1970 there were some 120,000 Kurds without citizenship (2, p. 470). There was no cultural,
linguistic or educational freedom for the Kurds, and the Kurdish Democratic Party was illegal. The names of villages were changed to Arab names (2, p. 470). There were repeated allegations of torture and imprisonment without trial.

Once more Syria experienced another coup in November, 1970. In a referendum which was held to select a president, Hafez Asad was the only candidate and was elected for a seven-year term on March 12, 1971. He was also chosen to be the Secretary-General of the Party in May 1971. Asad announced Syria's new policy of "openness". Within the country the new policy meant that the Kurds would be accepted within the framework of a Progressive National Front under the Baath Party's direction. Kurdish prisoners would be released; anti-Kurdish laws would be repealed; a more liberal economic policy would be implemented in Djazirah; and the general standard of living in Kurdish areas would be raised (11, p. 495-496).

In March 1973, a new constitution was written and approved by a referendum. According to this constitution, Syria is a sovereign, democratic, popular, socialist state, and a member of the Federation of Arab Republic; she is part of the Arab family of peoples, within which she is determined to work for the realization of the complete unity of the Arab people everywhere; Islamic Law is a vital source for legislation, and the official language is Arabic (11, p. 497).

It is obvious that the rights of Kurdish people likewise the former constitutions were ignored. The Baath Party guided the state policies as in the past. The Syrian
branch of the Party had advocated militant pan-Arab policies since 1963. The press and all other communications media were under strict governmental supervision and most of them were owned by the government or the Baath Party. The Syrian broadcasting service broadcast in Arabic, French, English, Russian, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Turkish and Hebrew, but not in Kurdish (11, p. 381).

In 1974, when seven leaders of the Kurdish Democratic Party protested against Arabization, they were imprisoned (12, pp. 15-16). They were accused of being anti-Arab. The Syrian government also deported or resettled the Kurdish population living along the border with Turkey. They were gradually replaced by Syrian Arabs. Some Kurds were scattered in other parts of Syria. Some others in urban areas were assimilated to Arabic culture (7, pp. 67-68; 8, p. 287; 10, pp. 30-31).

However, in 1975, Syrian authorities officially renounced any further implementation of the Baath Party's policies and the twelve-point plan, and decided to reinstate the policies of the past. They have also been trying to Arabize, that is, assimilate the Kurds. A possible explanation for this sudden change of Syrian policy was related to the rivalry between Syria and Iraq. As mentioned above, by helping the Syrian Kurds, the Syrian government might encourage the Iraqi Kurds to revolt. Syria and Iraq had long been rivals. A strong and ambitious Iraq was
particularly feared by Syria. The Syrian authorities did not want to see Iraq's power grow to the point where it could not be challenged. Hence, Syria supported the Kurds during their 1974-75 fight against the Iraqi government by providing them with sophisticated weapons (5, p. 287). Since then Kurds from Iraq to Iran and Turkey consider Syria a safe place for them. From their sanctuary in Syria they direct subversive activities in their respective homelands.

Summarizing, during the period of French rule, 1922-1945, the Kurds in Syria were treated as a favored communal group. The reason for this is that they looked upon by the French as a useful counter-balance to other communal groups within Syria. To keep their Kurds pacified, the French encouraged them to think in terms of an eventual independent Kurdistan. But although Kurdish political organizations were permitted, their political freedom was in fact only partial.

After the independence of Syria in 1945 and especially after the take over by the Baath Party in 1963, management of Kurdish conflict became a major internal and foreign policy consideration for Syrian officials. Forced assimilation to Arabic culture, resettlement, deprivation from educational and employment opportunities, and manipulation on foreign policy considerations were the main policies of successive military regimes in Syria.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

This study has been based on a central question--how the Kurdish conflict has been managed in the Middle East. Research has focused on three specific questions; i.e., (1) What means have been used? (2) What has been the degree of success or failure of applied measures? and (3) What are the possible explanations for the answers to the first two questions?

