

# The Cornell Daily Sun

Keith R. Johnson '56 Digital Archive

## The Middle East Bleak Prospects [ARTICLE]

Cornell Daily Sun, Volume LXXVIII, Issue 12, 3 October 1961, Page 4

### The Middle East . . .

## Bleak Prospects

Although the United States is not exactly distraught at seeing Gamal Abdel Nasser, president of the United Arab Republic (sic!) get his lumps, the Middle East is likely to present to our policy-makers some headaches during the next few months—just the time when we thought we had enough to keep us busy.

But, perhaps it would be useful to see first what ought not to be a headache before examining the real potential problems.

Although reports say that we are moving only very cautiously towards recognizing the new Syrian regime under Mahmoun al Kuzbari, a reputed conservative, recognition is not likely to be a genuine problem for us if the regime seems to have solid control of the country.

We are supposedly waiting to see whether the regime is "democratic". In the past however, this does not seem to have been a major consideration. We recognized the military junta after the South Korean coup this past spring with seemingly little trepidation.

But this is where the problems begin. Nasser might, in the near future, feel he has to draw attention away from his loss of Syria by directing the passions of his followers towards the hated Israel. In the event of a new attempted Egyptian invasion in

Israel, the great powers' negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Berlin might receive a dangerous jolt. For the Middle East would again become a hot battlefield in the cold war.

\* \* \*

The chances are that the new regime in Syria will lean to the right. And if it does, it will have no trouble receiving not only our recognition, but also our support. Therein lies the other problem, not at all a new one, which will face us with respect to our strength in the Middle-East.

We may, again, be supporting and identifying ourselves with a static regime, one which tends to favor the conservative landowners, one which resists drastically needed social reforms.

As it is, we are identified in the minds of the Arabs, with regimes which are bound to go in time: King Saud's in Saudi Arabia, King Hussein's in Jordan, Sheik Abdullah al-Salin al-Sabah's in Kuwait —that oil derrick-covered sand bank, which we supported, with Britain, this summer against Iraq.

\* \* \*

What makes the Middle East more volatile, and still more confusing, is that while Hussein might team up with Syria's new leader to resist Nasser, they also could possibly team up for joint military operations against Israel. Observers have pointed out that Syria, like Egypt, has not been noted for her love of the Israelis and the new regime might feel it necessary to rally public opinion behind it by taking military moves against Israel.

\* \* \*

Viewing then, our objectives in the Middle East —stability, which means acceptance of Israel by the Arab states, social reforms for the poverty-stricken Arab masses, protection of our (old) interests in countries like Kuwait, and keeping Nasser out of the clutches of the Kremlin — we find that these aims are unalterably antithetical each other, and that the long range prospects look bleak.

This article has been automatically clipped from the Cornell Daily Sun, organised into a single column, then optimised for display on your computer screen. As a result, it may not look exactly as it did on the original page. The article can be seen in its original form in the page view.  
Copyright 2005, Cornell University Library