

10 The Man Who Would Be Caliph

Sharīfian Propaganda in World War I*

Joshua Teitelbaum

The purpose of Sharīfian propaganda during the war was first and foremost to gain Muslim, Arab and British recognition of the Hashimite family as rightful heirs to the Islamic Caliphate in place of the Ottoman family. To do this, *Sharīf* Husayn ibn ‘Ali had to control as much Arab territory as possible, since a Caliph who controlled only the Hijaz would be a laughing stock.

In order to contextualize Sharīfian WWI propaganda, we first need a clear understanding of the status of the Caliphate on the eve of the war, British ideas about the Caliphate before the war, and the Hashimite family’s understanding of their role in Islam. But first, a look at propaganda itself.

What Is Propaganda and What Was Its Nature in World War I?

Propaganda has been with us from time immemorial, whenever one side in a conflict wishes to maintain the support of its own population, gain new adherents to its cause, or demoralize the opposing side. In modern times we rarely speak of propaganda. Instead we use terms such as information operations, or psychological operations. In the modern Middle East we still have ministries that aim to guide public opinion, such as the ubiquitous “Ministry of Information” (*wizārat al-i‘lām*).

Propaganda is a “systematic form of PURPOSEFUL PERSUASION that attempts to influence the emotions, attitudes, opinions, and actions of specified target audiences for ideological, political or commercial purposes through the controlled transmission of one-sided messages (which may or may not be factual) via mass and direct media channels.”¹ It can also be understood as “the deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behaviour to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist.”² Both definitions stress the systematic nature of these efforts to influence. In World War I the use of propaganda came into its own

with primarily Britain and Germany realizing its importance and devoting considerable, methodical and institutional effort to it.³

The Caliphate on the Eve of War: Ottomans, British, Arabs and Hashemite

Reigning (1876–1909) a few years before the start of the conflict, Sultan Abdülhamid II was widely recognized as Caliph. The Ottomans had claimed the Caliphate for centuries, and this was confirmed by the swearing of fealty (*bay'a*) by all the top civil and religious officials. In Abdülhamid's case, the Ottoman constitution, which came into effect at the end of December 1876, enshrine the link between the Sultanate and the Caliphate in law. To the *bay'a* and the constitution, Abdülhamid added three other traditionally recognized justifications to buttress his claim to the august office: hereditary rights, divine will and military power. Divine will originated with the Ummayyad Caliphs who saw themselves as the Caliphs of God – Abdülhamid needed to add nothing; hereditary rights were invoked by Suleyman the Magnificent (r. 1520–1566), Abdülhamid's ancestor, and Abdülhamid told all that the Caliphate was his by virtue of his being a descendant of the House of Osman. As for power and dominion, no one could argue that Abdülhamid did not control a vast empire. The justification of having enough power to protect Muslims is a long-standing qualification for the Caliphate.⁴

The one criterion lacked by the Ottomans, of course, was that they were not descended from the tribe of Quraysh. Buzpinar dismisses this criterion as based on a weak hadith, but admits that it was defended by the eleventh-century jurist al-Māwardī and that it was popular amongst Arabs in the nineteenth century.⁵ Nonetheless, it is generally viewed as true that most Muslims in the empire accepted the Ottoman Caliphate despite the absence of Qurayshi descent.

Yet as the century crept to a close, there were those within and without the Ottoman empire who began to call the Caliphate of the House of Osman into question. There had been military disasters which demonstrated a lack of Ottoman control; there was nascent Arab nationalism, which was transitioning through a kind of Islamic nationalism to a more secular one and which sought to throw off the Turkish yoke; and there were the British, who sought to weaken the Ottomans by calling into question their right to the Caliphate.

It was against this background that, when seeking an alternative to the Ottoman Caliphate, Arab nationalists and the British were wont to turn towards the Sharif of Mecca, who was indeed widely regarded a

descendant of the Prophet from the tribe of Quraysh. Yet the Sharif's writ did not extend beyond the Hijaz, and even in the Hijaz itself the Ottoman Vali limited it at times. To vie for the Caliphate, the Sharif would need to control more territory.

In the latter years of the nineteenth century and in the first years of the twentieth, Arab nationalists began to articulate their vision of a polity that would eventually replace the Ottoman framework. By the time Sharif Husayn ibn 'Ali al-Hāshimī assumed the mantle of the Sharifate in Mekka in 1908, three ideas were in circulation that would have an impact on Husayn's vision of the post-Ottoman order, and therefore influence Sharifian propaganda during the war. These were: the idea of a spiritual Sharifian or Arabian Caliphate; the importance of the Arabs, and of the Arabs of the Arabian Peninsula in particular in an Islamic revival; and the important role the Hijaz should play in a post-Ottoman polity. While the polity that Husayn envisaged borrowed from previous formulations, it included ideas developed from his own experience as the leader of an Arabian chieftaincy. Husayn's vision was of suzerainty, a *ri'āsa*. And it was at this target that he directed his wartime propaganda.

The notion of a Sharifian Caliphate in Mecca has roots that go back to at least the fifteenth century, and is not solely of European invention, as suggested or implied by several researchers. C. Snouck Hurgronje was probably the first scholar to assert so decisively that the idea had solely European roots. "The idea of a Caliphate of the Shereefs of Mecca has been ventilated, more than once, by this or that European writer on Islam, but, in the Moslem world, it has never been broached, and no one of the Shereefs from the House of Katada – rulers in Mecca and in varying portions of West Africa ever since the year 1200 AD – ever thought of such a thing."⁶

Recent research has demonstrated, however, that this is not true. Richard Mortel has shown that at least three Muslim historians from the fifteenth century mentioned the idea quite positively. Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Fāsi, for example, a fifteenth-century historian of Mekka, wrote of Sharif Abū Numayy (r. 1254–1301) that, "were it not for his [Zaydi] *madhhab*, he would have been [a] suitable [choice] for the caliphate ..."⁷

The idea's trail can be picked up again in the nineteenth century, and earlier in that century than has previously been thought. Disappointed with Ottoman reforms, Muslims in Northern Syria in 1858 were reported to support the establishment of a "new Arabian state under the sovereignty of the Shereefs of Mecca."⁸ In 1860, the idea "of using the Grand Sheriff as a kind of Caliph" to oppose the French in Egypt was discussed in British government circles.⁹ Buzpinar notes that there was some obscure talk

in 1876 by Ottoman reformers, of which Abdülhamid was aware, of “separating the caliphate from the sultanate and transferring it to the former Amir of Mecca, Sharif Abdülmuttalib.”¹⁰ And even Abdülhamid himself told a journalist that “England’s aim is to transfer the Great Caliphate from Istanbul to Jidda in Arabia or to a place in Egypt and by keeping the Caliphate under her control to manage all the Muslims as she wishes.”¹¹

It would seem, then, that the idea was already about in the fifteenth century, and then revived, perhaps in only embryonic form, in the mid-nineteenth century. Martin Kramer picks up the story about ten years later in the historical record. The idea of a Sharifian Caliphate in Mecca began to be propagated in the late 1870s by John Louis Sabunji, G.C.M. Birdwood, James Zohrab and even Jamāl al-Dīn “al-Afghānī” al-Asadabādī, although by the last a bit less enthusiastically. The most active on behalf of the idea – Muslim or European – was Wilfred Scawen Blunt, who was in contact with all the above.¹² Blunt espoused a solely spiritual Caliphate, not unlike the papacy.¹³

As we move forward in time, we also see evidence of movement in about 1880 in Bukhara among Muslims to establish a Muslim federation with the Sharif of Mekka as the Caliph,¹⁴ and that towards the end of the century the idea appeared to be quite widespread. British Muslim Marmaduke Pickthall noted that when in Syria in 1894–1896 he heard “Muslim Arabs talking more than once” about the Sharif of Mekka becoming “the spiritual head of the reconstituted realm of El Islam, [and] the Khedive of Egypt the temporal head.”¹⁵

The idea of an Arabian/Sharifian Caliphate became more widely known in the Arab world with the serialization of ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Kawākabī’s (c. 1849–1902) book *Umm al-Qurā* in Rashīd Riḍā’s *al-Manār*, April 1902–February 1903. This work purports to be the minutes of the meeting of a secret Muslim society in Mekka to work for a spiritual Qurayshi Caliphate to be headquartered in the holy city. The Caliph would have political power only in the Hijaz. The existence of the society and its goals were soon being repeated in diplomatic correspondence, and even made it into Negib Azoury’s *Le Réveil de la nation arabe*. As Sylvia Haim demonstrates most convincingly, *Umm al-Qurā* was taken from Blunt’s *The Future of Islam*.¹⁶

Both Azoury and Rashīd Riḍā advocated a spiritual Sharīfian Caliphate in Mekka. Azoury, who published his book in 1905, suggested that an Arab sultan with political power would be headquartered in Mekka, while the Hijaz would be an independent state headed by the Caliph of all the Muslims.¹⁷

Riḍā elaborated on the idea of a spiritual Caliphate. In 1911 he founded a secret society called the Society of the Arab Association (*Jam’iyyat*

al-Jami‘a al-‘Arabiyya), whose aim was to unite the emirs of the Arabian Peninsula who would then join with the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Sharif ‘Abdallah, Husayn’s son, passed through Egypt three years later, met Riḍā, and was inducted into the society. Riḍā proposed that Husayn be made president of a union of Arabian rulers, who would maintain independence internally but defend each other against foreign enemies.