In order to study these questions, an effort was made to classify conceptually the literature about management of communal conflict. All measures were categorized as (1) preventive or non-violent and (2) suppressive or violent measures. The explicit or implicit use of armed forces distinguish these two kinds of measures. Preventive and non-violent measures were divided into two sub-categories which were called (1) Pluralistic; and (2) Nationalism. Suppressive and violent measures were categorized under two basic strategies which were (1) Suppressive; and (2) Coercive approaches. Of course, the sequence and order of the application of these approaches varies from one society to another. The suppressive and coercive measures
constitute an alternative to prevention and resolution of communal conflict, and resort to them suggests the failure or neglect of preventive tactics. The purpose of such measures is to perpetuate the preeminence of the dominant communal group, and the maintenance of the integrity of the state against possible disintegration. The suppressive actors and their supporters assume that the use of force and violence are legitimate, justified in terms of the public interest and the integrity of the state. On the other hand, the challenging communal actors disagree with this judgement and regard these measures as nonlegitimate. One person's terrorist is another's freedom fighter.

In any communal conflict situation, the authorities have access to a variety of suppressive tactics. Many circumstances may influence the decisions made and the tactics chosen. Despite the variety in approaches and techniques of communal conflict management, it does not appear that any government has found a single solution. Indeed, no regime in a communally divided society can rely exclusively on a single method. Milton Esman's argument (2) seems valid in this respect, because management of the Kurdish conflict has been conditioned by the objectives of different regimes. Since each regime had different goals, the means employed were wide-ranging.

On the first question the evidence indicates that the Kurdish people have constantly been subjected to suppressive
and coercive measures of conflict resolution by the Middle Eastern countries, and at times by European powers and the superpowers as well. The territorial division of Kurdistan by major European powers; deprivation of political and cultural rights; discrimination; forced assimilation; resettlement and deportation; confiscation of the lands and property of the Kurds by force; changing the Kurdish names of villages and towns in Kurdistan; imprisonment and execution; genocide; exploitation in internal and foreign policies constitute examples of such measures.

The evidence of the use of these measures can be seen throughout the history of the Middle East, dating back to the Ottoman Empire. Historically, under the Ottoman and Safavid Empires, the Kurds enjoyed a kind of pluralist system, called the millet system. These Empires used the Kurds as border guards to protect their borders from foreign threats. Because of the emergence of nationalism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the millet system could not function and failed. In an effort to ensure complete control over the Kurds, the Ottoman Empire resorted to suppressive and coercive measures. When the Ottoman Empire disintegrated, Kurdistan was divided among Turkey, Iraq, and Syria, in accordance with the interests of European Powers in the Middle East. These countries have at times found opportunities to use the Kurds in their mutual relations, to deal with or put pressure on each other. Turkey, Iraq,
Iran, and Syria have on occasion supported the Kurds both materially and morally to achieve their goals in foreign policy. On the other hand, these countries have resorted to suppression when necessary to pacify the Kurds within their national borders.

The four countries which contain Kurdistan had been aware of the consequences of the Kurdish conflict, and had seen how a revolt by the Kurds in any one country could stimulate action among their counterparts in the others. A common fear of the Kurds on the part of the host countries promoted a form of tacit or official cooperation between and among the Middle Eastern countries, as in the Agreement between Iraq and Turkey in 1926, the Agreement between Turkey and Iran in 1932, the Saadabad Treaty between Turkey, Iran, and Iraq in 1937, the Baghdad Pact between Iran, Iraq and Turkey in 1955, the Agreement between Iraq and Syria in 1963, and the Iran-Iraqi Agreement of 1975, all designed to suppress and counter a possible unified Kurdish movement. It should be noted that cooperation among these countries rarely took the form of joint military action. However, the four countries would be expected to take joint action if the Kurds united and threatened to endanger the national integrity of the states. None of the four countries want an independent Kurdistan on their borders. Its creation would result in losing of territory on their part. However, the interests of these countries were not always identical, and
their long-standing differences sometimes encouraged them to use the Kurds against one another.

Over the years the center of suppression has shifted from one country to another. It first started in Turkish Kurdistan from 1925 to 1938. It then moved to Iraqi Kurdistan from 1943 to 1945; then to Iranian Kurdistan in 1946 during the Kurdish Republic of Mahabad and finally back to Iraqi Kurdistan from 1961 to 1975. The degree of suppression and violence has varied among countries. In some cases the suppression was extreme, as in Kemalist Turkey and Iraq. In Iran and Syria, it was moderate.

