Echos of the Past?

- Map It: The Byzantine Empire
- Post Reprint: “Four maps that explain the chaos of the Middle East”
- Role Play: Diplomatic Relations in the Middle East
- Post Reprint: “5 Myths About the Decline and Fall of Rome”
- Lede Study: Three Stories (and follow-up) From the Associated Press
As the 95th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Turkey is celebrated on October 29, the country reflects on a history that is a tapestry of Anatolian, Byzantine, and Ottoman backgrounds; woven with rich colors from Arabic, Roman, Greek, Balkan, and Crimean cultures, cuisines and religious traditions.

Students could be encouraged to work together to create a timeline of Turkey’s history. Use the maps that are included in the resource guides and the analysis, “Four maps that explain the chaos of the Middle East,” to enrich understanding of the dates, peoples and prominent figures. The Outlook section feature, “5 Myths About the Decline and Fall of Rome,” adds another dimension for older students to discuss and debate.

Turkey’s place at the crossroads of Europe and Asia has placed it in a tense, challenging and complex position. As war continues in Syria, Turkey hosts the most refugees of any country. Adults and children have crossed into Turkey, been registered and placed in refugee camps, some hoping to return home and others wanting to find work and education in European countries. AP stories relate some of the refugees’ efforts to leave Turkey.
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The Byzantine Empire

![Map of the Byzantine Empire in 900 AD](maps.commons.wikimedia.org)

![Map of the Byzantine Empire in 1025 AD](maps.commons.wikimedia.org)
1. Century-old states are more stable today

Countries whose political or geographic precedents stretch back over a century are more stable today. Turkey, Egypt, Iran, and, to some extent, the ruling dynasties of what are now Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, all, in one form or another, trace their current political structures to the late 19th century, before European colonialism took root in the region. Consequently, they were more likely to have the resources to maintain some independence in the face of European imperialism, or at least negotiate a less disruptive form of colonial rule.

Turkey, most vividly, escaped colonization at the beginning of the 20th century because the already extant Ottoman army defeated a number of would-be colonizers: first during World War I and then after the empire’s dissolution in Turkey’s subsequent war for independence.

Iran, meanwhile, was divided into informal spheres of influence by the British and Russians in the late 19th century but avoided formal colonization and initially kept the Qajar dynasty in power.

And Egypt, a British protectorate for several decades, became the first country in the region to achieve nominal independence in 1922, under the same dynasty that had established the Egyptian state more than a century earlier.

As a result, both Iran and Egypt had ruling institutions predating European colonial influence that subsequently remained in place. In both countries, local politics were, to a greater degree than elsewhere, allowed to continue, subject to external constraint and correction. Meanwhile, the far smaller dynasties of the Persian Gulf became protectorates of the British Empire on mutually beneficial terms, creating symbiotic relationships in which the British provided military support and trade opportunities that left these regimes stronger and wealthier than they were before.

2. Colonial rule led to fragile states
In contrast to these preexisting polities, countries such as Syria, Iraq, Libya and Lebanon came into being in the early 20th century complete with new borders and hastily formed governments set up by their colonial rulers. From the outset, these puppet governments lacked the legitimacy or popular support of those indigenous rulers, who, however unwillingly, had come under the influence of colonial powers. Unsurprisingly, all of these countries beside Lebanon soon experienced widespread and violent anti-colonial rebellions.

The consequences of these seminal conflicts persisted through the century. After occupying Libya in 1911, Italy suppressed resistance from local guerrilla fighters only after a decades-long military campaign that employed starvation, mass deportation and concentration camps. Britain, meanwhile, put down Iraq’s 1920 revolt with the help of extensive air power, then dropped poison gas on Kurdish tribes that continued resisting. And in Syria, a massive revolt in 1925 ended with French artillery shelling Damascus.

In each case, colonial powers also triumphed by recruiting local allies along ethnic or tribal lines to fight on their side against the rebels. In Syria, the French drew support from Christian and Alawite communities. In Iraq, key Sunni tribes cooperated with the British against rebels in return for political and financial rewards. As a result, these revolts deepened social divisions within these countries and stripped governing institutions of their legitimacy at the moment of inception.