In 1915, Riḍā gave the British a full explanation of his programme. Entitled “The General Organic Law of the Arab Empire”, it supported a spiritual Sharifian Caliphate in Mekka, with temporal rule to be held by a President and Council of Representatives to be headquartered in Damascus.¹⁸

It is clear, then, that the idea was afoot.¹⁹ But what did the Hashimites themselves know of the idea, and, if anything, what did they make of it? Our first piece of evidence comes from al-Afghani. Blunt wrote in 1885: “Amongst other things, he [Afghani] told me that it was he himself who had suggested to the Sherif el Huseyn [Husayn ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Awn] ... to claim the Caliphate, but El Huseyn had said it was impossible without armed support, and the Arabs could never unite except in the name of religion.”²⁰

James Zohrab wrote home extensively, beginning in 1879, of rumours of the existence of a “secret society” in Mekka whose objective was “to restore the Khalifate to the Arabs of the Hedjaz.”²¹ Zohrab was in the Hijaz during the tenure of Sharif Husayn ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Awn (and into the second term of Sharif ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib). It is not unreasonable to surmise that these ideas were already circulating in the Hijaz, and might even have been mentioned by Sharif Husayn ibn Muḥammad himself.

Kawākibī (and Blunt) was impressed by the many supposed qualities of the Arabs of the Peninsula, such as their independence, their freedom from foreign rule and influence, and their knowledge of Islam and the observance of its precepts. Moreover, Kawākibī believed, they practised equity and possessed a strong *esprit de corps*. The Arabian Peninsula itself was particularly well suited to be the headquarters of the Caliph, since it contained the Ka’ba, the Prophet’s Mosque, and was centrally located for Muslims.²² This argument in favour of the Arabs was to find an echo in the proclamations of Sharif Husayn’s revolt (see below) and in the writing of Husayn’s son, ‘Abdallah.²³ Yet both of these elaborated on the idea by personalizing it. For they were not simply Arabs of the Arabian Peninsula, and not simply Quraysh: they were of the house of the Prophet.²⁴

All this suggests that upon assuming office, Sharif Husayn was most probably very well disposed towards the issue of a Sharifian Caliphate, spiritual or otherwise. The notion resided in the collective historical

memory of the house of Hāshim, where there were also feelings of primacy coming from Qurayshī lineage and being of the Prophet's family. The issue was also a topic of general discussion, most famously by al-Kawākibī.

There was no reason, therefore, that an ambitious man such as Husayn would not have considered the possibilities, should they present themselves.

It will never be known for certain just when Husayn began to see the possibility of a Sharifian Caliphate as a realistic one. Although it appears that the *zeitgeist* gave ample reason for him to harbour such wishes, it seems that it was the British who gave him the idea that it might actually be attainable.²⁵ Elie Kedourie and Ernest Dawn agree that in the initial contacts between 'Abdallah, Ronald Storrs (Oriental Secretary in Cairo) and Field Marshal Lord Kitchener (the British Agent in Cairo) in February and April 1914, the Sharif was interested primarily in maintaining the emirate of the Hijaz in his and his family's name. But upon the Ottomans' entry into the hostilities on 31 October 1914, Kitchener fired off a message to 'Abdallah in which he raised the issue of the Caliphate for the first time. Kitchener, it has been noted, "had cherished for a long time the idea of an Arab Caliphate ...". The message was sent (after embellishment by Storrs in Cairo) the next day, 1 November 1914. He asked for the help of the Arab nation, and added a key phrase: "It may be that an Arab of true race will assume the Khalifate at Mecca or Medina and so good may come by the help of God out of all the evil that is now occurring."²⁶ The effect on Husayn of such a statement by a man of Kitchener's stature must surely have been electric. These were heady words indeed.

While Snouck Hurgronje, Kedourie and Kramer emphasized that the notion of a Sharifian Caliphate was a European invention and implied that it was without Arab local validity, we have shown that the idea was actually local and quite old, and therefore most likely part of Husayn's primordial historical memory; it resonated with him. Kitchener's statement therefore did not fall on a *tabula rasa*, as far as Husayn was concerned.

After having read the text, Husayn told Storrs' messenger of his reluctance to revolt. The time was simply not right, said Husayn, but he was fomenting rebellion. He then discussed the Caliphate. He was cautious, but was considering the issue. He said, "There no longer exists a Caliphate ... for their [the Ottomans'] rule projects ... deeds that are all contrary to religion. The Caliphate means this, that the rule of the book of God should be enforced, and this they do not do."²⁷ Kedourie is right in pointing to Husayn's hesitation on the subject, for what he was considering had been talked about for years, but no real opportunity had yet presented itself.

Clearly Husayn's interest in the Caliphate was high, but it was 'Abdallah who pushed things along. Kedourie sees 'Abdallah's hand behind the letter of 14 July 1915 which initiated what was to be known as the Husayn-McMahon correspondence. The letter demanded – apparently for the first time – that “Great Britain will agree to the proclamation of an Arab Caliphate for Islam.” Although Kitchener, in the 31 October 1914 message, had been vague and circumspect (“It may be ...”), it was most certainly tantalizing, and there was no reason for Husayn not to hope and believe that he was the object of Kitchener's statement. High Commissioner McMahon twice reiterated Kitchener's general comment in his letter to Husayn of 30 August 1915, and went even further to note that Britain would welcome the Caliphate's reversion to a “true Arab born of the blessed stock of the Prophet,” a certain reference to the Quraysh, and an implied reference to the Hashemites.²⁸ Kitchener was most probably talking about a spiritual Caliphate à la Blunt (a papacy of Islam), which was a popularly held Western notion, yet Husayn had no reason to believe that Kitchener and McMahon were referring to this type of Caliphate.²⁹

Although there is reason to believe that Husayn by this time was aware of the idea that there were those who conceived of the modern Caliphate as involving a separation of spiritual and temporal powers, Husayn did not subscribe to this notion. There is no reason to believe that Husayn had in mind any type of Caliphate other than the traditional Sunni type, involving temporal as well as a form of spiritual/religious authority or right to lead the *umma* stemming from his being descended from the Quraysh and the Prophet.³⁰

Husayn's ambitions and belief that he could achieve a grand role as a Muslim Arab leader and Caliph were nurtured by contacts with Arab nationalists as well. There is evidence of nascent Arab nationalist support for Husayn as early as 1911, when he received a letter of support for his activities against the Ottoman Vali from some Arab members of the Ottoman Parliament. These deputies gave him their blessing for the religious leadership (*ri'āsa dīniyya*) of the Arab regions.³¹ In that same year, 'Alī Riḍā al-Rikābī, the Ottoman Muḥāfiẓ of Medina, wrote to Istanbul complaining of Husayn's anti-Ottoman activities, and noted that he was assisted by “the revolutionary Society of the Arab Revival” which aimed to set Husayn up as Caliph.³²

The Arab nationalist societies of al-Fatat and al-'Ahd were active once the war began in recruiting the Hashemites to lead them. There were several approaches by the societies in 1915 both to Husayn in Mekka and to Faysal when he was in Damascus. These initial contacts led the Hashemites to believe that they had full Arab support. Husayn's ambitions

were thus augmented, as was the possibility of implementing them. At a family conference in Ṭa'if in June 1915, it was decided in principle to start a revolt and to begin negotiations with Britain.³³

We should not close here without discussing actual, verbalized Hashemite claims to the Caliphate prior to the Revolt. Given that the notion was about for hundreds of years, certain statements about the Caliphate by Husayn and 'Abdallah cited by Kedourie, yet attacked by Dawn as inconclusive, can now be given further weight, thus strengthening Kedourie's position that the Caliphate was a consuming desire for Husayn. In late December 1915 Husayn wrote to the Sudanese leader 'Alī al-Mirghānī on the possibility of the former assuming the Caliphate:

I had not claimed before to be the qualified chief of the Emirs (the Caliph) but I explained to them more than once that I was ready to extend my hand to any man who would come forward and take the rein of authority. I was, however, chosen in every quarter and even forced to take up the question of their future prospects.³⁴

In a verbal message from 'Abdallah to McMahan which accompanied the Sharif's letter of 18 February 1916, 'Abdallah requested 3,000 pounds sterling "for myself and my scheme"; when queried, the messenger explained that 'Abdallah's scheme was to choose a "powerful Islamic Committee from the Arab countries to offer his father the Khalifate. The latter is aware but feigns ignorance of these measures." In a move that could only have greatly increased Husayn's hope of the Caliphate, Storrs sent the money along.³⁵

Our third example took place in October, a few months after the Revolt broke out. 'Abdallah asked Storrs nonchalantly during a meeting in Jeddah in October 1916 if he would address his father by the title *amir al-mu'minīn*, a title most properly attached to the Caliph. Storrs knew this, and demurred, but it shows the direction of 'Abdallah's and Husayn's thinking.³⁶

Husayn's Caliphate and territorial ambitions were influenced, therefore, by three factors. First, there was the general idea – current in Muslim circles from at least the fifteenth century – that the Sharif of Mekka was the legitimate claimant to the Caliphate. Second, communications from both the British and Arab nationalists after he assumed the Sharifate in 1908 augmented his Caliphate ambitions and brought them into the realm of what he thought might actually be attainable. Third, the British and the Arab nationalists also influenced Husayn to believe that he had support for his ambition to achieve Hashemite territorial sovereignty

over much of the Arab world. It may be assumed, therefore, that these elements combined to create in Husayn's mind a powerful mix of personal aspirations and the perceived ability to implement them.

Husayn aspired to the Caliphate in its traditional meaning, as a temporal and spiritual office. As to borders, he wished to control the Arabian Peninsula, Syria and Iraq, but was probably willing to accept some modifications, and not receive everything at once. In his grand strategy the Revolt should lead to a fitting, Muslim replacement for the Ottoman empire, and not simply a truncated Hijazi state controlled by a secular ruler. Throughout the war and until he actually declared himself Caliph in 1924, Husayn consistently maintained these aspirations and gave voice to them in his wartime propaganda.