While the Kurds were suppressed by the Middle Eastern countries, at the same time they were subjected to forced assimilation. Turkification, Arabization, or Iranianization were used by the various central governments to assimilate the Kurdish population. The authoritarian regimes in Iraq, Turkey, Iran, and Syria tried to create a new national identity in one or two generations. The results of this technique were not positive, because of the persistence of communal solidarities among the Kurds. The visible indications of assimilation or integration were forced and coerced. The governments of Turkey and Iran tried to minimize the differences of the Kurds from other communal groups inside those countries. The Turks referred to them as "Mountain" or "East" Turks, and the Iranian government categorized them loosely with all other communal groups in
Iran. The Iraqi government did not make any claim that the Kurds are really Arabs. However, the whole Iraqi population was considered a part of the Arab nation. All the attempts made by Turks, Persians and Arabs to impose their languages upon the Kurds have resulted in failure. After World War I, in Turkey the use of the Kurdish language was forbidden by law. With the exception of a few Kurdish schools in one region in Iraq, schools in Kurdish villages in that country and in Syria were conducted in Arabic. In Iran the Kurds were compelled to get their education in Persian.

A common barrier to assimilation of communal groups in the Middle East is the fact that there are no secular states in the region. As Lewis W. Snider puts it:

The political identities of the majority population in the Arab states and Israel are based on ethnic religious nationalism. There is an intimate connection between the identity of the state and religion and culture of the majority which inevitably assigns an inferior political status for religious or ethnic minorities (3, p. 242).

The absence of secularism restricts the possibilities for the assimilation of communal groups. Efforts to manage communal conflict by creating a national identity or assimilation have not only been unsuccessful, they have also led to widespread resistance and violence.

Another reason for the failure of assimilation is the strength of Kurdish communal feelings. A centuries-old culture demonstrated a toughness and resistance to attack.
It may be hypothesized that the attacks strengthened the ties among the Kurds.

Instances of the use of preventive measures were usually designed to exploit the Kurds for foreign policy considerations (Iran, Syria, Iraq, Israel, Egypt, France, the United States and the Soviet Union), or to appease them for public policy considerations inside states (Iran, Turkey, Iraq, and Syria). Communal conflicts have been managed as means of achieving regime objectives rather than from considerations of justice, democracy, pluralism or respect for communal identity and individual rights. They were exploited by their own host countries and superpowers.

The Kurds supported the Young Turks' regime (the Turkish national and reformist movement) and fought against foreign intervention in Turkey. But when Mustafa Kemal strengthened his position, he suppressed the Kurdish people. The Kurds were paid back with mass executions and deportations. The Kurds supported and played a major role in Iraqi independence movements and the overthrow of dictatorial regimes, but when these changes occurred, all the promises to the Kurds were forgotten. Their demands for political, social, economic, and cultural rights were suppressed by successive Iraqi regimes. In Iran, the Kurds were supportive of democratic movements. But they were suppressed by the Pahlevi dynasty. In Syria, the Kurds have always stood side by side with the Arab people in the
national struggle and overthrowing of dictatorial regimes. But after independence and regime changes, whichever group took power suppressed the Kurds and deprived them of their political and other rights.

During the First World War, the Kurds sided with the Allies. Yet their demands were ignored by the Allies and the League of Nations. Later the Kurds supported the British. They were suppressed by them. During the Second World War, they again aided the Allies. Again they were betrayed and ignored in the United Nations. Consequently, the Kurds turned to the Soviet Union. Once again, the Kurds were one of the main consideration in the Soviet Union's foreign policy toward the Middle East and the Allies. These experiences suggest that management of Kurdish conflict has been based not only on internal considerations, but also has been a function of foreign policy problems for these countries. In several cases, notably those of Iran, Iraq and Syria, treatment of the Kurds was at times a function of foreign policy. Sometimes this meant favorable treatment; sometimes it meant suppression. In other words, the management of the Kurdish conflict has been subject to the interaction of the nation-states which surround them.

In terms of internal policy considerations, preventive and non-violent measures occasionally have been devised in a number of Middle Eastern countries. But as the Kurdish case indicates, few of them have been willing to apply such
measures. This reluctance stems from their political elites' concentration upon the building of a national consensus and integrity. What makes these states hesitant to shift towards preventive measures, such as pluralism or federalism, is the fear of secession.

Thus, the question of communal identity and management of communal conflict among the Middle Eastern societies continues to be a fundamental factor not only in guiding public policies, that is, the cultural, educational, legal, economic, and demographic policies of the governments in the Middle East, but also in constituting the foundation on which some of these countries are building their historical claims for influence and territory. The problem of communal identity, in turn, relates to the rise of nationalities and nationalism, and it consequently relates to a desire for independent national states.

