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Introduction:
The article is a glimpse into the history of nationalism in the Muslim world. It surveys the initial waves of nationalist ideology in some major Muslim countries, and deals with different aspects of nationalist movements in the Muslim world in general.

The idea of nationalism was accepted in Europe during the nineteenth century after the French Revolution(1) as a supreme political gospel. It was worshipped by people almost like a secular religion,(2) and the nation-builders were idolized as heralding a new era in world civilization. Nationalism is the foundation rock over which the whole super-structure of the modern state system has been built. Basically, it is a state of mind; a cultural phenomenon through which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be owed to the nation-state.(3) It emerged as humanity’s dramatic leap forward from its tribal existence to a bigger unit of socio-political organization. Nationalism generally appears among people who demonstrate deep identification with a particular territory and a common culture which they idolize. All these elements are then strengthened with an overriding desire for political independence. On the world scene, the last element becomes the most critical dimension of nationalism. It raises an extremely sensitive issue of sovereignty of the state. It is only when people sharing the above mentioned common traits demand political independence, and develop an inflexible fixation to their sovereign existence that nationalism becomes a potent manifestation of people’s collective will.(4)

a. Nationalism - A Reaction to Imperialism:
Developments in Europe undeniably had a profound impact on the mindset and thought processes of the Muslim intellectuals who were being educated in the European political tradition during the nineteenth century.(5) The role of the nation state and nationalism has been the central theme and an ‘invariable constant’ in the modern history of the Islamic world. It has been confirmed as the dominant, extremely flexible view of the world among Muslims in spite of the passage of a succession of distinct ideological political phases.(6) The Muslim world was caught under the spell
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of nationalism as a reaction to the colonialism of the Western nations who made their lands the playgrounds of imperialism. In the words of Hans Kohn, “Just as formerly French imperialism had roused German nationalism, and Austrian imperialism Italian and Czech nationalism, so too… in the East, imperialism acted as the awakener of nationalism.” (7)

The spirit of nationalism was so extensive in the Muslim world that with the passage of time in all Muslim lands, from Indonesia to Morocco, the main theme of the statesmen and scholars was territorial nationalist appeal and in each case inspiration was derived from the intellectual and philosophical heritage of the West. All nationalist leaders emphasized mostly on unity, freedom, past glories and future hopes but their main thrust was independence. The tempo of the international developments, and the pace of internal changes in the Muslim states was so accelerated that even the Arab world which, in language, culture, history, religion and ethnicity, had been one for centuries, was divided into small states, and each state then started to develop its own nationalistic identity. Iraq, Palestine, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria with all the lustrous legacy of their Arabism, decided to live as separate states rather than be linked into some pan-Islamic frame work.(8)

Modern intelligentsia and political elites who grew in the imperial environment on the one hand, promoted hatred for Western colonialists, and on the other hand, highlighted the cultural heritage of their respective lands, and stressed the need for independent homelands. This generation of modern intelligentsia endorsed and promoted the ideology of nationalism for several reasons. Foremost was their upbringing in the Western education system and the intense glow of self-confident European supremacy. Hence, they shared the convictions of their colonial rulers and instructors. Being well aware and well informed of the national and political symbols, they preferred state sponsored political movements over local affiliations. “An independent national state was the only potential homeland for people who no longer belonged to their old communities and for whom colonial political societies could only offer subordinate positions.” (9) The adoption of secular nationalism as the dominant ideology also provided this new political intelligentsia the opportunity to differentiate themselves from the established elites, “and could serve as a mobilizing symbol in the competition for the supporter of the other uprooted strata of the society and as a claim to leadership of the masses.”(10)

Nationalism also served better than Islamic modernism to symbolize the ambiguous relation of Muslim intelligentsia to colonial political domination. On the one hand, secularism and nationalism signified that the intelligentsias were the advanced elements of society and justified their
claims to participate in colonial regimes. On the other hand, nationalism also legitimized resistance to foreign rule in the eyes of European as well as Muslim peoples. (11)

Besides the support of political elites, Islamic modernism also played an active part. They not only reawakened Muslims to a sense of past power and glory but also produced interpretations of Islamic teachings compatible with modern ideologies. They pointed out that adopting modern Western systems of governance, education, civil society and the scientific method did not amount to subservience to Western powers and loss of Islamic identity. They categorically rejected Western hegemony and imperialism. They advocated the ideas of Muslim unity and independence:

