

Identification Terms

Approaches to IA

Analogy:

Analogies, according to Neustadt and May, are forms of comparison between past and present events. Analogies look at the similarities between two events as way for advocating a particular issue. An example of an analogy would be Post WWII, the US occupying Japan and Germany vs The War on Terrorism, the US occupying Iraq. The significance of the use of analogies are: "fighting the last war". They are ways to use events of the past to solve similar current issues or prevent the same issue occurring more than once.

Nationalism

Nationalism is the ideology that unites people of a similar origin, ethnicity, religion, or culture. It is both the position and the actions of a group of people united by the previously mentioned attributes. Though many examples may be acknowledged, the Algerian independence from France is a significant illustration of nationalism. The years of struggle that led to Algeria gaining its freedom from France were marked by courageous acts made in the name of Algerian Nationalism. The determination of the individuals, who sought after and fought for sovereignty, did so in the name of the people of their nation. Often these individuals are seen as "freedom-fighters" in the eyes of themselves and fellow nationalists and as "terrorists" in the eyes of those being opposed. Currently we see such nationalism between Israel and Palestine, both claiming Jerusalem as their city of origin and thus both fighting for the territory in the name of their nation.

The British in India

Indian Census

The Census began in 1871 in India and was implemented by the British. The census made the Indian caste system official by forcing people to identify their place within society, whereas it was previously more of a religious institution. Not only did this implementation change Indian society by hardening traditionally fluid and flexible classes, but it required people to identify their religion and aided the British effort to divide and rule. This redefining of Indian society would lead directly to many social and religious tensions (especially between Hindu and Muslim) that still exist today.

Aligarh

Aligarh was founded in 1875 by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan who was a Muslim elite. This school was supported by the British and was also modeled after them. The school was for upper-class Muslims who usually went on to become political leaders. Aligarh is a good example of Macalays Minute on Indian Education because it was modeled after the British morals and intellectual values. It was significant in that it showed Muslims were never a monolithic group.

Aligarh was an Indian school established in 1867 by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Khan was politically conservative and had very progressive ideals including that Islam wasn't harmful to Christianity, Muslims and Hindus weren't inherently incompatible, and that the British were required for India to live in harmony. Aligarh was modeled after British schools and incorporated western thought and Islamic traditions into the curriculum. Both Muslims and Hindus were allowed and it was the main school for aspiring muslim leaders. Aligarh had British backing but only served a small elite amount of people.

Deoband

Deoband a very traditional Islamic school created in 1867. This school was created for middle and lower class Muslims (Hindus were not allowed to attend this school) and gave the boys a traditional Muslim education with strict discipline and very modest living styles. The British did not support Deoband and it was a largely apolitical school.

Aligarh Vs. Deoband Education

The large debate over Muslim education is centered around two main school, Aligarh and Deoband. The Aligarh school was founded by Syed Ahmed Khan and was modeled on British schools. It had both Muslim and Hindu students and combined Islamic and Western education and received funding from the British. The Deoband school was focused on the purification of Islam and was composed of mainly middle and lower class Muslims. The Deoband school did not receive British funding and was largely apolitical. This debate is very crucial in Indian history because it further stressed the diversity of Indian Muslims. It also showed the British implementation in the Indian society and how the British supported an idea that they believed would benefit themselves.

Amritsar Massacre aka Jallianwala Bagh

Jallianwala Bagh Massacre- British soldiers under the command of Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer opened fire on unarmed Indian citizens gathering in the Jallianwala Bagh Garden. The shooting lasted until the soldiers had run out of ammunition, there were 379 dead and 1100 wounded. The reaction in India was that of anger and brought out movements for freedom which eventually allowed Gandhi to take center stage. The reactions in England however ranged from disgust in the House of Commons to Praise in the House of Lords. Some in Brittan felt that Dyer had taken the correct action and had "taught the rebellious Indians a lesson."

Partition

Partition is defined by its significance in numerous cases. Does it help or hurt the idea of peace? In India and Pakistan it seemed that it only hurt the two religions idea of division by drawing a border and allowing them to have something to fight over. In the Korea's the only way peace is kept is by a number of troops on the borders at all times. Partition is a key debate in politics and its outcome being negative or positive is also an important part of moves made in politics in having to do with the Middle East. It will never cease to be an option and that is why it is so significant.

Partition is a division of a country into separate nations, and is a term often used when an outside power divides up other people's land. When Britain's former colonies gained their independence Britain often saw partition as the answer to stabilizing the situation between conflicting groups within the country. In 1947 shortly after India gained its independence from Britain, India was divided into two nations and Pakistan was created. Britain drew the borderlines based on the amount of Hindus or Muslims living in the different areas. The partition resulted in a mass immigration. 10 million people were made refugees as they fled across the newly made boundaries. And 500 000 people were killed. Today there is still an ongoing conflict between the two countries on borderlines, left unresolved by the

British. In 1937 The British proposed the Peel Commission report, suggesting a partition of Palestine into one Jewish and one Arab state. The partition never found place due to the difficulty in deciding borderlines and the British resentment on using force to implement the partition. Today there are deep divisions among Palestinians and Israelis, which have caused several wars between the two groups. If partition is a good way of stabilizing tensions within a country or if it makes the situation more difficult is not easy to answer. There are still ongoing conflicts between both India and Pakistan and among Palestinians and Israelis. it's hard to know which countries are better off.

