

EISENHOWER'S DOCTRINE IN THE MUSLIM WORLD

At long last, US President Eisenhower delivered his much anticipated address about the Middle East on January 5th, 1957. Heavy publicity centered around his doctrine for the Middle East during the past 10 days to the extent that the entire world was anxiously awaiting it. The intentional publicity was intended to stimulate people to start discussing the doctrine, in order to gauge the world's reaction to the Eisenhower Doctrine.

The Eisenhower Doctrine is a defense proposal to bring the Near and Middle East under US protection. In reality, the title of the doctrine should have been: "Eisenhower, the American President declares American jurisdiction and protection over the Muslim World." Until the present, the Eisenhower Doctrine undoubtedly is the most dangerous political plan laid out for the Middle East following W.W.II. It carries far reaching consequences beyond any imagination. The doctrine expands American defense borders to the eastern and southern border of the Middle and Near East. This allows the entire region to be encompassed by US sovereignty and protection.

To fully understand the consequences and impact of Eisenhower's ambiguous plan, which intentionally focused on general principles and avoids specific details, requires awareness of key ideas related to it. Also, it is hard to accurately comprehend the objectives of political statements and declarations in the plan without being aware of pertinent political facts. Consequently, to fully understand the true nature of the doctrine, the following points need attention:

- Events related to the doctrine before it was presented.
- Understanding the text of the doctrine.
- Understanding the situation and circumstances, which has caused America to issue doctrines under the name of its presidents such as the Monroe Doctrine or Truman Doctrine.
- Understanding American defense policy towards the Middle East.
- Implicit and explicit terms employed by America, such as vacuum to justify its policy.

Understanding the context and background is necessary to comprehend the Eisenhower doctrine as some newspapers have called it. Information pertaining to this doctrine is abundant and centers around a specific framework established by semi-official sources and others such as the State Department and Secretary General of United Nations.

On December 29th, 1953, the New York Times, a well known American newspaper with links to the State Department, published an important article discussing the events in the White House and State Department related to the Middle East and its stability. Many ideas were presented in this article that grips one's attention. The newspaper mentions,

"President Eisenhower was reported today to be considering a request for Congressional authority to use the United States' armed forces as he deems necessary to maintain peace in the Middle East."

The newspaper further goes on to say,

"Later a reliable source said that the President and the Secretary of State intended to discuss future United States Middle Eastern policy with Congressional leaders at a White House meeting Tuesday. This source added that the Congressional leaders also would be asked to give their views on the possibility of getting Congressional sanction for the President to use the armed services of the nation in accordance with his best judgment in the event of any aggression in the Middle East."

The article also mentioned that,

"Officials here have become increasingly disturbed about the possibility that trouble in Iraq, Syria, Egypt and Jordan may lead to further Soviet penetration of that part of the world. This fear has grown due to the weakening of British influence in the Middle East as a result of the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt. Consequently, Administration officials have been discussing what action can be taken by the United States to make it clear that it does not intend to stand aside and watch a chaotic situation develop there to the benefit of the Soviet Union."

The newspaper continued to say that,

"it is expected that further meetings in the American Administration will continue until a policy towards the Middle East is crystallized. In fact, Secretary of State Dulles has already begun discussing with President

Eisenhower issues such as the situation in the Near East, Communist infiltration and American policy towards any aggression in the region."

On January 2nd, 1957, Secretary of State Dulles presented a proposal pertaining to the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East to the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Senate. After its meeting, the committee mentioned that the doctrine addressed the dangers of the complex situation in the Middle East. These statements were leaked even before Eisenhower delivered his address. More information regarding economic aid was leaked only 24 hours later.

On December 29th, the New York Times reported that the US Administration is ready to announce a new economic program to help Middle Eastern nations. The economic aid exceeds \$400 million and includes a commitment from President Eisenhower to deter any Soviet aggression in the region. The allocated fund is separate from the budget of foreign aid. Sources mentioned that, "Israel and Arab nations would be beneficiaries of the aid but the primary recipients will be countries around the Suez Canal." It was also reported that, "President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles would advocate the approval of aid from Congress. Both would also insist on the importance of stopping Soviet expansion in the region after the vacuum left by Britain and France due to their attack on Egypt." Secretary of State Dulles mentioned that the aim of this proposal is to establish a cooperation system amongst nations in the region that was similar to NATO. This is economic information, which was already leaked to the public regarding the doctrine. It is worth noticing that such information related to the doctrine is concise and coupled with political information.