“On the one hand, nationalism was a reaction to Western imperialism, to European colonial rule. On the other hand, it was in a sense also the product of a century of Westernizing reform. Many of these who led nationalism and independence movements owed their training to the West and were influenced by the liberal nationalist beliefs and ideals of the French Revolution (liberty, equality, fraternity) and, more especially modern Western political values and institutions such as democracy, constitutional government, parliamentary rule, individual rights and nationalism. In contrast to the traditional Islamic ideal in which political community (Ummah) based upon common belief, modern nationalism represented the notion of national communities based not upon religion but upon common language, territory, ethnic ties, and history.”(12)

In many parts of the Muslim world, reformers and nationalists joined together to form a potent force; modernist discourses persuaded Muslim masses to liberate themselves from colonial domination and political leaders legitimized this patriotism. The major themes of modernists inspired and complemented nationalist concerns: the preservation of Muslim identity in the face of the threat of political and cultural assimilation of Islam; the achievement of Muslim unity and solidarity to attain autonomy and independence.(13) Arab modernists’ highlighted Islamic symbols such as the Qur’ân and the Holy Prophet, pointing out that these were from Arab and raised the slogan of Arab nationalism even though the framework of Arab nationalism was organized by Christian intellectuals of Syria.(14) The spirit of nationalism changed the mode of thinking of Arabs and Muslims.

Islam played an important role in the development of anti-colonial independence movements and modern nationalism. It proved a factor to varying degrees in the development of local and regional nationalism: Arab, Egyptian, Algerian, Tunisian, Moroccan, Iranian, Pakistani, Malaysian, and
Indonesian. However, if religion was one factor, it was far from the only one. The appeal to Islam varied regionally conditioned by local contexts. In some areas, Islam was a prominent factor while in others it was subordinated to secular nationalism. (15)

In the Ottoman Empire, young Turks turned down the idea of pan-Islamism and adopted a secular constitutionalist position. In Tunisia, the first generation elites blended Islamic modernists and secular orientations, but were followed in the 1930s by an independence movement which was articulated mainly in secular nationalist terms. “In Egypt, the first generation of modernist intelligentsia was superseded by secular liberal political parties. In India the Aligarh graduates were secular and modernist in lifestyle and personal religious orientation, but for reason peculiar to the subcontinent developed a commitment to the formation of a “Muslim” national state. Only in Indonesia did the priyayi elites bypass the Islamic modernist phase and enter directly into secular nationalist literary and political opposition to Dutch rule. In Indonesia, the shallow integration of Islamic values into the historic cultural orientation of the political elite helped to explain the immediate adoption of secular nationalism.” (16)

b. Love for watani: Turkish Cultural Consciousness:
About the origin of nationalism in the Muslim world, it is said that the Turks were the first to be caught by the spirit of militant nationalism. Morali Essyeid Ali Effendi, an Ottoman ambassador to France after the French Revolution, was the first Turkish statesman who in his reports paid tribute to the zeal and fervor of the Frenchman for their watani. In later years, the term wataniyyaat became such a common theme in the political vocabulary of the Ottoman scholars that in the famous constitutional document Khatt-i-Gulkhanan, there were references to wataniyyat, and love of country was heightened as a great political virtue. (17) “The humiliation of Turks in the Greek War of Independence in 1831 and the Crimean War of 1851 provided an impetus for Turkish nationalism which kept on gaining momentum as the years rolled by. During this period, the proponents of nationalism even started publishing a newspaper called Ayina-i-watani. (18)

In the beginning, this loyalty and love for watani was cognizant with the Ottoman Empire and Islam but with the passage of time Turkish cultural consciousness started taking shape among the intelligentsia. With the decline of the Ottoman Empire, Anatolia was glorified as the homeland of the Turks, and peasants as the backbone of a Turkish nation. Various literary circles and organizations were formed such as the Turkish Homeland Society and the Turkish Hearth to publicize the idea of “Turkish” among the masses by simplifying the Turkish language to make it
accessible to the masses, and persuade the populace of its own Turkish nationality.

