

Name:

Instructor's Name:

Course:

Date:

Ways in Which British and Ottoman Interests Clashed and Converged In The
Aftermath Of World War 1 To Create Modern Turkey

The British-Ottoman relationship has played a significant role in contemporary European history. It was an excellent chance for the British Empire to control eastern ports, primarily when the Monroe Doctrine was issued in 1823. After gaining the right to free commerce inside the Ottoman Empire's boundaries in 1838, Britain sought to minimize any danger to its territorial integrity that would jeopardize its interests. Thus, it is safe to say that if the First World War hadn't happened, Turkey would be a different country today, which came about because of big and small fights and the coming together of the players during and after the First World War (Ediz 3). This essay proves this by outlining and explaining the evidence depicting how the Ottoman Empire and British interests rubbed each other, coupled with the evidence of their coming together after World War 1.

Despite their importance, the vital straits that link the Black Sea to the Mediterranean and Aegean seas frightened the British Empire; the Ottoman Empire didn't care. Under international guarantees, the straits were meant to be open permanently as an accessible route for vessels and businesses. At that time, the United Kingdom government thought that all ships from all countries, whether at war or not, should be able to pass through the Black Sea Straits under international control. It is important to note that in the past, until Russia seized jurisdiction of the northern boundary of the Black Sea in the 18th century, the straits were Turkish territory, and the Ottoman authorities let Russian trade ships pass through

them without any problems (Britannica). After beating the Turks in 1833, Russia asked them to agree to close the straits to countries that were not on the Black Sea to protect themselves from an attack from the south.

Additionally, a significant source of friction between the two sides arose from differences in Muslim leadership, notwithstanding the importance placed on religious tolerance. Between the two sides, the future of the Muslim world was by far the most significant issue. Since no other Muslim nation had ever been conquered, other Muslim countries considered the Ottoman Empire a leader state. The British Empire, on the other hand, was mighty. Muslims made up the majority of its colonists. As History.com Editors state, it took the holy war declaration by the Sheikh a fortnight later to rally Muslims worldwide, even those in Allied countries, to rise and protect the Ottoman Empire against its adversaries. The proclamation stated that many still living are happy, while those martyred are martyred for their faith in God's triumph. People who commit their lives to spreading God's word will be rewarded with honor in this world, and their last destination will be heaven. Britain offered more Muslim political rights to help break up the Ottoman Empire and remove it from its leadership position. To quell mounting notions of "holy war," they assumed that the Muslim world would give up its search for an external leader who could lead them in their quest for equality and freedom (History.com Editors).

Regarding how the two empires converged, Ediz states that on both sides, the British and Ottoman Empires agreed that Constantinople should be the capital of the Ottoman Empire after World War I. Moreover, the Mediterranean-Black Sea route between Europe and the Middle East should be neutralized and controlled (Ediz 14).

Consequently, they decided on the lands that would be part of Turkey (before the Ottoman Empire) and those that would be part of the British colony. All this occurred after the signing of the Lausanne Treaty in 1923. The allies' demands on Turkey were also

dropped in the same accord. The Turkish government's financial demands were also halted.

In conclusion, clashes between the British and Ottoman empires were the British empire of little concern to the Ottomans. They were concerned about the Black Sea's straits to the Aegean and Mediterranean seas. Consequently, religious conflicts arose between the two empires regarding Muslim leadership. In contrast to the clashes, both realms agreed to Constatipole becoming the Ottoman Empire's capital and decided on specific lands that constituted Turkey. The British, who were opposed to virtually all Ottoman Empire war goals, considered it beneficial to support a small number of them that did not conflict with their interests. British authorities hoped to preserve the empire's interests while sacrificing the minority who lived on this territory by permitting the Turks to form an independent state in these lands. Meanwhile, the British successfully persuaded the Ottomans to accept the terms of the agreement.

How Iranian oil shaped Iran and America

In the early 1950s, the Iranian oil issue sparked a rift between Britain and America in the Middle East, leading to the Suez crisis in 1956. After joining the USSR, Iran's economic and military structure was shaped into how they are now. Heiss mentions that the United States emerged as the dominant partner in Anglo-American attempts to protect Western economic and geopolitical interests in the area during this period. Most of the essential precautionary steps for Iran's stability were taken by the United States (Heiss 2). This essay shows America's strategic moves toward being a big beneficiary of Iranian oil and the step-by-step ways it implemented it.

As The World Bank states, industrial and financial services, hydrocarbons, agriculture, and service industries have a strong state involvement in Iran's economy. Iran boasts the second and fourth-largest crude oil reserves worldwide in natural gas and oil.

Although the economy and government remain heavily reliant on oil gains, and as a consequence, they have remained unexpected for a nation that exports so much of it. Iran's economy relies heavily on that sector when it comes to agriculture. However, it could be considered that if it were to sell its oil, it would be able to solve some of the financial issues. Moreover, exporting oil could go as far as establishing a stable government and implementing much-needed economic and social welfare programs. If Iran obtains oil earnings again, it will still be a challenge: ensuring that they are used for long-term value projects and limiting corruption (The World Bank).

First, the United States of America protected Western economic interests by ensuring that Iran received consistent financial assistance. Its reason for doing this is that it would not have to borrow money from its surrounding countries, particularly the veto powers. The veto powers would have supported Iran's joining an organization similar to the Soviet Union had they not received this assistance. This assistance was believed to be sufficient to maintain the regime until either May or June of 1954. Even though Iran had oil reserves that could be sold for a profit by the 1950s, most people still lived in destitution.