US officials were not content by these efforts to propagate America's new plan for the Middle East. Efforts were even made to leak more information to the United Nations through the Secretary General and to Britain and France through their delegates about the American plan. On December 23rd, 1956, Secretary of State Dulles went to New York to discuss the new American policy with the UN Secretary General prior to presenting it to Congress. This was done to create coherency in the structure of the policy and to insure that this policy would not be viewed contrary to the American support of the UN and that it continues to abide by the rule that all issues be resolved within the UN framework. After the meeting with the UN Secretary General, Secretary of State Dulles stated, "The US has to make its policy more appealing in the area. However, there are a few points that require attention and consideration. US policy is designed to support and compliment the UN policy. President Eisenhower had asked me to discuss the issue with the UN Secretary General." After this meeting, Secretary of State Dulles was successful in having the UN Secretary General agree to US policy and to convey it to the delegates. The newspapers of January 3rd, 1957, mentioned, " the principles of the new policy were conveyed by the UN Secretary General after meeting with Mr. Dulles on Monday, December 31st. These principles are the following:

- A. "America should insist that the issue of Palestine and the Suez Canal be under UN jurisdiction.
- B. "A proposal against any Soviet aggression in the region. Any aggression would fall under Article 51 of the UN charter that allows any nation or groups of nations to employ defensive measures until the UN Security Council is able to bring peace.
- C. "The American plan is directed against Soviet aggression and not against UN authority."

Therefore, it is evident that America informed the UN of its policy and furnished it with the information needed to justify its policy and then separated itself from the UN. Many US diplomats met with British and French officials on June 4th, 1957, to explain the Eisenhower Doctrine. It was made clear to Britain and France that the US considers the 1950 Triple Doctrine still valid. The events surrounding the Eisenhower Doctrine were merely a precursor to the official declaration of the Eisenhower policy.

President Eisenhower presented his proposal to the Congress on January 5th, 1957. Some important points of his speech and from other sources are the following:

1. The address views the Muslim World as one entity though it called it the Middle East. It talks about it in such a manner because the Middle East was under the Ottoman State and from a political perspective the Ottoman State was a major political force. The Ottoman State was a real force and influential. The Ottoman State exercised its influence and authority and maintained security over the region. Consequently, there was no vacuum or a possibility of one as long as the Islamic State existed. The present day nation states in the region did not exist. There was no Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, Syria, Turkey, or Lebanon. However,

there were provinces, which acted as states but had little influence. The doctrine mentions, "after W.W.II a new political phase began in the area towards self-determination and independence." This means that the aforementioned areas came under a foreign mandate after they were part of a leading nation. Later, these lands became independent nations governed by specific treaties recognized by International Law although they remained under British influence. The British influence came to a critical stage when Western influence weakened. The states were in the verge of freeing themselves of foreign influence and uniting. Consequently, the possibility of escaping from the Western camp appeared which was considered as a great danger. President Eisenhower's speech states: "The Middle East has abruptly reached a new and critical stage in its long and important history. In past decades, many of the countries in that area were not self-governing. Other nations exercised considerable authority and the security of the region was largely built around their power. But since the First World War there has been a steady evolution toward self government and independence."

2. The address claimed that the disunity of the Islamic State, which led to its lands being under mandate and the resultant "independent" nations went through a peaceful process. His speech states, "The evolution towards independence has in the main been a peaceful process." Apparently, his speech conveniently forgot the revolt against imperialism and colonialism in Iraq, Egypt, and Syria and considers this entire political phase as peaceful! Eisenhower's speech implies that the disturbances in the region is due to Israel and has led to instability in countries surrounding Israel. The attack by Israel on Egypt and Syria in October of 1956 increased the conflict between Israel and its neighbor. Instability followed the Israeli attack on Egypt with Britain and France. Britain and France filled the vacuum after the elimination of the Islamic State. The decline of influence by both nations caused a vacuum, which had the potential of being filled by nations that were not under the western camp. Due to these reasons, Eisenhower envisioned a need for military and defense projects for the region. This is clearly understood from the following statement made by him: "The evolution towards independence has in the main been a peaceful process. But the area has been often troubled. Persistent crosscurrents of distrust and fear with raids back and forth across national boundaries have brought about a high degree of instability in much of the Mideast. Just recently there have been hostilities involving Western European nations that once exercised much influence in the area. Also the relatively large attack by Israel in October has intensified the basic differences between that nation and its Arab neighbors."

3. Eisenhower's speech also mentioned that the Soviet Union before and after Communism had its eyes on the Middle East. Conquering the Middle East has been its traditional policy towards the region whether during Czarist or Bolshevik eras. His speech mentions that the Soviet Union is not in need of economic resources of the Middle East, whether it is transportation or oil. In 1955, Soviet traffic through the canal represented 75% percent of aggregate traffic. The oil supply within Russia is sufficient for its needs and does not need oil from the Middle East for production or consumption. Russia's interest is solely due to military and political aspirations to transform the entire world into a Bolshevik communist nation.

These assertions made by Eisenhower indicate that the Middle East has to be exploited by the West alone. The farms in the Middle East should be under the ownership of Western nations. The Soviet Union does not need the Middle East politically or economically, whereas America and Europe do. The Suez Canal is a vital means of transportation to Europe and not the Soviet Union. The oil is vital to the European economy and not the Soviet Union. Control of the Middle East is a strategic issue for the US both politically and economically. This clearly means that no one should think that the Middle East has to remain as one power with its own sovereignty. Rather, the Middle East is comprised of several independent states under the influence of the superpowers. The Middle East is either for control by the Western or Eastern camp. The Eastern camp does not need it except for conquering it to establish Communism. The Western camp has a need for it and it should belong to the West and consequently American jurisdiction should be positioned such that Europe and the US can exploit it. This is implied in his speech.