On the second question, i.e., the degree of success or failure of applied measures, one would notice that although suppressive and violent means have remained the most prevalent strategies of conflict regulation, and have been effective in the short run, they have not been effective and successful alternatives for resolution of communal conflict in the long run. The duration and repetition of the Kurdish conflict up to now supports this proposition.

In one sense, the four countries with Kurdish populations have succeeded in suppressing Kurdish national
aspirations. There is no independent Kurdistan, nor any likelihood of one being formed as of the close of this study. In another sense, the four countries have failed to solve the Kurdish problem. The Kurds remain a distinct communal group in all four countries. Their desire for autonomy has not weakened. They have not been assimilated. If, as of 1983, the Kurds still exist as an identifiable group, with their language and feelings of group solidarity intact, then all the efforts to assimilate or exterminate them obviously have been unsuccessful. If violent means have failed overall, they may have succeeded in the short run in the mind of particular political leaders; that is, a particular leader may be satisfied if the Kurds were simply quiet and inactive, even if they were not assimilated or dispersed. So success or failure has more than one dimension.

On the third question, i.e., possible explanations for applied measures and their success or failure, it should be noted that because of the diversity of the techniques of communal conflict management, as the experience of the Kurds indicated, solutions are wide ranging. Certainly there is no single explanation of management of communal conflict in the Middle East, but rather a number of interacting internal and external factors must be taken into consideration in order to understand the matter.
The choice of violent means was influenced by the lack of a non-violent tradition in Middle Eastern politics. In the Middle East, as the case of the Kurds indicates, not only have preventive measures seldom been applied, but also there are no clearly defined procedures for political elite recruitment, political participation, decision-making in regard to public policies, and responsibility of the central government towards communal groups.

In democratic communally divided societies of the West, political arrangements allow preventive and nonviolent measures to be reflected at least in four respects. First, in such societies the patterns of political elites' recruitment have been spelled out clearly in constitutions and statutes. Secondly, the formal rights of political participation and membership are defined. Thirdly, procedures for decision making in regard to public policies have been determined. Finally, the extent of responsibilities of the central government vis-a-vis communal groups are clearly explicated.

It is evident that because of the lack of requisites of democracy and pluralism, the political concepts and techniques of Western democracies have not been applied effectively in any of the Middle Eastern countries. In these states, communal group leaders played an important role in the movements to create a democratic government. At the planning stage democratic slogans were taken literally.
The promise of the creation of representative institutions was supported by all communal groups, majority and minority alike, in order to end autocracy and have a voice in the determination of governmental policies. But constitutions and institutional arrangements were very soon transformed into agencies of the dominant communal group.

In the Middle East, there has been an increasing tendency for states to be despotic, in the sense that transfers of power are usually achieved by violent means such as revolutions, riots, coups, insurrections, rebellions, and assassinations. As indicated by the experiences of Turkey (the military dictatorship of Ataturk between 1922-1938 and military coups in 1960, 1962, 1963 and 1971), Iraq (four coups in 1958, 1963, 1966 and 1968), Iran (two coups and several examples of internal unrest in 1953, 1960, and 1961), and Syria (military coups in 1961, 1962, 1963, 1966, and 1970), regime changes have been frequently associated with violence. Therefore, communal conflict is usually dealt with by repression rather than by institutional arrangements.

A second reason for the choice of violence and suppression has been that all the Middle Eastern countries have sought to establish nation-states on the Western pattern. But nation-states have emerged in the West only where earlier local community or district loyalties have given way to a larger common allegiance. In other words,
the communal groups in the West and the European countries who were attracted by nationalistic slogans were not aware of belonging to separate communal groups. Therefore, there was no conflict over group allegiance to a broader nationalistic identity. Such a condition has never existed in the Middle East. For this reason, a single communal group in each state has come to dominate the other communal groups. For example, Turkish-speaking Sunni Muslims in Turkey, Persian-speaking Shi'itic Muslims in Iran and Sunni Arabs in Iraq and Syria have dominated other communal groups. The state has become essentially the agency of a dominant communal group. Such groups have often tried to insure permanent advantage by suppressing other communal groups. They believe that communal groups should be assimilated or exterminated. Therefore, dominance by one communal group will result in alienation of others from the political system. Such alienation is not only political but also cultural and socio-economic. As the case of the Kurds indicates, they were alienated from the societies in which they lived.