Namik Kemal (1840-1888), the product of reformatory era of Sultan Mahmud II was an eminent scholar who wrote on a variety of subjects, but love of Father-land was the pivotal concept in this thought. “He infused in Turkish nationalism in the romantic fervor that had characterized nationalist movements in Europe. In his opinion, the nation is not only a geographical unit, but also a powerful reservoir of emotions which bind different parochial cultures within a specified territory into a compact unified political entity.”(19) Namik’s entire thesis about nationalism was drawn from the Western tradition and concerned Turkey only, and this is the reason that even today his words are passionately read by the Turkish people.(20) Ziya Goklap (1875-1924), a distinguished spokesman of Turkish nationalism (21) also celebrated the folk culture of the Turkish people, and called for the reform of Islam to make it expressive of the Turkish ethos.

In the beginning, the Turkish patriotic movement was confined only to a limited circle of Western educated intellectuals, but with the passage of time, as series of administrative and constitutional reforms were introduced into the empire, the circle of nationalist patriots widened a great deal, and the Turkish masses in general were also attracted to it.(22) The Turkish national idea reinforced the tendencies towards secularism and modernity, for it made it possible for the Turks to separate themselves from Islam without compromising their non-Western identity. The Turkish concept made it possible to define a new civilization which embodied the historic identity of the Turkish people but was not Muslim and which was modern but not Western.(23)

c. Glorification of Egyptian Civilization:

Among the Muslim nations, the spirit of nationalism was the strongest in Egypt(24) as Egypt was the first to become the playground for European imperialism. The establishment of “Egyptian Foundation” by Napoleon to promote research in ancient history and culture of Egypt endorsed Egyptian-ness. French Orientalist discourses glorified the magnificence of Egyptian culture and nation which inspired Egyptian intellectuals. Rifaa Rafi al Tahtawi (1801-1873) provided the lead in this direction; during his stay in Paris between 1826 and 1831, he became a great admirer of the French tradition of patriotism. He discovered the splendor of Egyptian civilization from the writing of Sylvester De Sacy who was the leading Orientalist of the Napoleon Scholars team. In order to make his patriotic message more attractive and romantic, he decided to versify Egypt’s past. In 1855, he published Qasida Wataniyyah Misriyya (A Panegyric in praise of Egypt) and Manzumat Wataniyyaha Misriyya (poems of Egyptian
patriotism). These poems adorned the exploits of Egyptian scholars who fought in the Crimean War and took part in the expeditionary forces sent by Napoleon III of France to Mexico. (25) Tahtāwi’s nationalism was characteristically Egyptian, because he did not take into consideration any other Arabic-speaking country. (26) His love for pre-Islamic Egypt was further testified by the translation into Arabic of a European book on the Pharos in 1838. (27) In other words, all the works of Tahtāwi were filled with his undiminished pride in the ancient glories of Egypt. (28) Mustafa Kamil (1874-1908), another nationalist writer not only propounded the idea of a unified nation which would be patriotic in spirit, passionate in its hatred of foreign rule, but also advocated constitutional form of government and Western type of education.

Among others, Lutfi al-Sayyid’s (1872-1963) (29) promotion for secular nationalism is notable. As a strong proponent of freedom, he declared it the basis of society. “Freedom from foreign rule, freedom from state control, and recognition (30) of the inherent civil and political rights of citizens were in essential principles. For Lutfi al-Sayyif, nationalism meant independence and also a new political and social system for Egypt.” (31) Tāhā Hussain (1889-1973), Ali Abdur Raziq (1888-1996) and Abdullah al-Nadim (1844-1896) were also great admirers of Egypt’s past glories and provoked the feelings of Egyptianness. (32)

d. Pakistan – an Islamic Ideological State:
Indo Pakistan was another area of the world where the Muslims maintained their identity despite the fact that they are outnumbered by Hindus by a very wide margin. The various Muslim dynasties that ruled the sub continent left a cultural legacy that helped the Muslims of the Sub Continent a great deal to remain a distinct religious community. During the nineteenth century, the spirit of nationhood got additional potency as fanatic Hindu organizations declared Islam a foreign religion and its followers, aliens. As the momentum of the struggle for independence for the Sub-Continent against the British increased with the passage of time, the Muslims became extremely restless, fearing that in a Hindu dominated political system their national identity would be seriously damaged. (33) This led to the emergence of a movement which, under the leadership of Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1876-1948), culminated in the establishment of Pakistan and the new state decided to operate as a nation state. Although the new state had been created entirely in the name of Islam, but ideologically it was structured within the parameters of territorial nationalism, a secular ideology. (34)
e. “Positive Nationalism” of Iran:
The expression of the love for ‘vatan’ has been part of famous Persian writings of Hassan Lahiji (1635-1709) and Mulla Ahmad Naraqi (1771-1829). However, the term ‘vatan’ was used both in territorial i.e. a person’s habitat and home where he resides even for few days while a-territorial ‘vatan’, as the original home of the human soul, was viewed as a-place or a-tropica to which the soul was destined to return after death.(35)