Furthermore, the doctrine places emphasis on the American and European need for the Suez Canal and the oil. Eisenhower's speech states, "The Suez Canal enables the nations of Asia and Europe to carry on the commerce that is essential if these countries are to maintain well rounded and prosperous economies. The Middle East provides a gateway between Eurasia and Africa. It (Middle East) contains two-thirds of the presently known oil deposits of the world and it normally supplies the petroleum needs of many nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, The nations of Europe are peculiarly dependent upon this supply, and this

dependency relates to transportation as well as to production. These things stress the immense importance of the Middle East. If the nations of that area should lose their independence, if they were dominated by alien forces hostile to freedom, that would be both a tragedy for the area and for many other free nations whose economic life would be subject to near strangulation. Western Europe would be endangered just as though there had been no Marshall plan, no North Atlantic Treaty Organization." Then the address states the following, which in reality is the main point. "All this would have the most adverse, if not disastrous, effect upon our own Nation's economic life and political prospects."

The above paragraph surfaced the real intention behind the proposal for US authority and protection. It also explained that if nations in the Middle East lose their independence and unite under one state and one force to stand against freedom, whether it be Islamic or Communist, it would be catastrophic from their point of view. By this we can understand the danger of the Eisenhower doctrine vis a vis the Muslim Ummah, even of its existence.

4. Eisenhower's speech mentioned the danger to the Middle East emanates from the Soviet greed. This requires a protection plan for the Middle East. His speech considers the Middle East as part of the "free world." In other words, part of the Muslim World is embracing freedom and the capitalistic ideology and this has marginalized their Islamic identity. His speech also mentions that people in the Middle East require protection and that the majority of people there are demanding it. The UN would be a good tool to protect the small nations. However, since the UN might not be able to protect it, there would have to be US involvement.

Eisenhower also mentions that the people in the region do not view the US as a colonialist nation. His speech implies that the US is not similar to imperialist Britain or France. It is apparent that his speech precluded the mention of US military bases in Dhahran and Libya, Proposition Four related to Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt, or the loans and gifts to subjugate and influence the people. All of this exemplifies an American brand of colonialism to its fullest extent. Yet, the doctrine ignores this and states that people in the region do not view America as a colonial power. Eisenhower's speech glosses over these facts and mentions that the people would welcome cooperation with America.

This is a dangerous policy being placed on the chest of the Muslim Ummah. He indicates this by saying that, "the free people of the Middle East want and require a military force to secure their independence. We turn to the UN to protect the small nations. The UN would help but would not be the ultimate factor when the USSR is involved. Due to these factors, the US has to be a responsible player." He further mentions, "There is general recognition in the Middle East, as elsewhere, that the United States does not seek either political or economic domination over any other people. Our desire is a world environment of freedom, not servitude. On the other hand, many, if not all, of the nations of the Middle East are aware of the danger that stems from international communism and welcome closer cooperation with the United States to realize for themselves the United Nations' goals of independence, economic well-being, and spiritual growth."

5. Those are specifically the four points in Eisenhower's speech, which are very misleading. These points lead to an even more important goal, mentioned in the fifth point, which is to have the Muslim World brought under military, political, and economic dominance to impose its sovereignty upon the Muslim World.

Those four points are summarized as follows:

a) Cooperation between the US and any nation in the Middle East such as Lebanon or between a group of nations such as the Baghdad Pact involving loans and gifts. However, these offerings are not intended for prosperity or to raise the standard of living. The real intention is to insure the status quo of the area as independent nations. The issue of cooperation is very important due to the following reasons:

- i. Cooperation between the US and any nation in the Middle East will definitely involve military and political treaties.
- ii. Any type of aid will be aimed towards developing the economy of those nations in order to maintain the independence of nations in the region. Thus, none of the nations in the Middle East will be allowed to expand its borders.

Eisenhower mentioned, "The action which I propose would have the following features: It would, first of all, authorize the United States to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of

the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence."

b) The doctrine will allow the US to establish a military relationship with any state such as Israel or a group of nations such as the Arab League to protect it against any internal coup. Therefore, if the Ummah initiated attempts to change the status quo, this doctrine would prevent such a change. The doctrine extends towards external aggression, as when Egypt was attacked by Israel or when any nation attempts to consolidate Muslim lands into one state. These treaties would involve military training and alliances. All of this translates into protecting Israel and imperialism in the Muslim world. This effort is oriented towards solidifying the division in the Muslim World to a state of permanence and preventing any consolidation of Muslim lands. Eisenhower says, " It would, in the second place, authorize the Executive to undertake in the same region programs of military assistance and cooperation with any nation or group of nations which desires such aid."

c) The American President was given broad authority to provide aid. This authority would also establish cooperative efforts involving US military personnel to provide security to nations requesting it. This policy would even apply to nations under military attack from any nation under the influence of international Communism despite the absence of any agreements or treaties. According to Eisenhower's doctrine, it will be included as part of the National Security defense project against the USSR without the need of a treaty. Such a point of view is purely imposing military dominance over the Middle East against its will.