Sharifian Propaganda in World War I: Text and Action

Meanwhile, in Mekka, Husayn had begun planning those aspects of the Revolt that would be centred there. He was also trying to form alliances with the nearby tribes and the townsfolk of Mekka. The latter, because of their financial dependence on the Ottoman Empire, were reluctant, and in March 1916 Husayn tried to starve them into "cooperation." In what was a form of propaganda, or at the very least an intelligence operation aimed at getting the support of Hijazis, he actually asked the British to blockade the Hijazi coast and cut off its trade; the townsfolk could perhaps be convinced to cooperate in order not to lose their livelihood and, in fact, their food supply.³⁷ The total blockade went into effect on 15 May 1916, and its announcement was communicated to "the Arab Chiefs and the Sheikh of Jeddah" by the commander of the British man-of-war *Suva*.³⁸

It was a masterstroke – Husayn had calculated correctly. In mid-May 1916, meetings of notables, merchants, heads of guilds, "ulama", and the shaykhs of the quarters were held in Mekka, some of which were attended by 'Abdallah. Those present bemoaned the calamity of the blockade and talked about concluding peace with Britain. At some meetings, oaths of allegiance to the Sharif were sworn. The Ottoman acting governor and commandant of Mekka, Binbashi Mehmed Zia Bey, wrote that "an attitude of distrust of the [Ottoman] Government began to appear among the people, and words to the following effect were current: 'Let us invite British protection,' 'Let us declare our independence,' 'Expel all the Turks from Hejaz.'" On 17 May the Ottomans deployed troops in Mekka in anticipation of a revolt. Husayn protested, saying that the comments made at the meetings had been misinterpreted and that the troops would

cause unnecessary alarm. By the night of 9 June the Ottomans noticed suspicious movements by armed men around Mekka, and the first shots were fired on 10 June soon after morning prayers. Zia Bey telephoned Husayn: "The Bedouin are revolting against the Government; find a way out." Husayn replied sarcastically, "Of course we shall," and hung up. The Revolt had begun in Mekka the Revered.³⁹

The empire's highest religious official, the *Şeyhülislam*, issued a fatwa on 7 November 1914, just a week after Kitchener's message to Husayn. The official proclaimed a Jihad and called upon the world's Muslims to take up arms against the Entente powers who were "enemies of Islam." The Sultan himself issued his own proclamation on 11 November, exhorting his armed forces to throw the infidels out of the *Dār al-Islām*, the Abode of Islam. A third proclamation issued by both the *Şeyhülislam* and the Sultan-Caliph on 23 November required the people to obey the Koran, as demanded by the *Şeyhülislam*, his fatwa, and defend the holy places and Islam.⁴⁰

Both the Sultan-Caliph and Husayn appealed, as part of their propaganda, to Islamic legitimacy. With secular Arab nationalism only in its nascent phase, Husayn had to emphasize Islam, yet he did this by stressing that it was the Arabs who were best suited to lead Islam. As for the Ottomans, their appeal was to their Arab subjects on the basis of Islamic solidarity.⁴¹

The Ottoman propaganda was carried in several Arabic-language papers, such as *Jarīdat al-Sharq* and *al-Ālam al-Islāmī*, which appeared in 1916 as part of a concerted Ottoman effort. In these papers, the Ottoman war effort was presented as duty and opportunity for Muslims to defend their faith.⁴²

In opposing *al-Qibla*, the Sharif Husayn's newspaper, *Jarīdat al-Sharq* and *al-Ālam al-Islāmī* could not play the Arab card. Instead, their propaganda centred on accusations that it was Husayn who had caused *fitna* (internecine fighting). He was a traitor to his faith and to the Caliph, whom he had abandoned at a time of crisis.⁴³

Husayn was acutely aware that in leading a revolt against the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph, he had rebelled against the centuries-old Islamic order. He also knew that the idea of Arabism was not an easy sell. To affirm that he was not causing *fitna*, he repeatedly claimed that he was doing his duty to rebel against a leader who violated the shari'a. This justification appears in a series of proclamations and articles published in early issues of Husayn's newspaper, *al-Qibla*.⁴⁴

Al-Qibla was an important vehicle of Sharifian propaganda. Even the name, *al-Qibla* (towards Mekka, the direction of prayer), was Islamically legitimizing and a reminder to Muslims that their religion commanded

them to turn towards Mekka not just in prayer, but in their hearts, to their new leaders, to the Sharif of Mekka, Husayn ibn ‘Alī, instead of the Ottoman Caliph. While we have no independent verification of the periodical’s circulation, at least an indication may be obtained from *al-Qibla*’s claim in 1919 that it had a circulation of 5,000, with most copies distributed outside the Hijaz.⁴⁵

Al-Qibla was part of both the Hashimite and British propaganda effort. The idea for publishing *al-Qibla* originated with Syrians in Cairo, who proposed it to the British. It won the hearty endorsement of Fu’ād al-Khaṭīb, who wrote to Clayton that “there is not the least doubt, that it will always remain loyal to the Allies and particularly to Great Britain.” The British funded it, supplied the equipment, and endeavoured to furnish the paper with “favourable and authentic war news.” Dispatches from Cairo were thoroughly examined before they were sent on to Mekka. As Clayton wrote, “The first number of the Kibla was naturally read over rather carefully in the Arab Bureau, as it was an experiment and required careful checking.”⁴⁶

The first proclamation, published in Egypt on 25 Sha‘ban 1334 [26 June 1916]⁴⁷ was primarily a diatribe against the CUP; it was guilty, Husayn insisted, of oppressing the Hijaz economically, murdering Arab nationalists, and violating the shari‘a. Husayn bemoaned the economic woes of the Hijaz caused by the entry of the Ottomans into the war, and by the ensuing British blockade (for which, it will be remembered, he was greatly responsible): “[t]he middle class,” he proclaimed, “[have been forced to] sell the doors of their houses, their chests of drawers and even the wood from the ceilings of their houses after selling all their furniture and clothes in hunger.” He decried the brutality of the ruling Ottoman triumvirate of Enver, Talāt and Cemal, in the hanging of 21 Arab nationalists. And he attacked the CUP at length for changing and violating the shari‘a. His proclamation mentioned an article in an Istanbul paper that was “disrespectful” of the Prophet, and he attacked the CUP for rejecting the *shar‘i* rules of inheritance which give a man a portion double that of a woman. The CUP was accused of limiting the power of the Sultan-Caliph. Moreover, the CUP had ordered the troops fighting Husayn not only to break the fast of Ramadan, but also to shell the Ka‘ba.⁴⁸

The second proclamation, dated 21 Dhu al-Qa‘dah 1335 [20 September 1916],⁴⁹ blamed the triumvirate for causing the downfall of the Empire by alienating Britain and France, and further crimes against the *shari‘a* were elucidated, particularly relating to the honour of women. Ottoman soldiers had taken the young girls (*mukhaddarat*) of the ‘Awali bedouin, near Medina, to the military barracks, an act “condemned by the Islamic

shari'ah and the Arab [sense of] honor." Cemal was accused of organizing a women's society in Syria, and forcing the society to hold a reception where the women sang to the men. They had therefore disobeyed the word of God by violating the honour of women, and the 'Islamic state' (*dawlat al-Islam*) had been sacrificed to the personal ambitions of the triumvirate. This proclamation embodied Husayn's idea of the lawful state: it had to be headed by a Caliph, embrace all the *umma*, and rule according to the *shari'a*. Ottoman rule, according to Husayn, clearly no longer fitted the bill.⁵⁰

The third proclamation, dated 4 Safar 1335 [10 December 1916],⁵¹ was the first issued after Husayn assumed the self-proclaimed royal dignity, and is signed "King of the Arab Countries." It is an attempt to transition an Islamic identity into an Islamically informed Arab one. In this proclamation he elaborated on the link between Arabism and Islam, declaring that national (*qawmiyya*) and patriotic (*waṭaniyya*) duty was the same as the religious duty of the Muslim, namely, to follow the *shari'a* and to revolt against those who "took the religion of God as an amusement and as a game."⁵² The fourth proclamation, dated 10 Jumada al-Ula 1335 [4 March 1917], was important for announcing the omission of the Sultan's name from the *khutba*, a move which Husayn declared he had previously avoided out of reverence for tradition.⁵³ That it took nearly a year to take this symbolic crucial step demonstrated his cautious approach to delegitimizing the Ottoman Caliphate.

The Hijazi "ulama" issued their own statement in March 1917.⁵⁴ It began by claiming primacy to speak since they were the "ulama" of the Haramayn, and expressed their outrage at the un-Islamic behaviour in government, "where Muslim women employed by the Government and exposed in public places unveiled before men of strange nations." It is best to let the statement speak for itself:

We endeavoured to please God and avoid a rebellion so long as it was possible. We rebelled in order to please God, and He gave us victory and stood by us in support of His law and religion, and in accordance with a wisdom known to Him which would lead to the uplifting of this people.

Every Moslem heart in the Ottoman Empire, even among the Turks in Anatolia and among the members of the Turkish royal family in the palaces, prays God for our success, and God always answers the prayers of the oppressed and the righteous.

There is no doubt about it, that if the inhabitants of those countries which the Unionists have lost through their alliance with Germany in this war had revolted against those oppressors, just as we did, they

would have no more been regarded as belligerents and would thus have saved their countries for themselves. But if things should continue as they are, no territory will remain for this empire.

If you keep this in mind and remember what the Indian paper *Mashrek* wrote on September 12th and 19th on the subject of the disqualification of the Beni Osman to be the Caliphs of Islam, you will understand that we have risen in order to avert these dangers and to put the Islamic rule on a firm foundation of true civilisation according to the noble dictates of our religion.

If our revolution were only to preserve the integrity of our country and to save it from what has befallen other Islamic countries, it is enough, and we are amply justified.

We have done what we ought to do. We have cleansed our country from the germs of atheism and evil. The best course for those Moslems who still side with and defend this notorious gang of Unionists, is to submit to the will of God before their tongues, hands, and feet give witness against them.

It is a great mistake to suppose that in rising against this party we are rising against a legitimate Caliph possessing all the legal or, at least, some of the conditions qualifying him to be such.