The concept of physical and spiritual ‘vatans’ was illustrated in a series of articles published in 1877 where the relationship of the concepts “love” ‘vatan’, and “faith” were explored and it was asserted that human body, the vatan possessed “nature, life, and reason” and was endowed with its own “unique and apt spirit and life”. Corresponding to a human individual whose existence depended on body and soul, the author argued that the territorial and spiritual vatan were conjoined, “the appearance and essence of vatan are inseparable. It is like spirit and body. Spirit cannot stand without the body and the body cannot live without the spirit.”(36) During later years, the nationalized home, the residing place of collective mind and body-became pivotal in nationalist writings.

The sentiment of nationalism and zeal in Iran was militant. Iran’s dominant Shiite tradition kept it outside the mainstream of Sunnite Caliphates of Damascus, Baghdad and Istanbul for long periods of history. The rise of Reza Shah and the foundation of Pahlavi dynasty gave further boost to the militancy of Iranian nationalism. The new ruler not only assumed a pre-Islamic title for his dynasty, but also encouraged educational institutions and literary circles to glorify the nation’s past. The reformers and modernists as I’timad al-Saltanah and Mirza Aqa Khan Kirmani recovered the history, literature and language of the homeland to reawaken the collective soul of the nation.(37) The inculcation of ‘vatan’-centered ethos was an integral part of official and counter- official national pedagogical strategies. Conscious efforts were made to eliminate the Iranian language of its foreign vocabulary, and all this signaled a marked change in the national outlooks of the Iranians. National honor and dignity was cultivated among military ranks. In a number of articles published in military magazine, individual dignity was associated with the “love of homeland” and it was stressed that there can be no dignity without the love of ‘vatan’. All ranks of the military were obliged to avow “their dignity, love of land, fervor and Shah adulation.”(38) Vatan veneration and Shah adoration were the focal points of a patriotic nationalist discourse that imagined the Shah as the father of ‘vatan’. The Shah of Iran and his political allies nominated its “positive nationalism.”(39)
f. Arab Nationalism- Revival of Arab Literature and Arab Racism:

Other than local identity consciousness, Arab nationalism in the form of cultural and racial nationalism also posed a serious threat to the idea of Muslim universalism. Near the close of the nineteenth century, as the Ottoman Empire rapidly drifted towards its dissolution, an Arab cultural and ethnic nationalism emerged as a very powerful political force in the Muslim world. In the second half of the last century, a kind of pan-Arab movement arose among the Arabs of the Ottoman Empire. Majority of the Muslim subjects and most of the Arab lands constituted the bulk of the territorial possessions of the Ottoman Sultan, and helped to maintain the caliphate authority of the Sultan. But as soon as the administrative hold of the Sultans over the Arab territories weakened, the Arabs also started feeling the pulsating sentiments of secession which ultimately became a formidable movement for Arab nationalism.

The rise of Arab nationalism was an indirect response to the Turkism of the Young Turks who had gained considerable influence in the affairs of the empire. Farah Ceaser comments on the Arab nationalists,

“As Arab thinkers mulled over in their minds such symbols from Europe as “fatherland”, “patriotism”, “equality”, and “natural rights” their nationalism was kindled, and pride in their newly rediscovered heritage supplied the fuel. Europe was advancing and becoming strong; why should they not follow the suit.”

Abdur Rahman Al Kwākebi (1849-1903) is generally considered the pioneer for the idea of Arab nationalism in modern history. In his book Taba i- Istibdād (the characteristics of Tyranny), published in Cairo in 1900 AD, he advocated Arab nationalism in unmistakable terms. He openly preached separation of religion and politics, and strongly felt that in the creation of Arab unity religion had a significant role:

“Here are the nations of Austria and America who have been guided by science to find a variety of paths and deep rooted foundations for national unity and harmony, but not administrative unity, for national harmony, but not sectarian unity. Why is that we cannot follow one of these paths.”

