

# In Military Doctrine... What Prevents the Armies of Muslims from Supporting Gaza? (1)

(Translated)

Al-Waie Magazine, Issue 456

Year 39, Muharram 1446 AH, corresponding to August 2024 CE

[HTTPS://WWW.AL-WAIE.ORG/ARCHIVES/ARTICLE/19459](https://www.al-waie.org/archives/article/19459)

Ustadh Bassam Farhat, Wilayah of Tunisia

Once again, political considerations for the Zionist entity align with aggression against Gaza. It serves as a rallying cry that appeals to the political medium, unifies all its factions, and revitalizes the spiritual and religious sentiments of a people whose collective memory is fed by the bloody massacres of 'Joshua, Saul, and David' against the Canaanite tribes, considering them as "historical glories."

The names may differ, such as "Operation Grapes of Wrath," "Operation Cast Lead," "Operation Protective Edge," "Gaza Envelope", but the reality remains the same: a bloody military scenario and a brutal, fierce, and one-sided war waged by the world's seventeenth-strongest military power, a member of the nuclear club, against a defenseless, displaced population. In this war, the so-called "**only democracy in the Middle East**" uses the most powerful weapons and the most horrific forms of genocide, revealing the extent of hatred, malice, cruelty, criminality, and vengefulness that has filled the Jewish character to overflowing. For the tenth consecutive month, the open massacre against Gaza and its defenseless, steadfast people continues, with unacceptable sadism targeting stones, trees, humans, and animals. As of the writing of these lines, the death toll has reached 40,000 martyrs, with 80,000 injured, most of whom are infants, children, women, and the elderly, along with widespread destruction of infrastructure.

The dilemma is that this systematic annihilation of the Gaza population's livelihood occurs in plain sight, under the watchful eyes, inspiration, and support of the so-called free world, with shameful complicity and blessings from the Arab regimes. These regimes not only fail to fulfill their duty to provide support, they even go as far as to provide logistical support to the Zionist entity, supplying it with essential resources like food and fuel.

In fairness, this behavior, which even wild animals would shy from, is not surprising. It is merely a small part of the vast criminality of the Bani Israeel, who continue to repeat themselves with meticulousness, perfecting their performance from one massacre to another, until they merge with the altered Talmudic project of "**Greater Israel**," at its most significant and horrific stage of displacement, which implies the ethnic cleansing of the central point of "Greater Israel," namely, the Blessed Land of Palestine.

However, as the saying goes, "**every cloud has a silver lining**." One of the few benefits of this unjust aggression is that the Islamic Ummah as begun to regain its confidence before its armies. It is now addressing them directly after decades of division, mistrust, and deep-seated enmity. However, the question remains: Is the military establishment in Muslim countries worthy of this trust, and prepared for it? If not, how can it be rescued from the clutches of colonialism, returned to the embrace of its Ummah, and mobilized to defend its causes?

## Distancing the Ummah from Its Strength

### 1. Discouragement and Despair:

Since the mid-20th century, the rhetoric of discouragement and despair, whether official, partisan, or popular, has persistently belittled the armies of the Ummah. The rhetoric is downplaying their significance, questioning their combat capabilities, and even doubting their integrity. They are often portrayed as either a tyrannical force that it is forbidden to seek help from, or as tools for oppressing the people and protecting the agent rulers. It leads to the belief that no good can ever come from them, and that liberation can only be achieved by their removal.

This toxic claim contradicts both social norms and political principles. Liberation from colonialism can only be practically realized when supported by a military force that backs it, protects it, and removes the physical barriers that stand in its way. Awareness and desire alone, without the support of those with strength and power, are not sufficient to bring about the desired change. Military entities can only be effectively removed by other entities of the same nature.