Secondly, the United States also helped Iran's military be robust and stable by providing financial support for military spending and deploying their soldiers back to Iran's forces. Financial support for the military was done to protect the American-Iranian oil settlement agreement and educate the Iranians on using the advanced weaponry the Americans had purchased. \$46 million in America's military assistance was given to Iran. Because Iran could not use the equipment provided by the United States, it was obliged to rely on American instruction and equipment, which it continues to do today.

Thirdly, to add to what I have just explicated about America, the United States also got Iran involved with geopolitical relations, which included the use of parties such as the United Nations, who would offer emergency help and intervene if they faced an

overwhelming onslaught.

Lastly, it tasked itself with the duty to protect the Middle East against possible Soviet expansion; this would have diverse effects on America since its interest in the country would compete with the Soviet Union. Iran, in the end, would have to pick a side on which country should access their oil, and America would not want to be on the losing end.

In conclusion, the reasons America had for investing so much in Iran over the years turned out to be fruitful. For example, protecting Western's economic interests, financing the military, introducing the oil-rich country to United Nations, and protecting the Middle East from Soviet expansion have shaped the foreign policy over the years, which occurred due to its reliance on foreign oil. There have been three significant phases in the history of oil in the United States: the emergence of oil as a commodity in the 1850s, the era of geopolitical rivalry after World War II, and the era of deregulation and diversification following the Cold War; so Iran has had a positive impact on the history of America, not forgetting that it too has grown as a result of the same.

Similarities between America and Iran

1. Pride in One's Country

The United States and Iran use peace as a religious motive in their speech. If they feel endangered or their existence is at risk, both fear going to war or employing violence. In this light, national pride and a sense of historical entitlement are more important than anything else. Both Iranians and Americans know to be true about them, as stated by The Christian Science Monitor. A conservative Iranian official once said they should hold up a mirror to understand the other's frequently sanctimonious and unyielding responses. A black-and-white view of the universe,

coupled with the belief that they are on a mission from God, leads Americans and Iranians to assume they're the world's rulers (The Christian Science Monitor).

2. Individualism

As in the United States, there is a strong emphasis on achievement and individuality in the culture. That explains why so many Iranians seem to thrive in the United States. They're like fish in water when they're in the water over there. That's not all, however. In public debate, both sides typically demonize an "enemy." American officials have accused Panama's Noriega, Somalia's Aidid, Yugoslavia's Milosevic and bin Laden, Libyan Col. Muammar Gaddafi, and Saddam Hussein, and Iran's revolutionary leaders in recent decades. Those are just a few of the many leaders the two countries have demonized in several decades.

Differences

1. Security

Index Mundi states that the level of security in Iran is not nearly as high compared in the United States. Iran is located in the Middle East, yet the country's security standards are pretty high despite this fact. For example, most Iranian police officers do not carry firearms, and while strolling half a day in the streets, likely, you will not see any police patrol cars or other vehicles. There is no need for police or the law to provide security in a community (Index Mundi).

2. Population Distribution

There are dense cities in the east of the nation of America, notably those in the Great Lakes area; mountain ranges, deserts, and the deep boreal woods of the far north and the central states are examples of sparsely inhabited locations. Because of the Zagros and Elburz Mountains, the north, northwest, and west of Iran have a large

concentration of population. There is a low population density in the enormous deserts of the Dasht-e Kavir and the Dasht-e Lut in the middle of the nation.

3. Constitution Amendment

Three-quarters of state legislatures must ratify amendments with a "joint resolution" from Congress or a constitutional convention called for by two-thirds of state legislatures; the US president does not have a role in the constitution amendment process. On the other hand, amendments to the Iranian constitution must be proposed by the supreme leader and approved by the "Council for Revision of the Constitution," which comprises representatives from the executive, legislative, judicial, and academic branches of government. The constitution's political system, religious foundation, and judicial branch are part of the process.

Works Cited

- Ediz, İsmail. *Sosyal ve Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi (SKAD) 107 Britain and the Ottoman Empire in the First World War: Clashing Interests of Two Belligerents Birinci Dünya Savaşı 'nda İngiltere ve Osmanlı Devleti: İki Muharip Devletin Çatışan Çıkarları*. 2016, pp. 107–34, dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/197566.
- History.com Editors. "Ottoman Empire Declares a Holy War." *HISTORY*, 7 June 2019, www.history.com/this-day-in-history/ottoman-empire-declares-a-holy-war.
- Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Straits Question." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11 Apr. 2016, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Straits-Question>. Accessed 9 June 2022.
- Heiss, Mary Ann. "The United States, Great Britain, and the Creation of the Iranian Oil Consortium, 1953-1954 | Mary Ann Heiss | Download." *Ur.booksc.eu*, Aug. 1994, ur.booksc.eu/book/61242676/565e21.
- The World Bank. "Overview." *World Bank*, 2017, www.worldbank.org/en/country/iran/overview#1.
- Index Mundi. "United States vs. Iran - Country Comparison." *Www.indexmundi.com*, 2021, www.indexmundi.com/factbook/compare/united-states.iran.
- The Christian Science Monitor. "Iran-US Tensions: 5 Ways Americans and Iranians Are Actually Similar." *Christian Science Monitor*, 1 Feb. 2012, www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0201/Iran-US-tensions-5-ways-Americans-and-Iranians-are-actually-similar/National-pride