Trying to justify its dominance by claiming that it will respond if asked is baseless and a complete facade as it is not difficult to put any nation in a situation causing it to request assistance. There is a major difference between this point and the previous one involving military treaties with the US and other nations. This third point is assumed that some nations would not have any or agree to any agreements with the US. Therefore, this policy would be enforced in the entire Middle East to protect it against the USSR without any agreement. Any request from any nation in the region warrants US armed forces to defend it, even if a nation does not have any agreements with US.

This aspect of the doctrine was mentioned as, "It would in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the armed forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism."

d) This proposal gives the US president broad authority to use funds under the Mutual Security Act for economic and defense purposes without being bound to the existing limitations. Eisenhower proposes, "The present proposal, would in the fourth place, authorize the President to employ, for economic and defense military purposes, sum available under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, without regard to existing limitations." What does this mean? Does this mean expanding Mutual Security or any Mutual Security agreement under the defense pacts?

6. Eisenhower's speech also summarizes economic aid. He mentions that the assigned fund for the present fiscal year ending June 30th is adequate. However, he mentions that he plans to seek authorization of \$200 million to be available during each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 for discretionary use in the area. This would be in addition to other mutual security programs for the area henceforth provided by Congress. The economic plan indicates that there is no intention to acquire more funds during the present fiscal year due to a sufficient balance. Thus, the subsequent six months will require no actual implementation of this policy and only preparation.

7. Besides resisting a Communist attack and considering it as a direct attack, Eisenhower's doctrine also mentions resisting any internal movements regardless of their dimension. This denotes an indirect attack on the Muslim World. His doctrine points to the current defense arrangements as weak and susceptible to an internal force. He suggests an active posture by the US to remedy this problem. He mentions that the region has sincere governments trying to resist such movements considered by the US as dangerous, whether Communist or otherwise. The doctrine calls for the elimination of internal movements and mentions that, "The proposed legislation is primarily designed to deal with the possibility of Communist aggression, direct and indirect."

8. This is the last point in Eisenhower's address. It seems as if the previous justifications do not warrant his military and economic plans, since there is no apparent Soviet threat or plan or any event that would be used

as a justification for Eisenhower's doctrine. Eisenhower used the possibility of a Soviet attack against weak security arrangements in the Middle East as ample justification for his doctrine. Eisenhower concludes that the best solution is to cooperate with allies who comply with the UN doctrine, which allows each nation or a group of nations to defend themselves. Such cooperation involving defensive pacts would fall under Article 51 of the UN charter as it does for NATO.

Eisenhower's proposal in itself indicated that it does not have justification. The Soviet attack even on a small scale has not occurred nor is there any evidence of an impending one. The justification for Eisenhower's doctrine does not exist and the need for a long-term military policy does not arise. The real intention of Eisenhower's doctrine is not against a fear of Soviet attack. The doctrine is an attempt by the US to replace Britain in the region. America wants to replace Britain since the latter's influence has become weak.

Eisenhower's states, "In the situation now existing, the greatest risk, as is often the case, is that ambitious despots may miscalculate. If power-hungry Communists should either falsely or correctly estimate that the Middle East is inadequately defended, they might be tempted to use open measures of armed attack. If so, that would start a chain of circumstances that would almost surely involve the United States in great military action. I am convinced that the best insurance against this dangerous contingency is to make clear now our readiness to cooperate fully and freely with our friends of the Middle East in ways consonant with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. I intend promptly to send a special mission to the Middle East to explain the cooperation we are prepared to give."

This is a brief summary of the address of President Eisenhower towards the Middle East. This occurred after it was realized that imperialism in the Middle East is about to disappear. What the US did is not new at all. In fact what it did is deeply rooted in the plan which the US employed in the past and still does. In the first quarter of the 19th Century, the US was a growing nation and the revolutions in South America reached a level of climax. These revolutions specifically led to the removal of Spain from the region. The US realized that European nations would intervene on behalf of Spain. Upon realizing this, the US believed that it alone deserves to exercise influence in South America.

Consequently, American president James Monroe presented a plan to the Congress on 2nd of Dec. 1823. The plan considered any intervention by any European nation in the New World or the American continent an act of aggression against the security of the US. The US would take necessary measures to prevent and stop this aggression. Congress agreed on the plan and it came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine and became the basis of US policy until 1941.

Through the Monroe Doctrine, America was able to extend its borders to encompass the entire American continent. Since then, America began emphasizing the policy of the balance of power. The Monroe Doctrine had a dramatic and far-reaching effect on European nations. It was able to completely uproot two European nations, Spain and Portugal from South America. The Monroe Doctrine was able to dislodge these nations and rendered South America the US' backyard until now.

This policy was used in the past. However, the US recently has begun following the same plan. After WWII, the Soviets conquered Eastern Europe and Britain's influence became weak in Europe. The US realized that this would effect the balance of power and thus it tried to free Eastern Europe. American President Truman sent a letter to Stalin requesting free parliamentary elections similar to Western nations to be held in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Stalin replied that these nations are free. At the same time, there was problem transpiring in Greece, which was important to the West. The Soviets were covertly functioning in Greece and attempted a revolution there.