The root cause of the conflicts was a clash of nationalism. The Kurds sought their own nation-state; the four governments were engaged in nation-building, or more aptly, nation-state building. This was their highest priority, and dictated their negative response to the idea of Kurdish autonomy. Turkish, Iraqi, Iranian and Syrian
nationalism was associated largely with the urban, modern, middle and upper classes in these states. Turks and Iranians recalled the glories of the past and bolstered their pride. Iraq and Syria, on the other hand, were newly independent states which were very sensitive to their nationalism. Therefore, one of the reasons which justified the use of coercive and suppressive measures against the Kurds was that the Middle Eastern countries were very concerned about their nationalism and territorial integrity. Any communal group which endangered or undermined the integrity, unity, internal order, or security of a state encountered a harsh reaction from the host countries. This means that the political integrity of the sovereign state has been much more important than the idea of communal groups self-determination.

The choice of violent and suppressive means of conflict resolution was finally in part a response to the Kurd's own methods. They engaged in revolt and insurrection many times, especially in Turkey and Iraq. Governments were in part responding to violence with violence.

Having suggested reasons for the choice of means, we turn to explanations for the failures and the successes of the means. In the first place, the failure of suppressive measures against the Kurds was associated with the transnational dispersion of the Kurdish population. That is, governments who were hosts to the Kurds had their own
quarrels, and especially in the case of Iran, Iraq and Syria, at times foreign policy considerations led to support or favorable treatment for the Kurds. For example, Iran's support of Iraqi Kurds resulted in the failure of Iraq's repression of them. To the extent that suppressive measures failed to destroy Kurdish nationalism or the Kurds as a distinct people, part of the reason had to do with the spread of the Kurds across national boundaries. They thus had sanctuaries and havens available against attacks. This must help explain why no country has had a high degree of success in this regard, and why the Kurdish conflict persists throughout the period of the study. Management of communal groups is more difficult if they have support and a safe refuge with fraternal groups across international boundaries; likewise, it should be expected that success in managing such conflicts should increase in situations where the communal groups have no such support and have no place to go.

A second reason for failure of repression is that, as the case of the Kurds indicates, communal conflict has been associated with weaknesses in the governments of countries in which they live. The Kurds have taken advantage of periods of internal violence, regime change, or international crisis to try to obtain autonomy. The creation of the ill-fated Kingdom of Kurdistan and the semi-independent province in Iran by Simko after the First World War, the
creation of the Kurdish Republic of Mahabad after the Second World War, and the autonomy movements of 1960's in Iraq after four regime changes were examples of Kurdish attempts to take advantage of international crises, internal violence, and regime changes.

The success of suppressive measures resulted in part from the failure of the Kurds to unite and organize effectively among themselves. Internal divisions among the Kurds weakened them and their cause.

The success of repressive means resulted also from the fact that the opponents of the Kurds had the power of the state behind them: the power to tax, the modern army and weapons, international acceptance, and so forth.

A third and final reason for the success of suppressive measures was the failure of the Kurds to gain the support of major powers for their cause. Since the general international organizations (the League of Nations and the United Nations) tended to be dominated in their early stages by great powers (Great Britain and France in the case of the League, the United States in the case of the United Nations), lack of support from major powers meant that the Kurds also got no support from the international organizations.

All efforts and appeals of the Kurds to interest the United Nations have been unsuccessful, because they have had no strong ally willing to push their cause before the
General Assembly. Their own delegates were dismissed or forgotten. Despite Kurdish hopes based on the Atlantic Charter, and the Yalta and Tehran conferences, as well as statements made by the League of Nations and the United Nations concerning the granting of freedom and independence to communal groups, no action was taken toward the resolution of the Kurdish conflict by international organizations or conferences. Furthermore, the continuous state of tension and crises in the Middle East, especially the Arab-Israeli conflict, overshadowed the Kurdish conflict. As James S. Bill and Carl Leiden put it, "the Kurds are under too many jurisdictions; their territory is landlocked; they have few resources, and the world does not care about them" (1, p. 198).
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APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

ahl al-kitab: People of the book, possessor of the Scripture, i.e., Jews and Christians, to whom were added later Sabeans and Zoroastrians.

ahl al-sunna: orthodox traditions, the Sunnites.

Alawi: Members of a Shii sect who consider Ali the incarnation of the deity, hence the name Alawi. They inhabit mountainous regions of northern Syria and southeastern Turkey.

aman: protection, safe conduct, safety.

al-Shahada: Testimony, whether in the ordinary sense of the word, the statement of an eye-witness, or in the religious and legal sense. In the religious use of the word shahada is the Muslim profession of Faith: "there is no god but God; Muhammed is the Prophet of God."

