

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

5-20-1958

### Eisenhower Middle East Doctrine

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Eisenhower Middle East Doctrine" (1958). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 295.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/295](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/295)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

Mr. President:

COPY

In his press conference on May 20, the Secretary of State had occasion to refer to the "Eisenhower Doctrine" which he described as the "Middle East Resolution." He noted, and I quote, that:

"There is a provision of the Middle East Resolution which says that the independence of these countries is vital to peace and the national interest of the United States. That is certainly a mandate to do something if we think that our peace and vital interests are endangered from any quarter."

Later in his remarks he referred to this provision as "the so-called Mansfield Amendment."

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the record the relevant portions of the transcript of the Secretary's press conference.

Let me note, for the Secretary's information and to keep the record straight, that there was only one so-called Mansfield Amendment adopted to the Middle East Resolution. It had nothing to do with the provision to which he referred in his press conference.

A resolution which I offered on the Floor and the only "so-called Mansfield Resolution" which was adopted reads as follows:

COPY

"The President should continue to furnish facilities and military assistance, within the provisions of applicable law and established policies, to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, with a view to maintaining the truce in that region." (Sec. 4 PL 85-7, 85th Congress)

May I say, Mr. President, that this amendment was adopted over the opposition of the Administration.

Let me say, further, Mr. President, that the Secretary or, whatever assistant advised him, might have been confused in referring erroneously to the "so-called Mansfield Resolution" by the fact that I did offer several amendments to the Eisenhower Doctrine, for purposes of discussion and clarification, which were considered and rejected in Committee. One of these did have something to do with the matter to which the Secretary referred. As for the intent of these amendments, however, it was made perfectly clear in a speech in the Senate on February 21, 1957. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

It was not necessary for the Secretary, however, to, - and I quote - "assume that the introduction of that resolution had a meaning and had a significance. You cannot, as a matter of legislative history, assume that when you put a new sentence

into a resolution that it is utterly meaningless. We assume that the Congress does not do things that are utterly meaningless." (laughter)

The Secretary of State is quite right when he assumes that when the Congress and the Senator from Montana as a part of it, introduce amendments to a resolution he hopes that they are not "utterly meaningless" even if they are not adopted.

Where the Secretary erred, however, is in assuming a "meaning" and "significance" when he could very well have discovered the actual meaning and significance of any and all "so-called Mansfield Amendments" by reading the speech previously referred to.

I introduced these resolutions because the Eisenhower Doctrine seemed to me faulty in several respects. It was sprung upon the world with a disgraceful fanfare of publicity as a kind of salvation of the Middle East situation when it did not begin to get at the basic causes of the difficulties and we are seeing some of the consequences of this fault now in the Middle East. The so-called "Mansfield Amendments" were, in part, <sup>to correct this fault,</sup> an attempt <sup>^</sup> to direct the resolution more to the basic causes of Middle Eastern difficulties. The Administration firmly opposed them.

COPY

The Eisenhower Doctrine was faulty, too, in that it obscured, as did the Formosa Resolution before it, the Constitutional division of powers and responsibilities and between the President and Congress. It was to correct this fault, too, that a "so-called Mansfield Amendment" was introduced. It was rejected in Committee but a modified version proposed by another member was adopted by Congress. It is this amendment, I believe, which the Secretary had in mind when he erroneously referred to the "so-called Mansfield Amendment". I supported that amendment which had only one objective, the clarification of the constitutional question of the division of powers as between the President and the Congress. That it was urgently needed is, perhaps, best illustrated by the Secretary's remarks at his press conference on May 20.

What that amendment tried to make clear, but apparently still did not make clear enough for the Department of State, was that the President had the constitutional power to act in a military fashion in a situation involving the vital interests of the United States but that he could not expect Congress to be bound in advance by his action. There was no intent to enlarge the scope of the President's proposed resolution and,

# COPY

if the Secretary did not know that he could have easily ascertained the facts by sending one of his assistants to read the transcript of the record of the discussion on the point which took place in Committee. In short, Mr. President, the sole purpose of "the" so-called Mansfield Amendment" which was not, as adopted a Mansfield amendment at all, was to make clear that Congress conceded the right of the President to act in the Middle East but it did not concede the congressional right to approve or to question his judgment as to how he acted. To interpret this amendment as a "mandate" is to misread its intent completely. The Amendment was simply designed to bolster the President in the execution of the powers of his office, a bolstering which he apparently felt that he needed.

It is not without significance, Mr. President, that when a reporter used the term "Eisenhower Doctrine", the Secretary corrected it to "Middle East Resolution." That is a measure of the basic difference between my intent and the Eisenhower Doctrine as originally presented to Congress, regardless of how the Secretary may have chosen to interpret my intent. In short, Mr. President, it seemed to me essential that the President act as the President of the United States and not as an agent

- 6 -  
COPY

of Congress and that he be willing to assume the responsibilities for his actions, as other Presidents before him have assumed them. In short, ~~if~~ the President wanted a "Doctrine on the Middle East" then it was incumbent on him to claim authorship and not pass this honor to the Congress as the Secretary of State apparently sought to do in his press conference.

I thought it necessary to set the record straight on this matter.

Further, Mr. President, the Secretary's comments at his press conference on May 20 make it all the more essential, it seems to me, to explore a new approach to policy in the Middle East. This I propose to do in a full statement to the Senate tomorrow on the situation in the Middle East.