What does the Mohammedan world say of the Beni Osman who pretend to be Caliphs of Islam, while for many years they were like puppets in the hands of the Janissaries; tossed about, dethroned, and killed by them, in a manner contrary to the laws and doctrines established in the books of religion on the accession and dethronement of Caliphs – which facts are recorded in their history?

We want those who are present here to tell you who are far away that we shall confess before Almighty God, on the last day, that today we do not know of any Moslem ruler more righteous and fearing God than the son of His Prophet who is now on the throne of the Arab country.

We do not know any one more zealous than he in religion, more observant of the law of God in words and deeds, and more capable of managing our affairs in such a way as would please God. The people of the Holy Land have proclaimed him their King simply because, in so doing, they would be serving their religion and country.

As to the question of the Caliphate, in spite of all that is known of the deplorable condition in which it is situated at the present moment, we have not interfered with it at all and it will remain as it is pending the final decision of the whole Mohammedan world.

Other statements at the beginning of the war, written by Husayn, *al-Qibla's* editor Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, or Fu'ād al-Khaṭīb, were

published in early issues of *al-Qibla*.⁵⁵ The premiere issue of the paper, in August 1916, for example, had pre-empted an Ottoman accusation of *fitna*: the Turks had abandoned religion, and this in itself was “*fitna* in every sense of the term.”⁵⁶ Husayn was out to save Islam and the Caliphate from the CUP. The Young Turks’ treatment of the Caliph was also attacked: they had imprisoned him and many “ulama”, thus humiliating the Caliphate and shaming Islam before the world. Those who behaved in such a manner, wrote *al-Qibla*, had “exceeded the divine statutes of God, and he who transgresses the divine statutes is an oppressor.”⁵⁷ And finally, expressing the perceived integral link between Arabs and Islam, the paper attacked the Young Turks for proposing a translation of the Koran into Turkish, for a “Qur’an not in Arabic is an imperfect Qur’an, and a copy of it remains jahiliyyah.” An article by Fu’ad al-Khaṭīb exhorted all Muslims to fight on behalf of the fatherland, and for the cause of Muslims everywhere.⁵⁸

Thoroughly grounded in Islam, whose message the Arabs had the most right to convey, the Revolt’s propaganda presented itself to the Islamic world. But what was Husayn planning?

“King of the Arab Nation”

On 29 October 1916, Colonel Wilson in Jeddah received the following telegram:

According to wish of public and assembled Ulema the Great Master, His Majesty Our Lord and Lord of all el-Hussein Ibn Ali has been recognised as King of Arab nation and he will be recognised as religious head until Moslems are of one opinion concerning Islamic Caliphate ...

The telegram was signed by ‘Abdallah as Minister for Foreign Affairs. The news was unnerving to British officials, who had seen no indication that Husayn had intended to make such a move. “This is rather a bomb,” minuted a Foreign Office official drily.⁵⁹

British astonishment notwithstanding,⁶⁰ Husayn’s move was entirely consistent with his pretensions. Claiming Kingship of the Arabs was a direct threat to the Ottomans and their Caliphate, for it asserted sovereignty over key Ottoman territory. Indeed, the issue had been raised twice on earlier occasions, but the British had not dealt with it seriously.⁶¹

The assumption of kingship took place at his palace in Mekka, with assorted guests in attendance. The event was carefully orchestrated by

‘Abdallah as a propagandistic spectacle, on the pretext of celebrating the Muslim New Year, 1335, which began on 28 October 1916. It was to seem like a guileless response to a demand made spontaneously by the notables and “ulama”. A long address and a petition from the “ulama” and notables recognizing Husayn as King of the Arabs was read by a religious official, and the reading was frequently corrected by ‘Abdallah, who knew the text by heart (a sure indication of his authorship). The head of the French mission in the Hijaz, Colonel Brémont, reported that his French Muslim officers present at the occasion had difficulty understanding the address, as it was delivered “in very classical Arabic with a Syrian accent, no word of which [they] understood.” ‘Abdallah telegraphed Brémont announcing his father’s new title, and added that Brémont’s Muslim aide, Lieutenant Colonel Cadi, “as well as all the members of the French delegation had attended the ceremony.”⁶²

‘Abdallah had managed to force the merchants, *shuyūkh al-ḥārāt* and notables of Jeddah into a coalition with Husayn. Several notables who were close to ‘Abdallah were instructed to spread rumours that Husayn had been recognized by England, France, Russia and Italy as well as all the neutral countries. They were also to keep a record of those who decorated their shops and houses in honour of the event. A committee of some major figures in town held a reception. And the merchants, *shuyūkh al-ḥārāt* and notables were ordered to send a boilerplate congratulatory telegram, whose text had been authored by ‘Abdallah. The head of the telegraph office was instructed not to send any telegrams which deviated from the formula. Over 2,500 telegrams of congratulations reached the Sharif from Jeddah, wrote *al-Qibla*.⁶³ Even taking exaggeration into account, ‘Abdallah, it appeared, had done his work well, to the discomfort of those whom he had coerced. It was the assessment of a British agent that “the people in Jeddah are not pleased with the Sherif declaring himself King.” Those who had sent telegrams or who in other ways had expressed support for Husayn were now bound to him in writing. If Husayn failed, the Ottomans would not treat them kindly.

The text of articles in *al-Qibla* and of the announcement of Husayn’s new title stopped just short of proclaiming him Caliph. The revolt was aimed, he declared, not at the reigning Caliph but at the CUP. Nevertheless, the language was so suggestive that his intentions were unmistakable.

The petition, read out as a proclamation by ‘Abdallah, reflected the same theory of the primacy of the Arabs in Islam first articulated by al-Kawākabī, elaborated upon by Rashid Rida and later echoed by ‘Abdallah in his memoirs, that “God singled out the children of Isma‘il” and that the Arabs were the most exalted of nations because they spread the message of *tawḥīd*. Quoting Muslim (the compiler of a canonical compilation of

hadiths), the petition stressed that the Prophet had been chosen because he was an Arab, of Quraysh, of the Bani Hāshim. The petition then turned to Husayn, praising his connection to the Prophet, and stating that the petitioners did not know a more pious and God-fearing emir. He was the “Saviour of Islam,” and he would lead the Arabs to freedom from those who had oppressed them. The petition then stated, “We recognise His Majesty our lord and master al-Husayn ibn ‘Ali as our King, we the Arabs, and he will act amongst us according to the book of God Almighty and the laws of His Prophet, prayer and peace upon him.” It concluded with an oath of allegiance to him as their “religious authority [*marja’ dīnī*] pending the decision of the Islamic world in the matter of the Islamic Caliphate.”⁶⁴ Although the petition declared him King of the Arabs and not Caliph, the qualifications specified for the former included those for the latter.

An account of the event was printed in *al-Qibla* alongside the text of the petition; it endeavoured to show that the “*ulama*” and the notables had spontaneously come to Husayn. All had gathered, it was reported, for the purpose of persuading Husayn to assume the mantle of “King of the Arabs (*malik ‘alā al-‘Arab*) and [to be] their religious authority (*marja’ dīnī*) until the Islamic world reached a unanimous opinion in the matter of the Islamic Caliphate.” Shaykh ‘Abdallah Sarraj, head (*ra’īs*) of the “*ulama*” of Mekka and chief qadi, entered the Hashimite Palace to inform Husayn that the crowd demanded that he come to them. The groups submitted the petition to Husayn when he joined them. He exclaimed, “I have never thought it necessary for you to do such a thing ... I swear to you by Almighty God that this had never occurred to me.” The audience then insisted that he accept their wishes, he complied, and a proclamation was read establishing his new title. Fu’ād al-Khaṭīb then stepped forward to proclaim the loyalty of Syrians to the new King.⁶⁵

To further his propaganda against the Ottomans, Husayn also caused a fatwa to be issued and sent to India’s Muslims, where support for the Ottoman Caliphate was strong.⁶⁶ The text begins with an attack on the CUP who “had evil intentions towards our religion.” One had only to go to Istanbul, continued the fatwa, to see “Moslem women employed in the Postal and Finance Administration in the same way as men are with perfect coquetry and unveiled, meeting men of various nationalities and going about their business. To obey these people would be to disobey God; so we chose to invoke their anger, and not that of God.” An article had appeared in an Indian paper that assessed the Ottomans as unqualified for Caliphate. The fatwa mentioned this article, and continued:

Today we do not know of any Moslem ruler more righteous and fearing God, than the son of His Prophet, who is now on the throne of the Arab Country. We do not know anyone more zealous in religion, more observant of the Laws of God in words and deeds, and more capable of managing our affairs in what would please God, than he is. The Arabs have proclaimed him King over them only because in doing so they would be serving their religion and country. As to the question of the Khalifat, in spite of all that is known of the deplorable condition in which it is situated at the present moment, we have not interfered with it at all and will remain as it is pending the final decision of the whole Mohammedan world.

The fatwa was signed by all the leading “ulama” of Mekka.⁶⁷ As Ruhi wrote, the proclamation was “a step towards the Caliphate.”⁶⁸

A few months after the assumption of the kingship *al-Qibla* printed the speech of “a representative of Medina” under a banner *bismillah* headline. The “representative” addressed the *Sharif* as “His Highness [*jalāla*] our Master [*mawlānā*] *Amīr al-Mu’immīn* and the Caliph of the Messenger of the Lord of the Worlds our Lord and Lord of all, *Sharīf al-Husayn bin ‘Ali*.”⁶⁹ Other numerous articles asserted the illegitimacy of the Ottoman Caliphate and the qualifications of Quraysh and the Prophet’s house.⁷⁰

“The Great Applier of God’s Law”

Since Husayn desired to portray himself as a true Islamic ruler, in strong contradistinction to the Caliph and the other rulers of the empire, he administered justice in a very different way from the Ottomans.