The consequences of these unstable foundations were often fully felt only in the aftermath of independence. After the Iraqi revolt, the British installed King Faisal I to rule the country on their behalf, hoping he would mitigate nationalist anger toward colonial rule. Faisal’s family maintained its throne with British support until 1958, when Faisal’s grandson was overthrown and executed in a military coup.

### 3. Instability and regime change

Observers have often noted that the Middle East’s long-standing monarchies appear significantly more stable than its republics. But this reading mistakes cause for effect. Libya and Iraq, along with Iran, Egypt, and Turkey, were all originally monarchies as well, at least until these monarchies proved too unstable to survive. Perhaps, then, it’s more accurate to say that the region’s unstable monarchies fell, while those in more stable countries were the only ones to survive.

In the 1940s and 1950s, the endurance of monarchies in the Middle East was inseparable from Cold War politics. While American officials often had deep reservations about British colonialism, with the start of the Cold War many concluded that maintaining British influence was preferable to the risk of Soviet infiltration. As a result, pro-British rulers like the shah of Iran, Faisal II in Iraq and King Farouk in Egypt became crucial elements of Anglo-American efforts to contain Soviet influence in the region.

When these regimes fell — Iran’s in 1979, Iraq’s in 1958, Egypt’s in 1952 — these countries moved away from their alliances with the West. Libya, too, followed a similar pattern when Moammar Gaddafi toppled King Idris, who, despite his impeccable anti-colonial credentials, was tainted by his pro-Western political orientation. In Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf, by contrast, pro-Western monarchies survived and kept their countries in the Western orbit throughout the Cold War.

### 4. The shadow of the Cold War

One of the most striking historical correlations is between countries enduring civil war today and those that, to varying degrees, leaned toward the Soviet
Union during the Cold War. But what is the relationship between Iraq, Syria, Libya and at least part of Yemen’s pro-Soviet geopolitics and their current chaos?

First, the political challenges some states faced may have left them predisposed to both instability and siding with the Soviets. To the extent that at the outset of the Cold War countries — both their regimes and their populations — were content with and, therefore, invested in maintaining the status quo, they were more likely to side with the West. Thus, monarchies across the region that benefited from their relationship with the British stayed with the West, while Turkey, having secured its independence, saw Western support as a way to maintain it against the risk of Soviet expansion. Where these regimes maintained the consent, or at least obedience, of the societies they governed, as in Jordan, the gulf states, or Turkey, this orientation remained. Conversely, in countries such as Iraq, Syria and Egypt, widespread popular resentment of the status quo and the regimes that enforced it both increased the likelihood of political instability and the appeal of the Soviet Union as an ally.

At the same time, many countries that stayed within the Western camp experienced follow-on benefits that contributed to their stability, while those that tried to leave often suffered as a result. The United States offered economic and technical aid to its allies far in excess of what the Soviet Union could offer, for example. These allies were also integrated into the global economy, often quite successfully, while those that defied the West, such as Iran or Iraq, ended up hobbled by sanctions.

Western military support played an important role, as well. The British sent troops to prop up the Jordanian monarchy in 1958, while three decades before Operation Desert Storm, British military intervention helped protect Kuwait from Iraqi invasion in 1961. And, again, there could be violently destabilizing consequences for those that sought to escape the Western orbit. Notably, the United States supported coups against governments in both Syria and Iran that Washington feared would take their countries in a pro-Soviet direction.

There is also an ideological dimension to all of this. Washington has long been willing to turn a blind eye toward authoritarian behavior from regimes it has supported in the Middle East. Still, the Baathist regimes in Syria and Iraq, as well as the Gaddafi regime in Libya, displayed a degree of totalitarian ambition and systematic brutality that set them apart from other regimes in the region. Saddam Hussein demonstrated that, as a source of ideological inspiration, Stalinism is not conducive to stability.

At the outset of the 20th century, then, neither Iraq, Syria, Libya nor Yemen existed as states or governments in their current form. All four then experienced direct colonial rule between World Wars I and II and subsequently overthrew their governing regimes in the postwar period. Finally, these four countries all ended up, to greater or lesser degrees, on the losing side of the Cold War.