This claim also contradicts the reality of these armies. They are an integral part of the Islamic Ummah, composed of its finest heroes who share its concerns and victories, and who, like the Ummah, are protective of the sanctities, and yearn for liberation and the elevation of the Word of Allah. It is true that the military establishment in Muslim lands is distinctly anti-religious. It is neither politically, psychologically, nor ideologically prepared to seek assistance, or to come to the aid of Muslims. It is indeed a tool for oppressing the people, waging war against Allah (swt) and His Messenger (saw), protecting the interests of colonialism, implementing its projects, and securing its agents on thrones.

However, it is essential to distinguish between the military establishment as an official, colonialist construct that is founded, trained and armed to be loyal to colonialist powers, and the individual soldiers who are part of the Islamic Ummah. These soldiers share the Ummah's faith, zeal for Deen, and suffering under the flames of capitalism. Therefore, it is possible to address the underlying Islamic Iman within them, provoke their discontent with the corrupt status quo, and draw them to support the Islamic project.

## **2. A Colonial Maneuver:**

Consequently, the colonialist Kuffar has sought to distance the military forces from the movements of their Ummah. It uses them to subdue their own people, curb their ambitions, and prevent the resumption of the Islamic way life. It was evident that this was a malicious colonialist maneuver aimed at separating the Ummah from its strength, isolating it from its armies. It is a maneuver aimed at creating a psychological and political barrier that would distance the Ummah from its source of power and protection. This separation was intended to perpetuate the Ummah's dependency, and suppress any liberating impulses it might have.

Ironically, this colonialist strategy found real-world validation and support. The events in Gaza serve as a stark example. Despite the heinous brutality of the Zionists, which even stirred humanitarian concerns amongst the enemies themselves, both regimes and peoples, and mobilized major cities across Europe, breaking through the traditionally pro-Zionist Western public opinion, particularly in the strongholds of Zionism and the top universities of the American and European political elite, it still amounted to a quiet cry in the wilderness. The outcry found no receptive ears among the armies of the Muslims, who instead were busy suppressing their own people's movements, and participating in the siege and oppression of the people of Gaza, alongside the Zionist entity.

These shocking realities, which are difficult to comprehend, shake our foundational beliefs and raise burning questions: What prevents the armies of Muslims from supporting their brothers in Gaza? Are they not united by the Islamic Aqeedah? Are they not even bound by the base ties of ethnicity, tribalism, and nationalism? Do the cries of widows and orphans, the groans of the violated, and the tears of children and infants not provoke in them a sense of honor, pride, and duty? Do the sights of bloody, dismembered bodies, and charred and decayed corpses not stir even the basic human emotions within them? How is it that an American Christian soldier, Aaron Bushnell, would set himself on fire in protest against the atrocities committed by the Zionists, yet a Muslim soldier refrains from defending the honor and lives of his fellow Muslims?

## **Leadership Control Panel**

### **1. The Conceptual Personality of the Army:**

Despite the complexity of these questions and their seemingly paradoxical nature, the answer is actually simple, logical, and even straightforward. Colonialism has taken control of the "dashboard" or control panel of Muslim soldiers, which is their military combat doctrine. Colonialism has rendered them obedient to its commands and at its disposal. Just as a single person has a tangible, real personality composed of intellect (aqliyyah) and disposition (nafsiyah) that determines their thinking, understanding, inclinations, behavior, perception of interest, and level of development, so too do nations and armies possess a moral, virtual, and conceptual

personality. This personality shares the same components as that of an individual. It has the same influence on the reality and character of the army, shaping its thinking, understanding, behavior, inclinations, interests, and development.

It is evident how crucial the intellectual foundation used in reasoning is, when linking reality to information, and motives to concepts. This foundation plays a pivotal role in shaping both aspects of the personality in a distinctive manner. It crystallizes meaning into a concept that drives and guides behavior. It molds motivation into a preference and inclination that determines how needs are satisfied.