Before 1916 the shari’a courts seem to have functioned under the Ottomans’ typical leniency in the application of the *ḥudūd* (sing. *ḥadd*) punishments, the Koranic penalties prescribed for certain crimes, such as the amputation of a hand or foot for theft.⁷¹ Snouck Hurgronje, writing of the late nineteenth century Hijaz, hints that the *ḥudūd* were used, but that the religious law, “by its marvellously mild application secures a way out for all offenders.”⁷² Ochsenwald, who covers the period 1840–1908, confirms the lax use of the *ḥudūd*. He notes that “[p]unishment for such crimes as burglary and forgery consisted of flogging and short prison sentences.”⁷³

When he began the Revolt, Husayn posed as the defender of Islamic law against the secularizing reforms of the Young Turks. His call was not a national one, as this would have generated little response, but an

Islamic call. In his first proclamation, he singled out the changes the empire had instituted in the *sharī* laws of inheritance (*mirāth*): it had established the *mirāth niẓāmī*, which gave newfound equality to males and females in inheritance. In general, all the *qawanīn* (secular laws) were applied in the Arab lands, but less so in the Hijaz, and the *mirāth niẓāmī* not at all.⁷⁴ Nonetheless, Husayn cited this *niẓām* as one of the reasons for his revolt, when he accused the Young Turks of having the gall to mock God's word in the Koran, where He said that the man's part was twice that of the woman ("*lil-dhakar mithl ḥaẓẓ al-unthayayn*").⁷⁵ With his pretensions to lead the Arab world, opposition to the *mirāth niẓāmī* was designed to strike a strong cord among traditionally minded Muslim males in Syria and Iraq.

The Young Turks were perceived all over the empire as anti-*sharī*. At home in Anatolia, the counter-revolution of April 1909 took up the slogan "the Şeriat is in danger, we want the Şeriat!"⁷⁶ In February 1910 the Ministry of Justice wrote to the Ministry of Finance with a proposal to reorganize the courts in the Hijaz. When 'Abdallah and the other Hijazi deputies learned this, they wrote to the Grand Vizier that "the presence of any courts other than the *shari'a* would be unacceptable in the holy cities of Islam." Perhaps because of their letter, and the opinion of Talāt that the *shari'a* law was better suited than secular law to Hijazi society, the *shari'a* courts of the Hijaz remained under the *Şeyhülislam*, the top religious figure in the Empire.⁷⁷ But the threat to the *shari'a* remained. In 1913 and 1915 the Young Turks weakened the independence of the *shari'a* courts by placing them under the authority of the secular Ministry of Justice.⁷⁸

Therefore, when the revolt began, Husayn moved rapidly to demonstrate his commitment to the *shari'a*. The *Sharīf* never ceased to emphasize that he abided by it, and British observers found his application of *shari'a* law worthy of note. The fourth issue of *al-Qibla* carried an announcement that Husayn had ordered the reorganization of the *shari'a* court in Mekka. Good salaries would be paid to all officials, and the court would be conducted according to religious law. Fees were to be lower than those set by the Ottomans, and officials who charged more than the official rate would be fired.⁷⁹

The carrying out of the *hudūd* was something of which Husayn was quite proud. For instance, in 1918, four men imprisoned in Yanbu' made an escape but were caught. The organizer of the escape, who had been imprisoned on Husayn's orders, received the *ḥadd* of having both a hand and a foot amputated. *Al-Qibla* noted that this was the first time this type of *ḥadd* had been applied in the Hijaz, and therefore the people were happy that the *shari'a* was being put to use against serious criminals.⁸⁰ The British were shocked, but refrained from making any official protest.

Wilson, who discussed the incident with Husayn informally, noted that the act “created a good deal of diverse criticism on the part of the nobles of Jeddah.” Husayn’s reply was that this *ḥadd* was the punishment laid down for rebellion or acts against public security or against the government by the shari‘a.⁸¹

Foreign observers noted that the *ḥudūd* were applied with particular fervour during the hajj, as Husayn wished to impress the *ḥujjāj* with his Islamic zeal as part of his propaganda efforts.⁸² An incident was reported in *al-Qibla* in 1923 under the headline, “Applying the *Ḥudūd al-Shar‘iyya*.” The paper said that two pickpockets had been caught working one of the pilgrimage caravans. They were taken to Mekka, where the *ḥadd* was applied as the crowd chanted the Koranic passage, “*al-sāriq wal-sāriqa fa-qta‘ū aydiyahumā*” (“As for the thief, both male and female, cut off their hands”).⁸³

In late February 1917, the French mission received a letter from a Hashimite official stating that the government would no longer tolerate the importation of alcoholic beverages. The French would, however, be allowed a small amount for personal use, as long as the customs officials were informed when it was brought into the Hijaz.⁸⁴ A few days later, *al-Qibla* trumpeted the new policy as evidence of the *Sharif*’s concern for the shari‘a. (So as not to upset the merchants, it was announced that all stocks of alcoholic beverages would be purchased by the government.)⁸⁵

Acts of unlawful intercourse were apparently also a problem addressed by Husayn to demonstrate his Islamic credentials as opposed to those of the Ottoman regime ... Writing in May 1920, the British agent in Mekka, Ihsanullah, reported that Husayn was “greatly grieved [about] the daily spreading of adultery in the holy city, and that during the last month twenty-three ... virgin girls [were] found [to be] pregnant.” Ihsanullah noted a case wherein an adulterer from the Jiyad quarter of Mekka had been arrested and jailed. The woman, he added, was sent to jail, “where she [would] remain forever.” “Indecent women,” of whom Ihsanullah noted 150 in Mecca, were incarcerated in a special prison.⁸⁶

In another case, *al-Qibla* reported that a court had sentenced some wine drinkers to the *ḥadd* of lashes. After the sentence had been carried out, the offenders were drafted into the army or sent to work on the railway.⁸⁷ Reporting from Mekka, British representative Captain Ajab Khan noted the puritanical streak in Mekka’s administration:

Liquors, Music, Gramophones, singing and dancing are prohibited to the public. A certain Sheikh of a ‘Hara’ [quarter] was recently reported for illicit distilling of ‘Aruck’ at his house for his own use[.] [O]n searching his house, distilling apparatus was found and captured[,] and with-

out any further trial, all the distilling pottery was flung at the head of the defaulting Sheikh and an award of 80 lashes was also inflicted on him.

Historically, some Muslim jurists viewed the use of cannabis as a crime, but the state's reaction to it varied, perhaps because, as Rosenthal reasons, it was not barred by "the authority of express statements creditable to the very highest religious sources."⁸⁸ In punishing sellers, however, Husayn followed the strictest interpretation of the jurists, and outlawed the sale of hashish in Mekka. Shipments were confiscated, and the dealers were fined and imprisoned. (This resulted, wrote Ajab Khan, in lowering the quality of the herb available in the holy city.) Hashish was sometimes sold by the most well known of the élite: in 1920, for instance, a large quantity was found in the house of Muḥammad al-Shayba, of the family that held the keys to the Ka'ba. Only Shayba's high status saved him from being imprisoned.⁸⁹

After the fall of Medina in January 1919, *al-Qibla* made a point of warning that sitting in the city's coffee houses and running shops and government offices during prayer time would no longer be tolerated. From now on, said the paper, everyone must go to the mosque.⁹⁰ Captain Zia, the Turkish officer who had been sent to negotiate the surrender of Medina, told the British that Husayn was unfit to run "civilized areas," "witness his ruthless application of effete Koranic punishments, such as [the] cutting off of hands and feet for minor offences"; Zia said, "such action has already gone far to alienate all intelligent Moslem opinion outside of Hejaz."⁹¹

Symbols and Spectacle as Propaganda

Husayn gave his state the standard symbols: first a flag, then stamps, and finally coins in 1923, the last several months before he declared himself caliph.

The flag of Husayn's kingdom was a red chevron with three horizontal stripes: black, white and green. Black was for the 'Abbasids, white for the Umayyads, green for the Shi'a of 'Alī, and red was for the ashraf of Mekka. It appears that Mark Sykes himself designed the flag; our sources are not only Sykes' biographer, but Husayn himself. During one of his conversations with Wilson touting his ambitions and his belief that Britain supported them, he told the British Agent that his national flag was the Arab national flag, and had been designed by a British official, Mark Sykes; the flag symbolized Hashimite rule over the Arabs. As a result, he was entitled to rule over the Arab world.⁹²

Ami Ayalon notes that stamps are important for conveying messages for mass domestic and international consumption. “They reflect ideologies, aspirations and values, attesting to political, social and cultural ideas ...”⁹³ It is unclear just on whose initiative Hijazi postage stamps were printed. According to Storrs it was his idea, although the diplomatic record shows that McMahan had telegraphed the Foreign Office that “Shereef requests to be provided with issue of postage stamps.” In either case, both parties had an interest in showing *Sharifian* independence from the Ottomans, and stamps were an often-used indication of independence. Storrs was acutely aware of the propaganda value of stamps: “[s]hortly after the Arab Revolution, we found that is success was being denied or blanketed by the Enemy Press (which was of course quoted by neutrals), and we decided that the best proof that it had taken place would be provide by the issue of Hejaz postage stamps in Arabic.” This would be helpful, noted Storrs, in spreading “the Arab propaganda” worldwide. During the hajj, he observed, letters could be sent from Mekka to the entire Muslim world, demonstrating that there was now an independent Arab-led Muslim state and it was not a British invention, but a real polity, as demonstrated by the stamps.⁹⁴

Husayn’s first designs were rejected by the British as not good enough (they were of monuments in the Hijaz), and they set T.E. Lawrence, then an intelligence officer in the Survey Department of Egypt, the task of redesigning them. The designs finally chosen were of calligraphy and abstract geometrical motifs based on monuments in Cairo. The central motif in all the stamps was the calligraphic *Makka al-Mukarrama* (Mecca the Revered), and they bore the simple legend “Hijaz Mail” (*Barīd Ḥijāzī*). Contemporary observers pronounced the stamps beautifully designed and executed. Husayn was proud of his stamps, and often publicized international reaction to them.⁹⁵