Arab: Member of a group of people who live in the area from Morocco to Iraq and speak the Arabic language. They are predominantly Muslim but encompass a large number of Christian minorities.

Armenian: Member of a group of people who speak Armenian and are of the Christian faith. They live in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic and throughout the Middle East, Europe, North America, and South America.

Askeri: One of the common Arabic terms for the army.

ayan: Plural of the Arabic Ayn in the sense of "notable person" and often used to denote the eminent under the caliphate and subsequent Muslim regimes. Under the Ottoman regime, it implied to the most distinguished inhabitants of and district or town.

Ba'ath: A political party founded in Syria in the early 1940s that advocates Arab unity and socialism. Its name means "renaissance".

capitulation (imtiyaz): Commercial privileges. All of the commercial privileges included, either explicitly or
implicitly, the following provisions with respect to the status of non-Muslim merchants in dar al-islam: 1) General security of person and property; 2) Exterritoriality; 3) Abolition of collective responsibility.

cizya or jizya: in the early conquests a tax imposed upon the subject populations, which later developed into a poll tax imposed upon dhimmis.

dar al-harb: The abode of war, the land of war, i.e., those countries where Muslim law is not in force.

dar al-islam: The abode of Islam, the land of Islam, i.e., territory in which Muslim law prevails.

dhimma: engagement, obligation, responsibility. To designate the sort of indefinitely renewed contract through which the Muslim community accords hospitality and protection to members of other revealed religious, on condition of their acknowledging the domination of Islam.

dhimmī: one who has the status of someone belonging to the ahl al-kitab.

Druze: Member of an independent religious sect founded in the eleventh century that draws its beliefs from Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Its adherents speak Arabic and are concentrated in mountainous areas of Syria, Lebanon, and Israel.

hukm or hukum: sovereignty, authority, an act or office of adjudication, dispensing justice, a decree, regulation, order.

Imam: "supreme leadership" of the Muslim community after the death of the Prophet. For Shii Muslims, one of the divinely inspired descendants of Muhammad through his daughter Fatima and his cousin and son-in-law Ali.

Islahat Ferman: a decree of reform.

Ithnaashariyya: name of that branch of Shii Islam that believes in twelve Imams beginning with Ali and ending with Muhammad al-Mehdi.

Janissaries: An elite corps of soldiers and administrators in the Ottoman Empire who were first organized in the fourteenth century. It became a state within the state, and in 1826 was abolished by Mahmud II.

jihad or djihad: holy war. Form of war which is
permissible in Islam, for, in theory, Islam must constitute a single community organized under a single authority and any armed conflict between Muslims is prohibited. Today, the term has multiple connotations and can mean broadly a freedom struggle carried on with passion and willingness to sacrifice one's life. The person who engages in jihad is called a mujahid.

jiwar: protection, safe conduct, neighbourhood.

khalifa: a successor, representative, a caliph. One of the successors of Muhammad as the spiritual and temporal leader of the Muslim community.

ma'mar: the place of safety.

milla or millet: a community, also used synonymously with umma. In the Ottoman Empire, a semiautonomous non-Muslim community organized under a religious head of its own.

Mosaic pattern: A society in which groups live next to one another but without a sense of common purpose or identity. The connecting links among them are few.

mustamin: one enjoying a guarantee of safety for a limited period. The person who has received an aman.

Quran: The sacred scripture of Muslims, who believe it to be the literal word of God transmitted to humankind through the Prophet Muhammad.

ra'aya or raya: subjects, peasants.

sharia: The sacred law of Islam. Islamic law derived primarily from the Quran and governing in theory not only religious matters but also political, economic, civil, criminal, and domestic affairs.

shii: Lit., "Follower." A sect of Islam which believes in Ali, the first cousin of the Prophet Mohammad and the husband of his daughter Fatimah. The Shiias maintain that Ali was the first legitimate Imam and the rightful successor to the Prophet.

sultan: power, temporal government, an independent or paramount ruler.

sunna: a precedent, normative legal custom; a tradition (of the prophet).

tanzimat: reform, reformation.
umma or ummat: the Islamic community.