When this dispositional-cultural equation is applied to the reality of the armed forces, it is translated into the term “**military doctrine.**” This doctrine serves as the intellectual foundation that the military institution uses for reasoning, carving out the contours of its conceptual personality, both intellectually and at the level of dispositions. It provides the military with a set of fundamental principles about how armies should think in various combat situations, ensuring their effectiveness, loyalty, obedience, and discipline. However, it is loyalty to the entity that defines their military doctrine. Therein lies the crux of the problem

## **.2. The Keys to Armies:**

Modern armies have three key components that enable control over them:

- (1) The hierarchical and rank-based structure,
- (2) The strict disciplinary system, and
- (3) The military doctrine.

This triad acts as the control panel that allows the subjugation, management, direction, and utilization of the military institution to achieve the state's political objectives and to ensure its security and supreme interests.

Those in high military ranks hold the “**magic formula**” for control and leadership, which includes:

- (1) Complete loyalty,
- (2) Blind obedience, and
- (3) Total submission.

In its modern military form, this control is based on a precise administrative organization, and a strict disciplinary system. The military institution is built on a hierarchical structure that extends from the top down in the form of a branching organizational tree, with various leaders and ranks controlling its joints. As you move down the ranks, the base broadens, from General to Colonel to Lieutenant, all the way to the soldier. The reverse is true as you move up.

Therefore, targeting and winning over the appropriate rank can allow control over the entire military institution, or significant parts of it, from corps, divisions, brigades and battalions. These commanders' orders must be obeyed without hesitation, or complaint by those of lower rank, under threat of severe punishment, which may include execution, especially if the country is in a state of war, as it is considered treason. This system discourages any thoughts of rebellion among the backbone, and essential component of the army, the soldiers. It contributes to their compliance and exploitation.

## **3. The Fundamental Pillar:**

Undoubtedly, the most crucial element in this triad is the military doctrine. It shapes the intellectual, cultural, and ideological aspects of the armies. The other two elements, hierarchical structure and strict discipline are merely complementary in organizational and administrative terms. There is a dialectical and interconnected relationship between a military's principles, its culture and doctrine, and its obedience, submission, and commitment. The influence of military doctrine on the loyalty and effectiveness of an army is significant, inevitable and automatic. It dictates those aspects and ensures adherence to them.

A military person, regardless of rank, remains a human being, whose behavior is fundamentally linked to their concepts of life, criteria and convictions. These determine the types

of emotions that drive them and the manner in which they act. According to these concepts, a soldier organizes their interests and forms relationships with others. From this perspective, military doctrine forms the fundamental pillar in shaping the military policy of any human group, regardless of its level of development or primitiveness, whether it is related to an empire, state, tribe, or mafia. No form of military organization can operate and achieve its goals without a military doctrine, no matter how base or instinctive it may be, such as looting and plundering, revenge and retaliation. The important thing is that it operates according to an idea, a vision, a perspective, and an objective it seeks to achieve. Otherwise, chaos would prevail, cohesion would disappear, and defeat and failure would follow.

Therefore, anyone who wishes to build an army, gain its loyalty, support, and victory must target its military doctrine, whether by establishing and formulating it, maintaining and focusing on it, or altering and adapting it. This is the general approach. To delve into the details, we need to answer the following questions: What is meant by military doctrine? What are its levels and sources? What is the role of the foundational cultural aspect within it? What is its relationship with the state's political doctrine? How does it contribute to controlling the armies, and enhancing their combat effectiveness? How can it be targeted and utilized?

## **On Military Doctrine**

### **1. Definition and Scope:**

Like any matter of utmost significance, military doctrine has been defined in various ways, addressing it from multiple perspectives, technical, procedural, strategic, political, ethical, and ideological. Despite the diversity of these definitions, they all share a common thread centered on the political doctrine of the state, its national security, and its general military policy. They also collectively aim to answer the following key questions: When do we fight? Whom do we fight? With whom do we fight? How do we fight? Why do we fight? How long do we fight?