But alongside these patterns, readers have almost certainly noticed the equally striking exceptions at every stage along the way. So while it is easy to predict that the violence currently afflicting Iraq, Syria Libya and Yemen will leave a legacy of instability moving forward, exploring the continuities of history can serve as a first step toward escaping from them.

Nick Danforth writes about Middle Eastern history and politics. He is a senior policy analyst at the Bipartisan Policy Center.
Diplomatic Relations in the Middle East

1. You are to be a diplomat from one of the listed countries. Select the country that you represent. Locate it on a map.
   - Egypt
   - France
   - Great Britain
   - Iran
   - Iraq
   - Italy
   - Jordan
   - Kuwait
   - Lebanon
   - Libya
   - Saudi Arabia
   - Syria
   - Turkey
   - Yemen

2. Select a time period in which to review your relationship with one to three of the other countries listed. (You must select countries with which you had interaction.)
   - 1900-1920
   - 1921-1940
   - 1941-1960
   - 1961-2000

3. Research your country’s aspirations for and actions toward the other country or countries. Treaties, military action, support of or campaigns against. Be specific in summarizing diplomatic relations.

4. To what degree did your actions in the selected time period influence the country or countries as they exist today? What is your current diplomatic relation?

5. What is your country’s relation to the United States and Russia/Soviet Union during the selected time period? Today?
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FIVE MYTHS

About the decline and fall of Rome

MYTH NO. 1
America is going through what republican Rome did.

These comparisons are common. Former Supreme Court justice David Souter has said that embracing an all-powerful figure who promises to solve the nation’s problems is “how the Roman republic fell.” Augustus, Rome’s first emperor, ended democracy “because he promised that he would solve problems that were not being solved,” Souter said in the 2012 quote, which resurfaced during this fall’s campaign. Along those same lines, a Huffington Post headline claimed: “Rome Had Caesar. America Has Trump. The People Were and Are Desperate.”

But such comparisons are light on scholarship. Simply put, most experts believe there is little to compare. Yes, the United States has seen a rise in populism, but it hasn’t experienced a microgram of the violence that accompanied the fall of the Roman republic. The end came only after numerous civil wars over offices and honor, decades of gang violence in the capital, and waves of sanctioned political murder. By that measure, Trump is no Caesar.

MYTH NO. 2
The republic collapsed because of class conflict

The rise of Donald Trump supposedly heralds the decline of the American idea, according to many of his critics, who’ve taken the opportunity to compare this moment to the fall of Rome’s republic in 31 B.C. or its empire in the 5th century A.D. Any historian is happy when their period of study comes into vogue, but these requiems leave a false impression of Roman antiquity and the causes of its greatest crises.

By Nathan Pilkington

• December 2, 2016

The rise of Donald Trump supposedly heralds the decline of the American idea, according to many of his critics, who’ve taken the opportunity to compare this moment to the fall of Rome’s republic in 31 B.C. or its empire in the 5th century A.D. Any historian is happy when their period of study comes into vogue, but these requiems leave a false impression of Roman antiquity and the causes of its greatest crises.

But the struggle between patricians and plebeians took place more than 250 years before the republic’s collapse. During an early republican period known to historians as the Conflict of the Orders, between 494 and 287 B.C., plebeians won the right to have their own magistrates — the tribunes — and to hold their own assembly to make laws for the entire Roman state. Patricians were excluded from this assembly but bound by its laws. Plebeians also gained election to the consulship, the highest office in Rome. After 366 B.C., normally one of the two consuls was a plebian.

Patricians and plebeians were not “classes” in the modern sense of the term. According to Roman myth, the patricians were descended from the original senators appointed by Rome’s founder, Romulus, to assist him in decision-making. Patrician status was inherited, and plebians made up the rest of society. After the Conflict of the Orders, many plebeians became wealthy and
powerful, while certain patrician families saw their fortunes decline and disappeared from history. Pompey the Great, for all his riches and power, was a plebeian from an area colonized in the 3rd century B.C. Emperor Augustus was born a plebeian; it was only when he was adopted by Julius Caesar in his will that he became a patrician.