The stamps were first issued on 26 September 1916. While it is difficult to assess their actual propaganda value, they did travel across the Atlantic fairly quickly, where they were reviewed in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (*JAOS*) quite favourably for their beauty. But for our purposes, it is important to note that *JAOS* also commented that Husayn’s postage “proved documentarily” that “the newly formed independent state of the Hijaz” was “an accomplished fact.”⁹⁶

The above holds true for stamps issued from 1916–1917. There are no signs of Husayn’s greater ambition in them, and the legend *Barīd Ḥijāzī* was rather limiting for the “King of the Arab Lands.” Terms such as “government,” “state,” “Arab” and “Hashimite” were conspicuously absent, no doubt because of British reservations. But after 1921, with his ambitions clipped by the British, Husayn issued stamps that were

more in keeping with his far-reaching goals: these stamps carried the legend “*al-Ḥukūma al-‘Arabīyya al-Hāshimīyya*” (the Hashimite Arab Government). Finally, in 1924, he issued stamps with a gold overprint, “*Tidhkār al-Khilāfa*” (Commemorating the Caliphate), in honour of his assumption of the title.⁹⁷

Similarly, Husayn began issuing coins by simply overstriking Ottoman, Egyptian and Austrian Maria Theresa thaler coins with the logo *al-Hijaz*. It was not until September 1923, a few months before he assumed the caliphate, that Husayn actually minted his own coins, with a decidedly more royal flavour. These carried, *inter alia*, the following logos: “Hashimite Arab Government” (*al-Ḥukūma al-‘Arabīyya al-Hāshimīyya*); “Struck at Mecca the Revered, Capital of the Arab Government”; and “Husayn bin ‘Ali, Reviver of the Arab Lands” (*Nāhid bil-Bilād al-‘Arabīyya*). Most of the coins were in bronze and silver, while the highest denomination, one dinar, was gold. They were all dated with the year of Husayn’s accession, AH 1334, and with the regnal year, 8 (a few were minted with the ninth regnal year).⁹⁸

Propaganda could be legal, printed or visual. In the Bedouin society which made up much of the Hijaz, Husayn’s son Faysal was adept at the spectacle of propaganda. On 4 January 1917, after consolidating his hold over the tribes along the coast North of Mekka, Faysal put on a show as he marched to Wajh. Here it is as described by Lawrence. Even allowing for his hyperbole, the procession of over 10,000 must have been a sight to see, effective propaganda, and quite the spectacle:

The march became rather splendid and barbaric. First rode Feisal in white, then Sharraf at his right in red head-cloth and henna-dyed tunic and cloak, myself on his left in white and scarlet, behind us three banners of faded crimson silk with gilt spikes, behind them the drummers playing a march, and behind them against the wild mass of twelve hundred bouncing camels of the bodyguard, packed as closely as they could move, the men in every variety of coloured clothes and the camels nearly as brilliant in their trappings. We filled the valley to its banks with our flashing stream.⁹⁹

As leaders of an established empire, the Ottomans had proclaimed Jihad at least six times between 1768 and 1922. Their proclamation this time around was aimed specifically at mobilizing the empire’s Arab subjects and securing their allegiance in the face of British incitement.¹⁰⁰ For them it was not an exceptional occasion. But it most certainly was for *Sharif* Husayn. He had to protect his project against accusations of sedition, arouse still embryonic passions of Arab nationalism against

a legitimate Islamic sovereign, and demonstrate that he provided a real alternative to the Ottoman Caliphate. This formed the core of the Hashimite propaganda efforts during the war as he countered those of the Ottomans.

We are entitled to ask if *Sharif* Husayn's wartime propaganda was successful. The answer should be no – at least for the most part. Most of the empire's Arab subjects remained loyal to the Sublime Porte until it was all over.¹⁰¹ Certainly, the British did put Hashimites in power in Transjordan and Iraq, which was something of an imperial achievement, but Husayn himself achieved little. As for his dear project of achieving the Caliphate, when the Ottomans abolished it in 1924 he was quick to claim the office – but no one was really listening.

Notes

- * The author would like to thank Marissa Young for her research assistance.
- 1 Richard Nelson, *A Chronology and Glossary of Propaganda in the United States* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), pp. 232–233, capitalization in the original.
 - 2 Gareth Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1999, third edition), p. 6.
 - 3 M. Sanders, "Wellington House and British Propaganda during the First World War", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March 1975), pp. 119–146. See also M.L. Sanders and Philip M. Taylor, *British Propaganda During the First World War, 1914–18* (London: Macmillan Press, 1982).
 - 4 This is especially true of the Hanafi tradition: S. Tufan Buzpinar, "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate in the Early Years of Abdulhamid II: 1877–1882," *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 36, no. 1 (1996), pp. 60–61.
 - 5 Buzpinar, "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate", p. 62.
 - 6 C. Snouck Hurgronje, *The Revolt in Arabia* (New York: Putnam, 1917), pp. 34–35.
 - 7 Richard Mortel, "Zaydi Shi'ism and the Hasanid *Sharifs* of Mecca", *IJMES* 9 (1978), pp. 461–462. The other two historians were Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442), and Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Mahasin Yūsuf ibn Taghrībirdī (d. 1470). Al-Fāsi's singling out of Abū Numayy was most probably due to his reigning during the time of the destruction of the Abbasid Caliphate by the Mongols in 1258; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka in the Latter Part of the 19th Century* (Leyden: Brill, 1931), pp. 183–184, also notes that the *Sharifs* of Mekka were at one time Zaydi Shiis.
 - 8 FO 78/1389, J.H. Skene (Aleppo) to Earl of Malmesbury, No. 33, 7 August 1858, enclosing copy Skene to Charles Alison, No. 20, 31 July 1858.
 - 9 FO 78/1514, 12 December 1860, cited in G.P. Gooch and Harold Temperley (eds.), *British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898–1914, Vol. x, Part II, The Last Years of Peace* (London: HMSO, 1938), p. 824. The editors note that there "is no real evidence of Arab support for the idea."

- 10 Buzpinar, "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate", pp. 63–64.
- 11 Ibid., "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate", p. 64. See Buzpinar's footnote 15 for his Ottoman source of the quotation.
- 12 Martin Kramer, *Islam Assembled* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 10–22. Sabunji was a former Syrian Catholic priest turned journalist from Diyarbekir who settled for several years in England; Birdwood was an Indian civil servant; Blunt was a Victorian poet and politician; Zohrab was British consul, Jeddah, from October 1878 to July 1881.
- 13 Elie Kedourie, *England and the Middle East* (Boulder: Westview, 1987), pp. 52–54.
- 14 Sylvia G. Haim, "Blunt and al-Kawakibi", *Oriente Moderno*, vol. 35 no. 2. (1955), p. 136.
- 15 Quoted in Sylvia G. Haim, *Arab Nationalism: An Anthology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), p. 28.
- 16 It has been shown that Kawākabi borrowed his ideas from Blunt (Haim, "Blunt and al-Kawakibi"); Elie Kedourie, *Arabic Political Memoirs and Other Studies* (London: Frank Cass, 1974), pp. 107–114; Eliezer Tauber, *The Emergence of the Arab Movement* (London: Frank Cass, 1993), p. 31.
- 17 Eliezer Tauber, "Three Approaches, One Idea: Religion and State in the Thought of Abd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi, Najib 'Azuri and Rashid Rida", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 21 (1994), pp. 190–198.
- 18 Tauber, "Three Approaches"; Eliezer Tauber, "Rashid Rida's Political Attitudes During World War I", *Muslim World*, Vol. 85 (1995), pp. 107–121; Tauber, *The Emergence of the Arab Movement*, pp. 109–117.
- 19 While the idea was the subject of discussion, it is not my intention to suggest that it was widely accepted; the popularity of the notion among wide circles of people would be quite difficult to assess, given the nature of our sources. Yet I do intend to suggest that Husayn thought that it might be accepted one day, given the right circumstances.
- 20 Quoted in Kramer, *Islam Assembled*, p. 20. Given al-Afghānī's poor reputation for telling the truth, one should take his statement with a grain of salt, although it is not unlikely.
- 21 FO 195/1251, Zohrab (Jeddah) to Marquis of Salisbury, No. 34, 6 August 1879 (quoted); FO 78/3314, Zohrab (Jeddah), 8 February 1881, quoted in Kramer, op. cit., 15.
- 22 Haim, "Blunt and al-Kawakibi."
- 23 See C. Ernest Dawn, *From Ottomanism to Arabism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973), pp. 69–86.
- 24 Yisrael Gershoni, "Ha-Leum Ha'Aravi, Beyt Hashim ve-Suriya ha-Gedola bi-Khtavav shel 'Abdallah, Helek Rishon", *Hamizrah Hehadash*, Vol. 25 (1975), pp. 1–26.
- 25 On the Caliphate *zeitgeist* in Britain see Peter Hopkirk, *Like Hidden Fire: The Plot to Bring Down the British Empire* (New York: Kodansha USA, 1997); Buzpinar, "Opposition to the Ottoman Caliphate"; and John Buchan, *Greenmantle* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1916).
- 26 Elie Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, pp. 48–54; the Kitchener quotation is on p. 52. The quotation on Kitchener's long held favouring of an Arab Caliphate is

taken from Jukka Nevakivi, *Britain, France and the Arab Middle East, 1914–1920* (London: Athlone, 1969), p. 18; on Kitchener and the Caliphate see Sir George Arthur, *Life of Lord Kitchener* (New York: Macmillan, 1920), Vol. 3, pp. 53–54. Kedourie and Dawn have debated Husayn's Caliphate aspirations in the pages of *IJMES* (9 [1978], pp. 120–130; 10 [1979], pp. 420–426). Kedourie argues that Husayn was primarily interested in the Caliphate after the Kitchener message. Dawn says that the Caliphate “was of interest to Husayn primarily as an instrument in his efforts with the British to gain kingship for himself and as much territory as possible for himself and the Arabs” (p. 423). But Dawn does not deny that Husayn was interested in the Caliphate, only that it was a primary motivating factor. For this article's purposes, that he was interested in the Caliphate at all shows just how grand his ambitions were, and how they affected his propaganda during the war.