In 1946, Macarius, through Britain asked for American intervention, supported by Britain. Consequently, America issued its policy towards Greece and Turkey. The Truman Doctrine was issued in March of 1947 to aid Greece and Turkey against any domestic or foreign disorder. Hence, America replaced Britain as the protector of Greece and Turkey. Similar to the Truman Doctrine is the one crafted by Eisenhower, which places America as the protector of the Muslim World.

Such a policy undoubtedly prevents the Muslim World from liberating itself from colonialism and becoming a leading power in world politics. Eisenhower's doctrine surpasses all of his predecessor's doctrine. Eisenhower's doctrine opposed foreign intervention as the Monroe Doctrine did; Eisenhower's doctrine provides the military and financial aid as did the Truman Doctrine. It encompasses all elements that are

prerequisites to hegemonize the Muslim World. Such a doctrine places the Middle East under US protection, thereby replacing Britain and France as the colonial power in the area.

Due to American greed and its efforts to maintain influence, it announced the Eisenhower Doctrine. This policy is consistent with the Balance of Power policy. It was manifested in bringing the Middle East under its sphere of influence. The US claims that it needs to fulfill the vacuum in the region due to British weakness. The US has repeatedly used the term vacuum as Britain used it in order to assert its influence in the region. However, the objective of both nations remains the same i.e., to colonize the region.

Terms such as "balance of power", "political and military vacuum", and "strategic vacuum" cannot be linguistically understood. These terms are political in nature and are equipped with precise connotations that demand acute cognizance.

Balance of Power

Balance of Power means a conflict amongst nations for power. Through power, nations are able to maintain their status or entity in the International Community. Since nations are in conflict amongst each other for power, the intention behind the game of the balance of power is not allowing a nation or group of nations enough power to disrupt the status quo of the international community. Power in the balance of power is a relative factor dependent upon the rival nation and does not mean being fixed. Increase in a rival's power means a decrease in power for its competitor. Based on this, the competing nation keep an eye on its rivals. Nations are left with two choices: increase power or decrease its rival's power. Treaties, pacts, regional coalitions, and neutrality, are through which the balance of power can be achieved. As for the term positive neutrality, it is vague and is used by some politicians to gain cheap popularity. It is currently used in the Middle East to justify cooperation between imperialist nations without declaring animosity against the Eastern camp.

The balance of power is changeable and is achieved through many different ways by each nation. Britain's policy regarding the Balance of Power is to have another power stand behind it without giving that entity intrinsic power. As an example, the Baghdad Pact is propped by Britain but is not a real power on par with NATO. Britain does not want to join the pact as a member but wants to remain as an independent entity that maintains power of the pact. Britain wants to place nations in the Baghdad Pact under British Commonwealth and the Dual Treaty.

The US is trying to create a group of nations capable of mitigating the USSR's span of control. Examples of such efforts include NATO and the South Eastern Asian Pact.

The USSR tries to weaken the coalition amongst Western nations. The Soviet Union does not seek to create coalitions because it considers all nations under the Eastern camp as one monolithic power. It is true that the Eastern camp has a federal structure, but in essence its power base is unitary.

The Muslim World, following the destruction of the Islamic State, has become a cheap source of raw materials and is economically, politically and militarily exploited. The Islamic State was considered a great power and it still can become politically, economically and militarily independent if an autonomous state is established in the region. However, after WWII, both Eastern and Western camps are ferociously competing to bring the Middle East under their camp. Specifically, America and Britain are competing for the lion's share. Upon reaching a climax in the competition, America issued the Eisenhower Doctrine in its effort to hegemonize the Middle East. If it succeeds in its efforts, America will gain on its side a greater power than China itself.

Regarding the states in the Muslim World, their sphere of exercising the balance of power is confined to each other. Each state in the Muslim World works to get the masses on its side to weaken the rival. It follows this policy since they became a nation state after WWI. The colonialist assistance fueled the feud in order to keep the area divided.

Vacuum

The term vacuum implies lacking stability and is a consequence from dysfunctionality of a state's power. A vacuum could be political, military, or strategic. A political vacuum occurs when a state as a whole is unstable and incoherent. Stability and coherency are prerequisites to fill the political vacuum and thus power

has to be given to a nation to live by one ideology. The colonialist Kuffar are imposing their influence in order to fill the vacuum in the region. If it is not able to influence the region, the colonialists will create federations such as the Arab League and assign themselves as being in charge of it. None of these efforts will fill the vacuum. The vacuum has to be filled from within through the creation of one state and adopting and adhering to one ideology.

In the case of a military vacuum, the nation does not possess enough military power to protect themselves against internal revolution or external attack. A military vacuum stems from a lack of military hardware, training, or resources needed to establish a military power. A military vacuum cannot be filled except through:

- a) Internal military resources and associated industry that is under the management and ownership of the nation.
- b) Provide high level military training to the nation.

In the absence of any external or internal threat, it is sufficient to establish a force guaranteeing domestic security and prevention of any external attack. This force would be sufficient to fill the military vacuum.