**MYTH NO. 3**
The empire collapsed because of widespread lead poisoning.

Professor Jerome Nriagu offered this theory in 1983, and its popularity is rising again because of recent investigations of lead contamination in Rome’s harbor. A 2014 article in *Science* wondered, “Did Lead Poisoning Bring Down Ancient Rome?,” concluding that it quite possibly played a role; astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson suggested in an episode of “Cosmos” that lead had a hand in the decline of the empire. Supposedly lead shrunk the population by poisoning the water, leaving the empire weakened and vulnerable. It’s just not true. The argument is predicated on the belief that most Romans used lead pipes to deliver water, lead cauldrons to boil wine, lead as a sweetener and lead in makeup. But the majority of Romans were rural farmers who lived at or barely above subsistence levels; they drank from local or personal wells and lacked the means to regularly indulge in makeup and sweetened wine.

Even if the city of Rome did have fairly high levels of lead in its public water system, which some recent skeletal evidence may support, it represented only one-sixtieth of the population of the empire. Lead contamination was never widespread enough to cause fertility problems, mass poisoning or other debilitating illnesses on a sufficient scale to diminish the Roman population and leave it powerless against invading armies.

**MYTH NO. 4**
The empire collapsed because of barbarian invasions.

In a recent Huffington Post article, political scientist Joseph Nye compared the decay of America to the fall of the Roman Empire, fretting that “an absolute decline in [Rome’s] society, economy and institutions ... left it unable to protect itself from hordes of invading barbarian tribes.” Likewise, a Utah State University guide to Rome claims that “barbarian forces overran western Europe, spelling the end of an era.”

Yet Rome didn’t succumb to a sudden influx of barbarians at the gate. Nor were Goths or other Germanic peoples “barbarian” in the modern sense of the term. They had regularly interacted with the Roman Empire for 200 years and, in many cases, were educated, trained and employed inside its perimeters before they succeeded in destroying imperial authority in Italy, France, the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa during the 5th century A.D. At various times over these two centuries, the tribes served in Roman armies.

Alaric, who famously led the
Visigothic migration through the empire to the gates of Rome (395-410 A.D.), started his military career commanding Gothic troops serving in the Roman army. His primary opponent was Stilicho, a half-Roman, half-Vandal who commanded the armies of the western half of the empire. The eventual rout was no invasion of unknown “hordes,” as Nye put it.

**MYTH NO. 5**

**The empire collapsed because of Christianity.**

Economists have long believed that there is an unavoidable trade-off between equality and growth — having more of one means having less of the other. Arthur Okun’s book about it, *Equality and Efficiency: The Big Tradeoff*, remains a classic. The implosion of communism and the decisions of socialist countries like Sweden to reduce taxes and welfare are widely seen as acknowledgments of the failure of overly egalitarian systems to produce adequate economic growth. But evidence suggests that there is also a point at which high levels of inequality begin to deliver less economic growth, not more — and that the United States has passed that point, according to research by the International Monetary Fund. That’s partly because more-unequal economies tend to have oversize and overcompensated financial sectors that are more prone to booms and busts. Other researchers have found that worker productivity suffers when economic gains are not widely shared.

A further reason may be that rising income inequality erodes the trust people have in one another and their willingness to cooperate. As the political economist Francis Fukuyama has written, this “social capital” lubricates the increasingly complex machinery of market economies and the increasingly contentious machinery of democracy. Countries with more social capital tend to be healthier, happier and richer.
Three Stories (and follow-up) From the AP

From breaking news to investigative reporting, teams of Associated Press (AP) journalists and photojournalists cover stories in more than 100 countries. The Washington Post has one of the most extensive foreign bureaus of any media company, yet it subscribes to this not-for-profit news cooperative to give more diverse, eyewitness and timely coverage for its readers.

The following are AP stories. Note the datelines. These indicate where the reporters were when they wrote the story. Most AP stories do not have bylines indicating the writer’s name.

Europe

22 migrants die in truck crash, 13 others injured

By Associated Press

• October 14, 2018

ISTANBUL — At least 22 migrants, including children, have been killed in a truck accident Sunday, Turkey’s official news agency said.