In his later work, Umm al Qur’a, though he changed his strategy somewhat, but remained firmly committed to the cause of Arab unity. This book was serialized in Rashid Rida’s al- Manar in 1901-1902, and at many places he pointed out that it was the duty of the Arabs to close their ranks and rise once again to defend Islam, because no other nation in the world, in his opinion has the strength to salvage Islam from its difficulties in the contemporary world. Advocates of Arab nationalism pleaded the cause of Arab unity by using the name of Islam. They took pride in what they
perceived as the special privileged status of the Arabs. For example, the Qur’ān was revealed to Arabs. Holy Prophet SAW was an Arab; Arabic language and Arabic literature was glorified.(46) According to their point of view, many ancient Arab customs became part of Islam.

The name of Naguib Azouri (1870-1916) who was an Arab Christian and contemporary of Kwākebi is also outstanding in forming the discourse of Arab nationalism. He published a book in Paris in which he advocated the creation of an independent Arab state headed by a Muslim Sultan and stressed the separation of civil and religious administration. Another spokesman for the cause of Arab nationalism was Ibrahim al-Yazji (1847-1906), who called for an Arab revival in 1868. He recalled the glory of the Arabs in the past and declared them the most remarkable of nations for their high level of achievements in a short duration of time which according to him, had surpassed other nations of the world. The progress of Europeans is due to the fact they borrowed knowledge from Arabs and built upon it. Moreover, the decline of the Arabs is due to the slippage of power in the hands of non Arabs (Turks) who reduced learning to religious sciences only. Therefore, if Arabs want to regain their glory and progress, they have to get rid of foreign rule and fanaticism.(47)

Scholars like Abdur Rahman Kwākebi and Naguib Azouri structured the philosophical framework of Arab nationalism and the Christian missionaries created the secret societies that demanded complete independence of Arab territories from the Ottoman Empire.(48) The idea of a single Arab nation persisted and remained a popular theme in practically every discussion among intellectuals regarding Arab politics. Despite their enduring zeal and devotion, these intellectuals could not give this idea the requisite charismatic thrust to make it a popular movement. Arabs who are always motivated by an idea or ideology that is being advocated by a charismatic leadership(49) united under the President Gamal Abdul Nasser of Egypt after the World War II. Nasser, who is credited with rejuvenating the doctrine of Arab unity, was one of the most inspiring and charismatic leaders of his time. Between 1952 and 1954, Nasser purged the ranks of the Revolutionary Command Council of all opposition to his policies, and then turned toward the realization of the two primary objectives of the revolution; i.e., the re- Egyptianization of this country and making Pan-Arabism the ruling ideology of the Arab world.(50) In his treatise ‘Philosophy of Revolution,’ he stated, “we are a group of neighboring nations welded into a homogeneous whole by every possible material and moral ties that would unite any such group of nations.”(51)

Nasser consumed his time and energies in creating a political framework of Arab Union which would fit into the spirit of pan Arabism
while in Syria the *Ba‘th* Party accelerated its philosophical crusade to make Arabism a universally respected political ideology in every Arab land. The principle architects of this ideological edifice were Michel Aflaq (1910-1989) and Salahuddin Baitar. Aflaq’s greatest passion was Arabism— the *Ummah Arabiyah*, which he urged had social role to play in the contemporary world. In his words, “The nationalism for which we call is the same sentiment that binds the individual to his family, because fatherland is only a large household and nation a large family.”(52) The opening article of the *Ba‘th* Party’s constitution of 1947 stated, “The Arabs form one nation. The nation has the natural right to live in a single state and to be free to direct its own destiny and then laid down the principles to guide the *Ba‘th* Party (Arab Resurrection Socialist party) in publicizing its message for the popular consumption.”(53)

The wave of Arabism overwhelmed the youth everywhere. It was very difficult for any of the Arab rulers to disown this political gospel. The Six Day War (54) and Balfour Declaration (55) dealt a serious blow to Arab unity and both the two streams of Arab nationalism the philosophical framework and leadership of Nasser turned out to be nothing but a mirage. Now the slogan of Pan Arabism or single Arab nation is heard only as the voice of the past. The individual Arab states are no more labeled as freaks born out of European diplomacy and their rulers as “interim caretakers or obstacles to be removed.”(56)

**Conclusion:**

Nationalism in the Muslim world dealt a serious blow to the concept of the Muslim *Ummah*. Critics argue that Muslims face a dichotomy of choice; either they remain loyal to their national identity and culture or they choose to identify themselves with their religious identity. The plurality of the Muslim world – which is a blend of people of varying ethnic origins – adds complexities to the whole dimension. This failure of the Muslim world to understand and live with the diversity amongst themselves while at the same time evolving a united political and economic front is the root cause of the paralysis of the Islamic bloc on the world stage.