- 27 L/P&s/18/B22, “Shorthand Note taken by Messenger [Ali Asghar] of a discourse by the Sherif of Mecca”, undated [first week of December 1914]. This paper is also in Wingate Papers, 134/8/114–116, where it is dated 9 December 1914.
- 28 Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, p. 52; George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1939), p. 414 (letter of 14 July 1915).
- 29 Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, pp. 52–52; Thomas Arnold, *The Caliphate* (London: Routledge, Kegan Paul, 1965), pp. 146–147, 170–171, 189–200. Kedourie has also shown the influence of ‘Abbas Ḥilmī, Storrs, Wingate and Clayton in lobbying for a Sharifian Caliphate, although most of this effort came after the initial Kitchener communications: see Elie Kedourie, *In the Anglo-Arab Labyrinth: The McMahon-Husayn Correspondence and its Interpretations 1914–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 7–64. Wingate was particularly active, writing to several movers and shakers in London in the spring and summer of 1915 and enclosing a memorandum from the Grand Qadi of the Sudan, Sir Sayyid ‘Alī al-Mirghānī, who also favoured a Sharifian Caliphate. In a letter dated 17 November 1915, Mirghānī wrote to the *Sharif*, presumably with Wingate's authority, urging him to “rise and take over the reins of the holy Arabian Koreishite Khaliphate, which you represent, being a direct descendant of our Holy Prophet” (Kedourie, *Anglo-Arab*, pp. 42–43).
- 30 Indeed, Husayn's newspaper *al-Qibla* was later to take issue with the notion of a separation between the spiritual and temporal functions of the Caliph; Islam, wrote *al-Qibla*, does not recognize a spiritual Caliphate akin to the Papacy (*al-Qibla*, 21 Shawwal 1335 [9 August 1917]).
- 31 The letter's authenticity is disputed in the anti-Hashimite treatise, Anīs Ṣāyigh, *Al-Hashimiyyun wa-al Thawra al-‘Arabīyya al-Kubrā* (Beirut: Dar al-Talī‘a, 1966), pp. 22–24, but Dawn, *From Ottomanism to Arabism*, p. 11, believes the letter to be authentic. The text of the letter is in Sulayman Musa, *al-Ḥaraka al-‘Arabīyya* (Beirut: al-Nahār, 1982), p. 57.
- 32 Tauber, *The Emergence of the Arab Movement*, pp. 49–50.
- 33 Eliezer Tauber, *The Arab Movements in World War I* (London and Portland: Frank Cass, 1993), pp. 57–82.

- 34 FO 371/2767/30674, McMahon to Grey, No. 26, 7 February 1916, enclosing Hussein to Sayyid Ali El Morghani, 28 December 1915, cited in Kedourie, *Anglo-Arab*, pp. 122–123.
- 35 FO 371/2767/45855, McMahon to FO, No. 42, 29 February 1916, enclosing note on the verbal messages from ‘Abdallah, and FO 141/461/1198/48, Memorandum of R. Storrs, 11 March 1916, both cited and discussed in Kedourie, *Anglo-Arab*, p. 123.
- 36 FO 882/5, Storrs’ diary of visit to Jeddah, 17 October 1916; Kedourie, *Anglo-Arab*, pp. 144–145. Dawn’s contention (IJMES 10 [1979] p. 424) that the title claimed by Husayn, *amīr al-mu’minīn*, “had long since lost its connection with the caliph and had become a rarely used title of honor” conflicts with that of Gibb: “until the end of the Caliphate as an institution, *amīr al-mu’minīn* was employed exclusively as the protocollary title of a caliph, and among the Sunnis its adoption by a ruler implied a claim to the office of caliph” (H.A.R. Gibb, “Amir al-Mu’minin,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Second Edition).
- 37 Antonius, p. 191. That the blockade was instituted at Husayn’s request is attested to by McMahon, who telegraphed the FO on 4 June 1916: “Our blockade of Hedjaz which it should be remembered was instituted at the urgent and repeated request of Shereef himself.” (FO 371/2778/187291, no. 487). The British had initiated a partial blockade as early as late 1914, which led Husayn to complain about the lack of grain in the Hijaz (Wingate Papers [WP] 134/8/114–116, Shorthand notes taken by x of a discourse by Sherif of Mekka, which took place in privacy on the roof of his palace, 9 December 1914). In mid-1915, the British decided to allow restricted imports of food to Jeddah via Port Sudan and Suakin at the urging of McMahon, who believed that stoppage of supplies alienated the Arabs (WP 134/6/11–12, Clayton to Wingate, repeating FO to High Commissioner, received Erkowit 14 May 1915; WP 134/6/36–37, Clayton to Cheetham, 20 May 1915). This policy met with approval in the Hijaz (WP 136/1/146–147, Report of the third visit of Messenger “G” to the Sharif Hussein Ibn Ali at Mekka, 25 January 1916). See also Colman, pp. 96–101, and Sheila Scoville, “British Logistical Support to the Hashimites of Hejaz: Ta’if to Ma’an, 1916–1918”, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1985, pp/ 51–53.
- 38 Text in *Arab Bulletin* [AB], no. 21, 15 September 1916; WP 136/6/29–30, Wingate to Wilson, 7 May 1916.
- 39 *Arab Bulletin*, No. 21, 15 September 1916.
- 40 Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, pp. 140–141.
- 41 Cleveland, “The Role of Islam as a Political Ideology in the First World War”, p. 86.
- 42 Ibid., “The Role of Islam as a Political Ideology in the First World War”, p. 88.
- 43 Ibid., “The Role of Islam as a Political Ideology in the First World War”, p. 93.
- 44 The texts of these proclamations can also be found in: *Revue du Monde Musulman* 46 (1921), pp. 1–22; *Revue du Monde Musulman* 47 (1921), pp. 1–27, *Revue du Monde Musulman* 50 (1922), pp. 74–100, where they appear in Arabic and French; the first proclamation appears in English in FO 371/2775/196445. They have been discussed, from different angles, in William L. Cleveland, “The Role of Islam as a

- Political Ideology in the First World War”, in Edward Ingram (ed.), *National and International Politics in the First World War: Essays in Honour of Elie Kedourie* (London: Cass, 1986), pp. 84–101; and in Dawn, pp. 75–86.
- 45 Jorgen Baek Simonsen, “How to Use and Misuse History in Printing: Jihad and World War I”, *Culture and History*, Vol. 16 (1997), pp. 122–1126.
- 46 FO 882/14: W.H. Deedes to General Staff Officer [Intelligence GSO1], 19 August enclosing note by Fu’ad al-Khatib, 19 July 1916; Clayton to Private Secretary, Khartoum, 25 July 1916; and WP 140/5/68–70, Clayton to Wingate, 21 September 1916. See also Bruce Westrate, *The Arab Bureau: British Policy in the Middle East, 1916–1920* [University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992], pp. 110–111.
- 47 It was not published in *al-Qibla*, which appeared first on 15 Shawwal 1334 [14 August 1916].
- 48 First proclamation, *Revue du Monde Musulman* 46 (1921), pp. 20–21.
- 49 There is some confusion over the date of this proclamation. The versions published in *Arab Bulletin* no. 25, 7 October 1916 and in *Revue du Monde Musulman* 47 (1921), 12–13, are dated 11 Dhu al-Qāḍah 1334 [9 September 1916]. The text in Sulayman Musa, *Al-Thawra al-‘Arabīyya al-Kubrā: Watha’iq wa-Asanid* (Amman: Da’ira al-Thaqāfa wal-Funūn, 1996), pp. 77–81, and in *al-Qibla*, no. 11, 21 Dhu al-Qa’da 1334 [20 September 1916] carries that date.
- 50 Dawn, *From Ottomanism to Arabism*, pp. 81–82.
- 51 The text in *Revue du Monde Musulman* 47 (1921), pp. 5–11, carries the date Saffar 1335 [November 1916]; the text in Suleyman Musa, *Watha’iq*, and in *al-Qibla*, no. 31, 3 Saffar 1335 [10 December 1916] carries that date.
- 52 Dawn, *From Ottomanism to Arabism*, pp. 77.
- 53 Text in Musa, *Watha’iq*, pp. 78–82, where it is dated 10 Jumada al-Ula 1335 [3 March 1917]; and in *al-Qibla*, no. 58, 11 Jumada al-Ula 1335 [4 March 1917].
- 54 Available online, “Proclamation of the Ulema Regarding Independence from Turkey, March, 1917”, citing Charles F. Horne, *Source Records for the Great War, Vol. IV* (National Alumni 1923). http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/arabindependence_ulema.htm.
- 55 Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb (1886–1969) was born in Damascus and embodied “all the ideological complexities of the Ottoman-Arab Muslim elite of his generation.” For him, “Arab rights and Islamic order were inseparable parts of the political whole” (Cleveland, p. 87). Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Fu’ad al-Khaṭīb both had connections to British intelligence (see *Arab Bulletin*, no. 37, 4 January 1916). For more on Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb see Amal Ghazal, “Power, Arabism and Islam in the Writings of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb”, *Past Imperfect*, Vol. 6 (1997), pp. 133–150.
- 56 *Al-Qibla*, no. 1, 15 Shawwal 1334 [14 August 1916], quoted in Cleveland, p. 89.
- 57 *Al-Qibla*, no. 10, 17 Dhu al-Qa’dah 1334 [14 September 1916]; no. 1 15 Shawwal 1334 [14 August 1916], both cited in Cleveland, p. 91.
- 58 *Al-Qibla*, no. 3, 22 Shawwal 1334 [21 August 1916], cited in Cleveland, pp. 90–91.
- 59 FO 371/2782/218006, McMahon to FO, no. 945, 31 October 1916, transmitting Wilson’s no. 436 of 29 October 1916, which includes ‘Abdallah’s announcement; FO 371/2782/217652, ‘Abdallah (Mekka) to FO, 29 October 1916, minute by George