The Anadolu news agency said the migrants were traveling in a truck in the western province of Izmir that rolled over off a bridge. Video footage showed a destroyed truck, tipped upside down in a waterway with personal items scattered all around.

Thirteen people were injured in the crash and were being treated in nearby hospitals. Their nationalities were not given and authorities have launched an investigation.

Turkish media reported the driver was among the injured and said in his initial statement to police that a car had swerved in front of him.

Hundreds of thousands of migrants have set out to sea from Turkey’s coasts in the last few years to try to reach neighboring Greece, which is a member of the European Union. A deal with the EU in 2016 to send those migrants back to Turkey significantly curbed the number of border crossings but many desperate migrants still attempt the journey.

Europe

About 200 migrants wade across river into Greece from Turkey

By Associated Press

• October 16, 2018

THESSALONIKI, Greece — Authorities say about 200 migrants have crossed into Greece from the northeastern land border with Turkey, an unusually large number of arrivals in that area in a single morning.

Police said the migrants were mostly families with children and were found early Tuesday after making their way to the side of a road near a local highway. They told authorities they had waded across the Evros River running along the border because the water level was low.

There was no immediate information on their nationalities or how many children were among the group. Police sent buses to pick up the new arrivals and transport them to police stations to be registered.

Authorities have reported an increase in the number of people crossing the Greek-Turkish land border in recent months.
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The Americas

US pastor released from house arrest, flown out of Turkey

By Zeynep Bilginsoy/ AP

IZMIR, Turkey — An American pastor flew out of Turkey on Friday after a Turkish court convicted him of terror links but freed him from house arrest, removing a major irritant in fraught ties between two NATO allies still strained by disagreements over Syria, Iran and a host of other issues.

The court near the western city of Izmir sentenced North Carolina native Andrew Brunson to just over three years in prison for allegedly helping terror groups, but let him go because the 50-year-old evangelical pastor had already spent nearly two years in detention. An earlier charge of espionage was dropped.

Hours later, Brunson was transported to Izmir’s airport and was flown out of Turkey, where he had lived for more than two decades. He was to be flown to the U.S. military hospital in Landstuhl, Germany, then on to Washington, where he was to meet with U.S. President Donald Trump on Saturday.

Additionally, Turkey could now hope that the U.S. will lift tariffs on Turkish steel and aluminum imports, injecting some confidence into an economy rattled by high inflation and a mountain of foreign currency debt.

Friday’s ruling followed witness testimony that seemed to partly undermine the prosecutor’s allegations and highlighted concerns that Turkey had been using the U.S. citizen as diplomatic leverage. Turkey bristled at suggestions that its judicial system is a foreign policy instrument, and has accused the U.S. of trying to bend Turkish courts to its will with tariffs in August that helped to send the Turkish currency into free fall.

Brunson’s release doesn’t resolve disagreements over U.S. support for Kurdish fighters in Syria, as well as a plan by Turkey to buy Russian missiles. Turkey is also frustrated by the refusal of the U.S. to extradite Fethullah Gulen, a Pennsylvania-based Muslim cleric accused by Turkey of engineering a 2016 coup attempt.

Follow-Up Story

Courts & Law

US, Turkey lift sanctions imposed in case of detained pastor

By Associated Press

WASHINGTON — Turkey and the U.S. on Friday lifted sanctions on senior government officials that had been imposed during the diplomatic standoff over the arrest of American pastor Andrew Brunson, officially ending a case that had strained relations between the two NATO members.

The Treasury Department said it was lifting the sanctions on Turkish Minister of Justice Abdulhamit Gul and Minister of Interior Suleyman Soylu, while Turkey removed its retaliatory measures against Attorney General Jeff Sessions and Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen.

The moves follow the release last month of Brunson, who spent two years in prison and faced the possibility of a life sentence on terrorism charges that he called “ridiculous.”

Brunson had lived in Turkey as a missionary for more than two decades when he was arrested as part of a widespread Turkish government crackdown that followed a failed coup against President Recep Erdogan in July 2016.

Brunson denied the charges against him, and the U.S. repeatedly called for his release. In August, it imposed sanctions on the two government officials to press Turkey to release the 50-year-old evangelical pastor.