Partition is defined as the process of dividing into two or more units an area previously forming a single administrative entity. It is carried out by an external party. It is an accepted method of terminating disputes among nations without resorting to war. Significance: The arguments for partition are that: 1) homogeneous states should be the goal of any country. (Each ethnicity with its own nation) 2) There will be a reduction of violence and conflict; there will be more hopes for peace in the future. The argument against partition is that it will create grievances that will lead to more violence.

It is important for the people of the territory to comply with the future plan of a partition. The country that is carrying out the partition needs to think of partition: as a concept, as a plan, and as a policy.

Nuclear Proliferation

NPT

Non Proliferation Treaty: started in 1970 and was indefinitely extended in 1995. Has roughly 180 members minus North Korea, Israel, Indian and Pakistan. Under the NPT Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) are not allowed to build more nukes or distribute them to Non- Nuclear Weapons States (NNWS). The NWS nations are France, UK, US, Russia, and China. All the other members make up the NNWS. The NNWS are allowed to use nuclear material for peaceful methods under the Atoms for Peace, but are not allowed to acquire nuclear weapons. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is suppose to monitor nuclear weapons, but essentially lacks policing power and is essentially useless. The significance of the NPT is that it is remnants of world powers retaining then power over other nations, but it is essentially pointless because non NPT members have nuclear weapons.

The NPT would be a perfect term from the exam because it in itself is incredibly important and covers a wide range of issues as well. It states that there are 5 permanent nuclear states, the United States, France, Britain, China, and Russia. All other states under the treaty agree not to become nuclear states, however the three that are not part of the treaty, Israel, Pakistan, and India, are nuclear states not under the NPT. India, for example, feels that the NPT is an unfair and unjust bias towards the permanent nuclear states that gives them a monopoly on power in the world. India thinks it degrades it's national security by not having nuclear weapons, and that it degrades their position in the international community. India thinks that only nuclear states are recognized and respected in the international scene, and that without nuclear weapons it cannot be fully respected.

A treaty to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. Only five countries that are a part of this treaty have nuclear weapons; the United States, Russia, China, United Kingdom, and France. India, Israel, Pakistan, and North Korea are the four recognized sovereign states with nuclear weapons that are not part of the treaty. It is significant why these states have not signed the treaty because, they argue, the NPT creates

a club of "nuclear haves" and a larger group of "nuclear have-nots", by restricting the legal possession of nuclear weapons to the states that tested them before 1967. This treaty is said to have collapsed with the Sino-Pakistani nuclear weapons collaboration.

Nuclear Proliferation (South Africa)

South Africa began a nuclear program in 1973, during the era of apartheid. In South Africa, the nuclear energy was used for mining. South Africa was unique in giving up their nuclear arsenal because in 1989 the white ruling minority party knew they wouldn't be in power for much longer and they didn't want the black people to be able to make decisions about nuclear warfare. South Africa remains the only country to this day to successfully obtain nuclear weapons, yet also give them up peacefully.

Nuclear Proliferation (India)

India's Motives- India has had continuous disputes with China and Pakistan, and China being a nuclear state it was crucial for India to develop nuclear weapons. It is also important that India be one step ahead of Pakistan at all times. Also India wanted national recognition that they were a nuclear state and didn't need the NPT's permission to produce these weapons.

Deterrence

The concept of nuclear weapons as a "deterrent" rather than an offensive weapon came about almost immediately following the accusation of nuclear weapons by multiple nations. The concept was even given its own acronym MAD: mutually assured destruction. Common knowledge would say that the realization that there could be no winners in a nuclear war did in fact stop the United States and USSR from escalating the cold war into an all out nuclear exchange. And while it is hard to deny this fact, there is still the implication that the deterrence has aided nuclear proliferation and perhaps other conflicts in more recent past. India and Pakistan have a history of somewhat large scale conventional warfare, and it is indeed likely that nukes have helped to prevent further large wars. Nukes are a powerful deterrent, obviously no country wants to be responsible for annihilating its entire population, and perhaps the global population, and this fact always weighs on the minds of officials in control of nukes. However, whether you believe that nuclear weapons are deterrents or not, it is undeniable that it is the primary reason that states such as Pakistan and India obtained nuclear weapons in the first place. Furthermore analysis has uncovered that nuclear weapons have done little to prevent conventional conflict. There have been several limited wars between India and Pakistan including, but not limited to, conflict over Kashmir. Also potentially dangerous military strategies such as India's cold start doctrine have emerged in response to nukes in South Asia. With continued limited conventional war, and continuing pressure on the nuclear threshold the environment in South Asia is indeed as dangerous as ever. Deterrence may be a field leveling protective measure that benefits those that enjoy it, or it may be a rationalization that has allowed further proliferation. Either way, it is one of the pressing issues of our generation.