- Clerk dated 31 October 1916. Husayn's title was rendered by the Hashimites into English as "King of the Arab Nation," into French as "*Roi de la nation arabe*," and into Arabic as "*malik al-bilād al-'arabiyya*."
- 60 "The telegram of Emir Abdulla was a complete surprise to me," wrote Wilson to McMahon (FO 371/2782/23317, Wilson to McMahon, no. 12, 31 October 1916, enclosed in McMahon to Grey, 9 November 1916).
- 61 See Joshua Teitelbaum, *The Rise and Fall of the Hashimite Kingdom of Arabia* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), pp. 107–108.
- 62 FO 371/2782/242002, Wilson to McMahon, no. 14, 5 November 1916; FO 371/2782/220734, McMahon to FO, no. 960, 2 November 1916, transmitting telegrams from Brémond passed on by French Military Attaché (Doynel de San Quentin) in Cairo. When Cadi found out that it was now trumpeted throughout Mekka that he had just congratulated the *Sharif* on becoming King in the name of France, he immediately took to his bed with a diplomatic "fever."
- 63 FO371/2782/23317, Wilson to McMahon, no. 12, 31 October 1916, enclosed in McMahon to Grey, 9 November 1916. *Al-Qibla*, 3 Muharram 1335 [29 October 1916]. On 1 November 1916, Wilson telegraphed that there had been an official announcement stating that "Our Allied Governments had sent congratulations to Shereef expressing pleasure at his action" (FO 371/2782/219490, Wilson to McMahon, no. 452, 1 November 1916, relayed in McMahon to FO, no. 955, 1 November 1916).
- 64 *Al-Qibla*, 3 Muharram 1335 [29 October 1916]. A translation of parts of the petition can be found in Kedourie, *Anglo-Arab*, pp. 145–146.
- 65 *Al-Qibla*, 3 Muharram 1335 [29 October 1916]. Husayn also published a speech by Sāmī al-Bakrī, of the Damascus Bakris, stating that "the Syrians and the Iraqis are happy today with the swearing in of their king" (*al-Qibla*, 10 Muharram 1335 [5 November 1916]).
- 66 See Gail Minault, *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982).
- 67 FO 371/2783/255868, McMahon to Grey, 2 December 1916, enclosing the *fatwa* which is enclosed in Wilson to Director, Arab Bureau, 14 November 1916.
- 68 FO 371/2782/23317, Note by Hussein Effendi Ruhi, 30 October 1916, enclosed in Wilson to McMahon, no. 12, 31 October 1916, enclosed in McMahon to Grey, 9 November 1916.
- 69 *Al-Qibla*, no. 56, 4 Jamadi al-Ula 1335 [25 February 1917]. Husayn's response, printed in the same issue, was typically self-deprecating, stating only that the people of the country had decided to abide by the decision of the rest of the Muslim world on the Caliphate issue.
- 70 See, for example, the following in *al-Qibla*: a two-part article by F[u'ād al-Khaṭīb?], 27 Jamadi al-Thani [19 April 1917] and 2 Rajah 1335 [23 April 1917], denying the Ottoman claim to the Caliphate; an article published on 25 Jamadi al-Ula 1335 [18 March 1917] quoting an article from the Cairene paper *al-Kawkab*.
- 71 On this leniency see Haim Gerber, "Sharia, Kanun and Custom in the Ottoman Law: The Court Records of 17th Century Bursa," *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 2(1981), pp. 131–147: "We know that large parts of the orthodox *sharia* were hardly ever in use, e.g., the criminal law which involved amputation of

- limbs and the like.” Indeed, these punishments, except for the death penalty for apostasy, were officially abolished under the Penal Code of 1858: see Noel J. Coulson, *A History of Islamic Law* (Edinburgh University Press, 1964), p. 151.
- 72 Snouck Hurgronje, *Mecca*, p. 189. Snouck Hurgronje makes the blanket statement (pp. 182–183) that Hanafi *fiqh* was applied in all religious matters and in family matters, but that “all other matters were decided according to the new secular law (called al-Qanun al-Munif) which replaced the Shar’ al-Sherif (Sacred Law).” This seems a bit of an oversimplification, and contributes to the general confusion over the issue.
- 73 Ochsenswald, *Religion, Society and the State in Arabia* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University), p. 89.
- 74 “When local Ottoman townspeople died, their property was divided according to Qur’anic injunctions, with recourse to a qadi or mufti if necessary” (Ochsenswald, *Religion, Society*, p. 87). Muhammad ‘Abd al-Jawad Muhammad, *Al-Taṭawwūr al-Tashrīṭī fi al-Mamlaka al-‘Arabiyya al-Sa‘udiyya* (Cairo: Cairo University Press, 1977), pp. 40–41, also stresses this.
- 75 Muhammad, pp. 40–41. The quotation is from Surah IV:11.
- 76 Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 215.
- 77 Hasan Kayali, *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908–1918*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 216.
- 78 Stanford and Ezel Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, II, Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808–1975* (Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 306–307. Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: Hurst, 1998 [rpt. of 1964 edition]), pp. 415–416, puts this reform in 1916, but does not indicate whether it came before or after the beginning of the *Sharif’s* Revolt.
- 79 *Al-Qibla*, 25 Shawwal 1334 [24 August 1916].
- 80 *Al-Qibla*, 27 Sha‘ban 1336 [6 June 1918].
- 81 FO 686/38, General Notes on Conversations with King Hussein on [sic] Jeddah on 2, 3, and 4 June 1918, by Wilson, 6 June 1918.
- 82 FO 686/28, Jeddah Report, 11–30 August 1922; FO 371/8943/E 2478, Pilgrimage Report, 1922, enclosed in Marshall to Curzon, no. 11, 31 January 1923; FO 371/10006/E 289, Report on the Economic Conditions in the Hedjaz Vice-Consul L.S. Grafftey-Smith, enclosed in Bullard to Curzon, no. 12, Overseas Trade, 31 October 1923.
- 83 *Al-Qibla*, 31 May 1923. The verse is from v:38. For another such incident see FO 686/26, Extracts from Report from Agent-Mekka, enclosed in Jeddah Report, 10 May 1920.
- 84 MAE, Djeddah (consulat), carton no. 529, 27 February 1917.
- 85 *Al-Qibla*, 14 Jamadi al-Ula 1335 [7 March 1917]. In 1919, *al-Qibla* wrote that Indian newspapers had praised Husayn for this policy (2 Rajah 1337 [2 April 1919]).
- 86 FO 682/12, Ihsanullah to British Agent, Jeddah, 19 May 1920.
- 87 *Al-Qibla*, 15 Sha‘ban 1337 [15 May 1919].

- 88 See Franz Rosenthal, *The Herb: Hashish versus Medieval Muslim Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).
- 89 FO 686/12, unidentified intelligence agent in Mecca [Nasirudin?] to British Agent (Jeddah), no. 79, 6 August 1920. The term used in this report is “grass,” and I assume that hashish is the substance intended, particularly since the Arabic for weeds or grass is hashish.
- 90 *Al-Qibla*, 15 Sha‘ban 1337 [15 May 1919].
- 91 FO 371/4166/21996, Interview with Captain Zia, sent from Constantinople by the Turks to negotiate the surrender of Medina, 19 January 1919, enclosed in Cheetham to FO, no. 39, 24 January 1919.
- 92 Shane Leslie, *Mark Sykes, His Life and Letters* (London: Cassell, 1923), p. 280; Kedourie, *Anglo-Arab Labyrinth*, p. 198, citing FO 141/679, file 4088/17, Wilson, 5 June 1918; Arnold Rabbow, *Div-Lexicon Politischer Symbole* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1970), pp. 179–180. According to Khayrīyya Qāsimīyya, *al-‘Alam al-Filasṭīnī* (Beirut: PLO, Markaz al-Abḥāth, “Abḥāth Filasṭīnīyya” series, no. 21, 1970), Sykes was not responsible for creating the flag: she cited in this respect Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, who said that the three horizontal stripes were created by al-Fatat; Husayn only added the red chevron.
- 93 FO 371/2774/148524, McMahon to FO, no. 639, 30 July 1916; Ami Ayalon, “The Hashemites, T.E. Lawrence, and the Postage Stamps of the Hijaz”, in Asher Susser/Aryeh Shmuelevitz (eds.), *The Hashemites in the Modern Arab World: Essays in Honour of the late Professor Uriel Dann* (London: Cass, 1995), pp. 15–30; *al-Qibla*, 7 Shawwal 1335 [26 July 1917], quotation on page 16.
- 94 Ayalon, “The Hashemites, T.E. Lawrence, and the Postage Stamps of the Hijaz”, p. 16.
- 95 *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- 96 *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- 97 *Ibid.*, pp. 21–22.
- 98 *Al-Qibla*, 20 September 1923; Chester Krause and Clifford Mishler, *1995 Standard Edition of World Coins* (White Plains, NY: Krause Publications, 1994), pp. 1797–1800; Tim Browder, “Coinage of Hejaz Kingdom”, *Numismatic Scrapbook Magazine* 26 (1960), pp. 3489–3496. I wish to thank Dr. Michael Bates of the American Numismatic Society for these numismatic references.
- 99 T.E. Lawrence, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (New York: Doubleday, 1935), pp. 140–141.
- 100 See Mustafa Aksakal’s contribution to this volume.
- 101 Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire* (London: I.B. Taurus, 1998), p. 175.