However, the colonial powers are claiming that a vacuum exists in the Middle East, which must be filled. Thus, they are trying to flood the region with military hardware and above all, putting restrictions on the usage of the hardware. Also, military training programs are being initiated between the colonial powers and client states in the region, in addition to military alliances and treaties.

Presently, there is not a single military vacuum in the Middle East. Military might in the Muslim world is enough to quell any internal disruptions if they ever occur and warding any external invasion assuming that this would happen. The possibility of a Soviet invasion upon the Middle East should not be considered as a reason for the cause for a military vacuum. As an example, there is a possibility of Soviet attack on France but no one dares to claim of a military vacuum in France, which has to be filled. Likewise, there is no military vacuum in the Middle East. Many American military personnel share this view. Admiral Wright, American naval commander on the Eastern Mediterranean says "there is no military vacuum in the Middle East. However, the West perceives the Middle East as a central point of attack if another war occurs."

A strategic vacuum occurs when a region is destabilized due to problems facing the internal and external security of the region. The existence of Israel in the Middle East is a complicated issue, which causes security concerns in the region due to continuous conflicts. Also, the existence of Israel causes external intervention, which is another security concern. Therefore, the existence of Israel has created a strategic vacuum in the region. This vacuum cannot be filled except by eliminating Israel. This is due to the fact that the currents between Israel and nations in the region are conflicting due to the Islamic 'Aqeedah, political ideas, ideology, point of view, interests, and objectives. There is absolutely no reconciliation between these glaring differences. The colonial powers are trying to reconcile the differences through the traditional carrot and stick approach.

The policies of the superpower towards the vacuum in the Middle East are unique from one to another. The Soviet Union considers the Middle East as under Britain's domain and seeks to create a vacuum in the region as an excuse to intervene in times of crisis. Britain has begun mentioning the term vacuum once it leaves the area. This departure will cause the Soviet Union to take advantage of the vacuum and will position itself to remain in the area.

America also envisions a vacuum in the region and seeks to fill it. It considers all factors in this attempt. This includes nationalism and the creation of false hopes for people. After WWII, it began initiating attempts to gain a foothold in the Middle East. However, America was concerned about its relationship with Britain as their policies are linked with each other and it is an ally with America against the USSR. Upon the demise of Britain's influence in the area, America issued Eisenhower's imperialist plan to fill the vacuum it claimed. Its intention is to secure its interests throughout the region and to expand its influence to secure oil and the strategic means of transportation whether it be naval, land, or air. In securing the strategic means of transportation, it considers naval and air as first priority and land transportation second. America seeks to maintain the security of Israel as a European and not Middle Eastern nation. America formulates an economic plan based on the intention of expanding the American market. It considers any threat to the internal or external to the region as a threat to the US. America realizes the security of the Middle East as

important as the security of NATO. Consequently, since 1949 it began developing defense projects to secure its interest from two types of enemies. A real enemy (people of the area) and the expected enemy (Soviet Union). It initiated defense projects seven years ago. However, it was not too successful due to Britain's effort against it and people's resistance towards it. Despite many temptations and threats, the US has laid a comprehensive defense policy in the Middle East. Many books and reports have discussed this issue. One of the most important reports written on this subject was by the Brookings Institution in Maryland and recommendations by Admiral Fletcher, president of the supreme defense committee of US defense policy.

With the possibility of mobilizing a huge force, the admiral favored a proposal that called for an Arab unity which possesses military strength. This has become one of America's foremost objectives in order to protect its interests in the region. While working towards this plan, America is trying to convince her ally Britain and the people in the Middle East on the acceptance of military bases in the Middle East. Regarding the security of the Middle East, five options were suggested in the study:

1. The United States confine its actions to maintaining or extending its military facilities in the Middle East.
2. The United States, in addition to maintaining military facilities, provide military assistance to selected individual states.
3. Encourage regional security arrangements without participation by the United States and other non-Middle Eastern states.
4. Initiate and implement a regional defense arrangement in which the United States and other non-Middle Eastern countries participate.
5. All of the above alternatives were mentioned explicitly. However, while talking about the fourth alternative, the report talks about a necessary supplement to the arrangement under NATO which should be established. This would obviate any complications if any Middle Eastern nations were brought into NATO. This by itself could be considered as a fifth alternative.

This is the summary for the American defense policy as presented in the Brookings study. Regarding Fletcher's report, it mentioned that the Middle East is a weak point in the American military preparation. The admiral predicted a third world war before 1960 and the difficulty of American troops facing Soviet troops in Europe. The admiral mentioned that the Mediterranean and the Middle East should serve as American shelter. The Middle East has many features, easy transportation and the ability to mobilize a great amount of power in the area. Thus, the admiral supports proposals leading towards Arab unity in order to establish a strong coherent military bloc.