Imperialism in the Middle East

The Balfour Declaration

A letter from Lord Balfour of England stating his support for a Jewish state in Palestine. This became the root of much conflict, as Muslim Palestinians were already living there and were extremely opposed to the idea of Zionism. The declaration was at least in part directed towards gaining the favor of Jews abroad in Europe. This declaration has had lasting effects on relations with the Middle-East as it's the root of much of the distrust and hostility between the Muslim World and the West.

Churchill White Paper

As Arab and Jewish Palestine were warring over the terms of the Balfour Declaration, Winston Churchill created the British White Paper of 1922 to clarify Britain's views on the declaration. The declaration stated Britain's willingness to help establish a National Jewish Home in Palestine which created tension between the Arab and Jewish population. In the White Paper, Britain hoped to calm these tensions by assuring the population that they were not taking sides. Today, Palestine has been partitioned into a Jewish Israel and an Arab Palestine with lingering tensions dating back to the British mandate

The 1939 White Paper

The 1939 White Paper was issued by the British in 1939 after World War I. This particular document placed restrictions on Jewish immigrants into Palestine, and put a specific number on how many Jews were allowed to immigrate in to Palestine. Among other things, this document created many issues because it was a controversial subject due to the fact the Britain had promised too many things at the end of the war to too many people, which in turn they could not keep. One of their promises was an independent land for the Jews, and by signing this paper Britain was going back on their word of partitioning the Palestinian Mandate. This was very significant because it created great tension and conflict and seemed to be an awkward moment for Britain since they were not able to keep their promise. This goes to show that Britain was worried about the outcome because in the earlier 1930's they began to hear about the horrific conditions in Germany and that the Jews needed refuge, and instead of created a land of refuge and safety, instead they signed a document that limited the number of Jews that were able to immigrate into a safety land. From 1942 onward after that it was well known to the British leaders that the Germans plan was to drive out all Jews, and this was a very scary thing for Britain.

1939 White Paper vs. 1922 White Paper:

1939- Also known as Macdonald White Paper, was a British government statement regarding its policy on Palestine. This paper put stringent restrictions on Jewish immigration to a specific number. The paper was in favor of creating an independent Palestine governed by both Arabs and Jews in proportion to their numbers in the population. A limit of 75,000 Jewish immigrants was set for the five-year period 1940-1944. After this cut-off date, further immigration would depend on the permission of the Arab majority. Restrictions were also placed on the rights of Jews to buy land from Arabs. The White Paper was heavily on the Arab side because the British believed that in the event of war against Nazi Germany, Jewish support was guaranteed. However the British feared that the Arab world might turn against them.

1922: Churchill White paper, it limited immigration because of "economic limitation of land" and the economic capacity. This paper was a signal that the British recognized Arabs concerns of Jewish immigration and Zionism. It was the first official statement from the British Government interpreting the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate. The document acknowledged the progress that the Zionists had made in building a community with "'national' characteristics", but made clear that the British did not support a separate nation as a Jewish National Home, only a continuation of the community within the Palestine region.

Mustafa Kemal

Ataturk was the ruler of Turkey during the beginning of the 20th century who saw the collapse of the once-powerful Ottoman Empire. During his reign, he was all about moving Turkey into the Western world and adopting Western ideas and culture. He did this by adopting the western tradition of the last name and banning fez hats and head scarves in public. More importantly than this, Attaturk drove the Europeans and Greeks out of Turkey after the Ottoman empire broke up, when other nations desired control over Turkey. Additionally, he got rid of the Sultan-caliphate, and gave women the right to pursue education and vote. This all was important in creating modern Turkey and moving the new nation into the Western world and improving conditions for those within the country, as his changes have lasted to the present day. In fact, he is revered as a God in modern Turkey, and insulting him is a great offense.

Oil in Middle East

Starting in the 1950's, the British colonial empire made key strategic moves to guarantee its ownership of oil resources. Although India received its independence shortly following World War II, the Suez Canal made access to the Middle East still possible. From 1952 to 1956, however, military change and Nasser's ascendancy in Egypt quickly changed the status quo. The canal was nationalized, barring Britain from accessing oil. The nationalization of the Suez Canal and military takeover of Nasser had greater implications than just access to oil, however. The barring of the Middle East raised British and American concerns about the spread of communism to the Middle East. Oil and the Middle East will continue to play a large part in political and economic power struggles.

Orientalism

Orientalism is an academic field and a style of thought based on a distinction between the Oriental and "us". It was considered a western style of rule over the Orient. Orientalists believed that Orientals were childlike, irrational, unintelligent, and many other demeaning things. Orientalists believed that they were the exact opposite. They were mature, intelligent, noble, and fit to rule over the Orientals as such. This philosophy resulted in new ways of thinking for those who studied it. After studying and understanding this philosophy, people would realize their own biases, they would think carefully how they speak and the diction that they use, and they learned to think critically about what they read and to not believe what they read on face.

Zionism

Zionism was a modern political movement that was designed to find a homeland for the Jews. The Zionist leaders represented the Jewish population. For example, they compromised with other leaders (European and Arab) in order to establish a Jewish national state. By founding a movement like Zionism it shows that the Jewish leaders wanted to establish a homeland in an organized manner.