

relationship among non-Arab states, all of them with a pretty general idea of what their objective was with respect to the Soviet Union.

And so, we've gradually built up our influence in the Middle East by a policy of "mutual tolerance," is what I call it, with Nasser, to the point where, in many ways, we have a stronger position there than any other country, including the Soviet Union. There are even some European observers of the scene who feel that the United States has worked itself into what might be called a dominant position in the Middle East.

There has certainly been plenty of unrest and plenty of crises in this period of the last five years. But somehow we've been able to get over them. They haven't been the type of crisis of the 1950s, each of which seemed to result in some kind of forward step and victory for the Soviet Union, and some kind of retreat for the West. And we've also been able to live through such affairs as the falling apart of Nasser's United Arab Republic when Syria defected in 1961; the crisis in Kuwait in 1961 which the British handled very well; these more recent crises haven't been of the type which seemed to threaten a real world military conflict as was the case in '56 or '58.

This was partly because I think we have established a stronger position for ourselves, which is based, really, not on any obvious American presence in the Middle East; it's something on the contrary; it's by our being able to detach ourselves more from Middle Eastern internal disputes - from inter-Arab conflicts particularly - that we have been able to establish a position both with those countries which tend to represent more