Zoroastrianism: The religion of pre-Islamic Iran that was founded by the Prophet Zoroaster.
APPENDIX B

COMMUNAL GROUPS DATA FOR MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES
(Estimate of Mid-1973 Population)

Introduction

The data in the Appendix B derive from numerous sources. Among these, the following are used extensively:


With the help of these sources, population estimates are made of major religious, linguistic, and communal groups in the Middle East. Several points have to be kept in mind about the data in this appendix. In the first place, with regard to numbers, we often have to be content with approximations because with the world population increasing at an accelerated pace, even the most accurate data may be out of date within a few years. In the second place, some of the countries of the Middle East have never undertaken a thorough census. As is common in the developing countries,
accurate population figures often are invariably nonexistent. Current figures are estimates based on previous studies carried out by colonial administrations. Most of the figures about the communal groups are speculative. The data in this section have been derived from numerous sources. Current demographic figures published by the countries themselves do not in all cases show an ethnic breakdown because of the central governments' desire to de-emphasize ethnicity in order to reinforce the concept of a homogeneous national population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNAL GROUPS</th>
<th>POPULATION (000)</th>
<th>PERCENT OF POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>33,730</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi'i</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Orthodox</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>38,840</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNAL GROUPS</td>
<td>POPULATION (000)</td>
<td>PERCENT OF POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shii</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldean</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaic</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNAL GROUPS</td>
<td>POPULATION (000)</td>
<td>PERCENT OF POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi</td>
<td>31,120</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorian</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldean</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics/Protestant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoroastrian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkic/Azari</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluchi</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNAL GROUPS</td>
<td>POPULATION (000)</td>
<td>PERCENT OF POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alawi</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismaili</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shii</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Orthodox</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorian/Armenian</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Orthodox</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Catholic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maronite</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druze</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Amin Zaki, Mohammed, Summary of Kurish History From Earlist Times Up to the Present, Cairo, Saada Press, 1931.


Committee for the Advancement of Kurdistan, An Appeal Concerning the Tragic Condition of the Kurdish People in Syria, n. p., n. p., 1957.


----------, The Emergence of the Middle East, Berkeley, University of California, 1980.


Iranlari Mutarakki Rushenfikarlar Jam'iyyeti (Asas Namah), Text in Azari, Azarbayjan, n. p., 197-.


----------------, Political and Social Thought in the Contemporary Middle East, New York, Praeger, 1968.


-----------------, Notes and Documents from the Turkish Archives, Jerusalem, The Israel Oriental Society, no. 3, 1952.


Nordlinger, Eric A., Conflict Regulation in Divided Societies, Occasional Papers in International Affairs, no. 29, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, Center for International Affairs, 1972.


Pierce, Joe E., Understanding the Middle East, Rutland, Vt., Tuttle, 1971.


Shahrirvarin or Ikisi 1324-1325 Azarbayjan, Text in Azari, r. p., League of the Progressive Turkish Intellectuals, 1977.


Thayer, Philip W., Tension in the Middle East, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1958.


Urquhart, David, Turkey and Its Resources, London, Saunders, and Otley, 1833.


Young, George, Nationlism and War in the Middle East, Oxford, H. Milford, 1915.


ARTICLES AND PAPERS


Cruickshank, A. A., "International Aspects of the Kurdish Question," International Relations, 3 no. 6 (October, 1968), 411-430.

Dann, Uriel, "The Kurdish National Movement in Iraq," The Jerusalem Quarterly, no. 9 (Fall, 1978), 131-144.


Hah, Chong-Do and Martin, Jeffrey, "Toward a Synthesis of Conflict and Integration Theories of Nationalism," World Politics, 27 no. 3 (April, 1975), 361-386.


----------, "The Kurds and Their Importance in the Middle East," Jewish Frontier, 26 (July, 1959), 11-12.


Patai, Raphael, "The Dynamics of Westernization in the Middle East," Middle East Journal, 9 no. 1 (Winter, 1955), 1-16.


Rothchild, Donald, "Ethnicity and Conflict Resolution," World Politics, 22 no. 7 (July, 1970), 597-515.


"Peace With the Kurds (Iraq)" New Outlook, 13 (May 1970) 35-42; (June 1970) 32-40.


Documents


United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Foreign Policy-Middle East, Staff Study, 95th Congress, 2nd Session, No. 13, June 9, 1960.
Encyclopedia Articles


Unpublished Materials

Howell, W. N. Jr., The Soviet Union and The Kurds, (M.A. Theses) University of Virginia, 1955.


Newspapers


Time, September 23, 1952.