From all of this, it is clear that the most important thing that the US wants to achieve in the Middle East is to establish a defense system to protect its interests. While doing so, the US would project a favorable attitude towards its historic ally Britain while at the same time convincing the people in the region of the benefit of the defense pacts. The US began executing the option mentioned in the Brookings report and thus they began the following:

1. Provided Greece and Turkey aid since 1949.
2. America tried making a treaty with the Arab League in 1950. At the time the League discussed it, eventually leading to the Mutual Security Covenant addressing the defense of the area.
3. Upon the cancellation of a treaty between Egypt and Britain in 1951, America, Britain, France, and Turkey proposed a Quadruple suggestion to the Egyptian government in the Middle East.
4. An explanation regarding the Quadruple suggestion was presented to the following governments: Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, and Israel.
5. Turkey and Pakistan have had a pact since 1954 to include other Middle Eastern nations.
6. Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia have had a mutual defense agreement since 1953.

However, these projects were not able to establish a defense system in the Middle East. All of these projects involving defensive measures for the Middle East were not viable due to not being comprehensive and too restrictive. Other initiatives were made to establish defense projects but were not successful. Due to the differences between America and Britain regarding the details of these defenses projects. On many

occasions, Britain was able to stand against American plans in the Middle East and diffuse them. Britain created the Baghdad Pact, which includes Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Britain. America refused an invitation to join the pact, but is working to diffuse the pact in order to contain, change, or even destroy it.

Also, the people in the region have realized the reality and the danger of the defensive pacts. Consequently, a public opinion against foreign alliances became strong and people viewed the Baghdad Pact as dangerous. Thus, It became impossible to have defense pacts linked with Western nations. The idea of defensive pacts failed due to many reasons. The major reason was due to the issue of Palestine and Israel.

After the events related to the Suez Canal crisis, the issue of military pacts became much more intricate. Solving the issue of Palestine and the Suez Canal became a prerequisite for any defense agreement. When the attack on Egypt by Britain, France, and Israel occurred, the US played a very sensitive role. The US was able to have the nations in the region turn towards the US and furthermore dispatch UN forces. It was able to bring the issue of the Suez Canal and Palestine onto the UN's General Assembly and was able to get a majority to approve its policy regarding the Suez Canal from the UN. The US policy was mentioned by Dulles' address in the London conference in August of 1956. Its policy towards Palestine was mentioned in Dulles' speech in August of 1955.

Finally, America was able to station the UN forces in Suez to carry its policies as a UN resolution. Thus, it was able to issue a doctrine of such a plan to protect the Middle East. This doctrine accommodates any nation wanting to join it through the establishment of treaties. More importantly, due to the nature of the doctrine, it encompasses nations who are not willing to join as well. The configuration of the doctrine is left for Eisenhower to decide. Consequently, the Eisenhower Doctrine became an imperialistic defense policy in the Middle East. Meanwhile, America has left the issue of Palestine and the Suez Canal under the UN umbrella.

The motivation behind US involvement in the Middle East is the weakness of British influence in this region and the fear of Soviet aggression. This is the situation of the states in the Middle East. This political naivet, became obvious in the Ummah during the attack against Egypt. The sad situation of the Muslim countries became obvious when French, Israeli, and British forces launched an attack in Egypt. None of the nations in the area came to Egypt's support. Furthermore, the Ummah's acceptance of the situation and having been easily misled by the cheap talk of defending Egypt by the Middle Eastern states and the military occupation in strategic areas gave America the green light to design its new policy towards the Middle East.

Eisenhower was afraid of a full-scale war breaking out in the Middle East due to the attack against Egypt. Secretary of State Dulles, went several times to London to prevent any attack on Egypt. He realized that in the eyes of the Muslim World Egypt is a crown jewel and people would rush towards defending it with great emotional fervor. Eisenhower was afraid that this would lead to the destruction of Israel and colonial influence. Therefore, America was quite concerned of an attack against Egypt. After being informed of the attack, it evacuated US citizens and prevented anyone from traveling to the Middle East. In addition, America made attempts to prevent a breakout of a full-scale war. Eisenhower's weariness about the situation caused Secretary of State Dulles to spend his time in the UN. America began proposing economic sanctions against Britain to prevent any further attack, which could grow into an all out war. Eisenhower realized the naivet, of the Ummah at such a time by espousing what the rulers say, "Wisdom is to leave the enemy to himself and politics is to listen to US instruction", which signaled a monumental victory. When Eisenhower witnessed such justifications as "Occupation of the military forces in the area is in the interest of the Ummah" and witnessing how easily the politicians and rulers deceive the Ummah, he was sure that he was very much mistaken about its idea of the Middle East.

All of this encouraged Eisenhower to adopt this policy. We are certain that if the position of the states and Ummah's position were not the same, the US would not have the guts to announce this policy. We have to be firm regarding this policy. This requires serious reaction and we should not accept or be silent about it. A decisive reaction should be aimed at rejecting this policy. The Eisenhower Pact is an aggressive imperialistic policy. If the Ummah is to reject and firmly resisted any single defense policy, it would have to be this one.

This doctrine is economically and politically preparing existing nations in the Middle East for a well-choreographed proxy war. The Muslim Ummah has nothing to do with international conflicts. The pacts make the entire Middle East subservient to the American plan, regardless of their choice. It means establishing new military bases throughout the Muslim World, maintaining and expanding them. These

bases already exist in Dhahran and Libya. This magnetizes more foreign troops to occupy the Muslim World. This categorically translates into imposing foreign dominance to enslave, humiliate and exploit the territory. This is the most humiliating catastrophe that one can imagine ever happening to the Ummah.

