

ting themselves into any kind of military showdown with us in the Middle East. This was apparent in the various crises we've been through with them in '56, '58, etc.

They never have committed their forces to a situation where they might be likely to come into conflict with Western forces. They've been very active in all the other ways of supplying arms, attempting to subvert governments and all the rest. But they have not been willing to risk adventurous military action.

They have a two-stage strategy I would say, on the political side, and this has been laid down fairly clearly over a long period of years, which is to push the Western powers out of positions which they have had historically in the area, as the first stage, and in doing this they will make an alliance with anybody who is available; any nationalist movement; even reactionary forces; any political groups which have any role to play in the Middle East are possible allies of the Soviet Union in order to gather the force which can push. It has been particularly the British, but it has been aimed also at such positions as we have held, out of the area altogether.

And the second stage, then, is the communization or the actual establishment of regimes which are really under Soviet control. And, while they've made a great deal of progress, particularly in the 1950s, in the first stage, and were successful in pushing the British out and destroying much of the position which we had built up in parts of the Middle East, they have not been successful in the second stage of moving on to take over governments and actually establish controlled satellite