The most concise and comprehensive definition of military doctrine is: **"The art and science of managing armed conflict to achieve the political doctrine of the state."** This definition positions military doctrine as a servant, protector, enabler, and enforcer of the state's political doctrine, which comprises the sum of teachings, supreme values, and political, military, economic, social, and spiritual principles that originate from the civilization of the people, and are deeply embedded in their conscience and collective spirit.

According to this definition, military doctrine is nourished by several key sources, the most important of which include:

- The state's doctrine, whether it is religious, ideological, or principled, formulated by political leaders.
- The values, principles, customs, traditions, and norms prevalent within the state, and widely accepted by its people.
- The state's military history, which is the cumulative result of experiences, experiments, and lessons learned over the years.
- Technological and technical development, requiring constant updates and adaptation to stay current.
- National security imperatives, including threat sources and changes in the global order, as well as anticipated wars in terms of their type, shape, levels, and scope.

The state's geostrategic considerations, including its location, resources, economic, social, political, and cultural conditions, which significantly determine the size, structure, and type of its military organizations, their methods of operation, and their influence on internal and external policies.

Based on this understanding, military doctrine is a sovereign and intrinsic concern specific to each state. It is tailored to its unique circumstances and characteristics. There is no universal military doctrine applicable to all states as a standard. Instead, each state has its own military doctrine, reflecting its reality, conditions, and specificities.

To allow another state to formulate a military doctrine for a country is the peak of criminality, as it effectively means the colonialization, exploitation, and subjugation of that country for the benefit of the other state.

**Levels of Military Doctrine:** Based on the aforementioned sources, we can distinguish between five levels of military doctrine:

1. **Ideological Doctrinal Level:** This level defines the intellectual and cultural foundation, and the ideological background of the army as a whole, as well as the specific beliefs of its soldiers. It shapes the army's overall worldview, and the individual mindset of its members.

2. **Strategic Level:** This level identifies and defines the threats, risks, and challenges that the state currently faces or anticipates. It involves aligning the military doctrine with the state's security doctrine and national security strategy, ensuring that military policies are tailored to address these threats effectively.

3. **Technical Technological Level:** This level focuses on modernizing weapons, equipment, and the overall capabilities of the army. It ensures that the military keeps pace with technological advancements in armament, training, and logistical support, thereby maintaining its operational readiness.

4. **Operational Tactical Level:** This level concerns the war effort, including the mobilization of the state's resources and armed forces for warfare. It involves building the army's combat doctrine, encompassing organization, planning, preparation, and training to engage in battles and achieve military objectives.

5. **Ethical Level:** This level addresses the human and moral aspects of military doctrine. It provides the army with a reservoir of noble values, guides it towards virtues, and imposes religious, humanitarian, and ethical constraints, on its behavior during the execution of its missions.

Each of these levels plays a crucial role in shaping a comprehensive military doctrine, that not only defines how an army operates, but also ensures its alignment, with the broader objectives and values of the state it serves.

These five levels are intricately interconnected. It is impossible to separate them or neglect any one of them, as each level complements the others. Together, they form a comprehensive military doctrine in its fullest sense, which can be defined as **“a set of intellectual values and principles, aimed at establishing the theories of military science and the art of war, determining the structure and use of armed forces in times of peace and war to achieve the state's supreme interests and objectives.”**

Although most of these levels have a technical and procedural nature, the cultural and doctrinal aspect serves as the binding thread between them. This doctrinal level does not merely dictate how to fight. It also establishes a set of fundamental principles that guide the thinking of the armed forces in various combat situations. It determines whom they ally with, whom they oppose, whom they fight, how, when, why, and to what extent they fight. In this sense, the military doctrine serves as the brain, emotions, and conscience of the military institution.

Therefore, it is a crucial gateway for anyone aiming to target that institution through recruitment, mobilization, or support, provided that they rely on the doctrine shared by the soldiers and the people. However, if the body is Muslim while the mind, emotions, and senses are Western, Christian, or Zionist, this is a recipe for colonialism, demise, and political suicide.

[To be continued]