At present, leaders of all Muslim states consider their lands as independent political identities and do not care about the interests of other Muslim brotherly-lands. So Muslim countries devote their resources and capital on fighting petty regional skirmishes that actually strengthen their enemies. The idea of giving priority to historical traditions, civilization and historical nationalist heroes puts aside the universal value of humanity and revives national creeds. That is the reason that organizations established in the name of Muslim unity have little or no political clout on the world stage.
The situation in Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine is a case in point. In the first two cases, the USA and its allies are fighting the “war on terror,” which is highly controversial and perceived as a kind of new imperialism. Political hegemony of America and the Western nations has been established through logistic support being provided from all Muslim countries. Similarly, the Palestinian people continue to suffer and it is business as usual for the Muslim countries.

However, nationalism cannot and should not be blamed for political powerlessness of the Muslim people. It is unrepresentative government and rule of autocratic oligarchies and elites that aligns them with Western powers against the wishes of their own people. Even nationalist aspirations are not fulfilled by these Western alliances.

But the real question worth asking is whether Muslim unity is practically possible or just a utopian concept. Nationalism may have led the way to secularization of Muslim societies but it also played a great role in their political independence from imperial forces in the last century.

The modern nation state owes its legitimacy to nationalism. Despite the Islamic mixture in national identities, the formation of nation states legitimized in secular terms implies important changes in the role of Islam in Muslim societies. Before the emergence of nationalism, Islam dominated the political and social discourse. With the rise of nationalist forces, this status quo was disturbed.

The overall direction of these changes is towards secularization, and the separation of state and religion, but the nuances are considerable. In some cases a radical secularization and reconstruction of the whole system of society is under way. As states are secularized, Islam is increasingly confined to the spheres of socio-communal affairs and personal religious belief. However, much depends on the ability of Muslim nations to find the right mix between nationalist aspirations and religious identity. To those who claim that nationalists confine their vision to their own interests that lead to the limitations of others, and live by a set of rules that favor them at the expense of everyone else, one might counter by saying the same applies to any united political and economic bloc. What is required is a dispassionate analysis of these two competing forces; there is no reason that a compromise can’t be reached that would pave the way to political development for the betterment of the masses.
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Paul E. Sigmund, Ideologies of the Developing Nations, 159; The Manifesto of Ba’th Party was based on the four major articles; 1. The Arab homeland is an indivisible politico-economic unit. It is impossible for any of the Arab regions to perfect the conditions of its life in isolation from the rest. 2. The Arab nation is a cultural unit. All of the differences among its members are artificial accidents which will cease to exist as a consequence of the awakening of Arab consciousness. 3. The Arab homeland belongs to the Arabs. They alone have the right to utilize its resources and its wealth and to control its potentialities. (‘The Constitution of the Arab Resurrection. (Ba’th) Socialist Party of Syria,’ Middle East Journal 13, no. 2 (Spring, 1959): 195-200, http://www.jstor.org/)

The Six-Day War of June 5–10, 1967 was a war between Israel and the neighboring states of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. The Arab states of Iraq, Saudi
Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria also contributed troops and arms. At the war's end, Israel had gained control of the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. The results of the war affect the geopolitics of the region to this day.” (Wikipedia:-The Free Encyclopedia, s.v. “Six-Day War.” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Six-Day_War)

“...The Balfour Declaration of 1917 (dated 2 November 1917) was a formal statement of policy by the British government stating that "His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." The declaration was made in a letter from Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour to Baron Rothschild (Walter Rothschild, 2nd Baron Rothschild), a leader of the British Jewish community, for transmission to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain, a Zionist organization. The letter reflected the position of the British Cabinet, as agreed upon in a meeting on 31 October 1917. It further stated that the declaration is a sign of "sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations."(Wikipedia-The Free Encyclopedia, s.v. “Balfour Declaration, 1917.” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balfour_Declaration_of_1917)