Eisenhower's Doctrine was based on Communist presence in the Middle East and was the primary justification. Similarly, Britain used this factor to establish its presence and destroy anything against it. The claim of the US to establish its presence is baseless and has no justification, militarily, politically or economically. The reality of the Communist presence in the area is that although there are people who call for it and who politically study its doctrine, its influence is limited. Its propaganda and misconception mislead many. Politicians who are creating extremists in order to use them as a vehicle to gain power use Communism in Middle Eastern nations. People in the area do not agree with it nor support it. Even the acceptance of Communism is not based on conviction but rather due to the repulsion of Western Imperialism. This hatred is similar to the way people supported Hitler during WWII because of their disgust towards Western Imperialism. The Communist Party draws very little support from the Muslim countries to the extent that it is hard pressed to push a single cabinet into power.

Regarding the Soviet Union, it views the Muslim World as part of the Western camp. It has not carried any political actions except discussing communist ideas, supporting communist parties with their needs and creating disturbances against Western Imperialism through rallies and demonstrations. By opposing America and Britain in the UN since 1954, it has viewed people in the Middle East as trying to rid themselves of Western Imperialism. It views the states as independent entities easily tempted shed Western Imperialism. Realizing that rulers in the region are puppets of the West or "friends" as Eisenhower dubbed them, the Soviet Union has worked in the Muslim World through the guise of international relations. Since they were not successful with communist parties and disturbances, the Soviets began making official contacts with nations in the Middle East in order to establish economic, political and cultural links. Many official visits were made. These included Parliament members from the Eastern camp traveling to the Middle East. All of these efforts did not yield much influence, it just promoted communist ideas and was an attempt to ideologically penetrate the Middle East.

However, when the triple attack occurred against Egypt, the USSR intervened in the Middle East as an international power. This forced Britain and France to wage a cease-fire. Therefore, the Soviet Union existed in the Middle East as part of the politics of the Middle East but was not able to internally influence it regardless of any deals it struck, whether they were for wheat, weapons or other. Nothing came about from these deals, which amounted to nothing more commercial transactions centered on trade. The international position began taking Russia into consideration when the issue of the Middle East arose. This did not strengthen Russia but it did weaken Western Imperialism. This situation strengthened the people and provided sincere and cognizant politicians with an advantage of the Soviet Union's presence in the International Situation. The Muslim World fought against Imperialism and Israel. There is great exaggeration in what was mentioned regarding Communism in the Middle East.

The US uses it to justify its policy as Britain used it in the past. We expose the Eisenhower Doctrine to the Ummah before the catastrophe occurs. It is to make the Ummah aware of the perils involved and to not be deceived by the ruler's cheap and hollow popularity and false and sentimental slogans. The Ummah should not be naive so to experience a replay of events.

The Prophet (saaw) says, "A Mu'min cannot be stung by the same hole twice."

Therefore, we warn the Ummah to be aware of the US plan and the governments governing the Ummah. We warn the Ummah of accepting any agreement regardless of the terms or details. This would lead to an overwhelming US invasion. The Ummah must understand that if the regimes in the Middle East refused such a doctrine, no power in the world could enforce it. The doctrine cannot be executed except through the acceptance of regimes in the Muslim World. The Ummah has to realize that it can prevent this doctrine if she stands in front of it decisively even if some regimes accepted it.

As an example, Indonesia ousted the Dutch and became an independent authority. Following this, the US proposed generous aid to be used as part of a US policy against the Dutch occupation. America supported Indonesia while Britain supported the Dutch. Consequently, the Indonesian government accepted US aid. However, the Ummah realized the danger of such aid and pressured the government to resign, which it did. A new cabinet was formed and immediately the government refused aid. The US was able to do nothing.

Therefore, the Ummah has to stand with the same intensity as the attack against it. The Ummah has to stand against the politicians and the rulers.

Since this Ummah is the Muslim Ummah, it is important to emphasize that Islam rejects this proposal and necessitates its resistance. The Hukm Shari' states that the Muslims are prohibited to be under the protection of the Kafir states. The security of the Muslims and their land must be dependent upon Muslims.

Allah (swt) says:

"Allah does not allow the Kuffar to wield authority over the Muslims"

[An-Nisaa 4: 141]

The Hukm Shari' states that the Muslims cannot fight with or accept to do so alongside any Kafir states. The Prophet (saaw) told a Jewish regiment to return when they wanted to fight with the Prophet (saaw). The Prophet (saaw) also said that we do not seek the light of the Mushrikeen. Therefore, it is mandatory upon the Ummah to comply with the Islamic rule of rejecting and resisting this proposal. The Ummah must realize the objective of this proposal that prevents the Ummah from building its state.

The Ummah must know that its case is the case of Islam, which is to reestablish the Islamic Khilafah State.

Hizb ut-Tahrir

10th Jummada-Thaniya 1376

January 11th 1957