his hegemony which would expand his influence in concentric circles to all Africa and the whole Moslem world.

This program and the methods employed by Colonel Nasser are fully realized by the United States as well. Though dedicated to peaceful means, the United States has also taken repeated action to stop Nasser by invoking both moral and economic pressure, as in the case of the Aswan Dam and the Suez Canal. In this purpose, at least, the United States is therefore at one with Britain, France and Israel. And though it is now divided from them by their unilateral military action, it can still join with them in consultations to seek solutions that will achieve the common aim of all free nations.

This common aim is peace, which, as the United States has always stressed, must be peace with justice. We shall pursue this aim in the present instance by attempting to mobilize world opinion through the United Nations, including the General Assembly, to localize the conflict and then end the bloodshed. But President Eisenhower also recognizes that the larger peace can be preserved and expanded only by maintaining the free world alliances, not only to cope with Nasser, but with the far more formidable Soviet empire that stands behind Nasser, and he specifically emphasizes that present differences will in no way impair our friendships with the three nations in question, nor loosen the bonds between us. To maintain these friendships and alliances is and remains the supreme goal of our foreign policy.

WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Despite President Eisenhower's persistent efforts to promote a peaceful solution of world problems the complex situation in the Middle East has now exploded into two related but separate military conflicts, the ultimate scope and consequence of which cannot now be foreseen. In one of these conflicts Israeli and Egyptian forces continue to fight by land, sea and air over an expanding area. In the other, following Egypt's rejection of a twelve-hour ultimatum, British and French forces have opened hostilities against Egypt for the purpose of occupying the Suez Canal and safeguarding that lifeline of Western Europe.

Both Britain and France, as well as Israel, have embarked on a military solution of their problems in the face of open disagreement with the United States and without awaiting approval of their action by the United Nations. In so doing they have given Soviet Russia a propaganda plaster with which to cover up its wounds in Eastern Europe and have aroused the other Arab states, with increasing peril to Europe's essential oil supply.

In this situation the United States has been compelled to decide on a new policy, proclaimed by President Eisenhower last night. This new policy is one of non-involvement in the present hostilities, which will have to be conducted by Britain and France without our help. We do not challenge their right to take the actions they have taken, but we also maintain our right to dissent. And we do dissent in the present instance because we regard the use of force as contrary to the principles of the United Nations and as neither a wise nor proper instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

At the same time, President Eisenhower recognizes that the actions of the three nations raise complex legal and moral problems which are not too easy to decide. For they involve the agonizing and never adequately answered question as to what, in a given situation, constitutes aggression and who the real aggressor is. In one view, aggression means a military attack across the borders of another country, and those engaged in such an attack are the aggressors. In this case, this would mean Israel, Britain and France. But the problem is not that simple, and the modern methods of waging war by propaganda, infiltration, subversion, sabotage and economic strangulation have further complicated it. Certainly Britain and France emphatically deny any aggression and refuse to indict Israel on such a charge, without condoning its original attack.

The reason for this attitude is that it would be ridiculous to permit Colonel Nasser to pose before the United Nations or the world as the innocent victim of aggression, or to hold a protecting hand over him. On the contrary, in so far as there is any one man guilty of aggression it is the Egyptian President. For he has waged war against Israel, Britain and France by propaganda, by gun-running, by infiltration of murderous bands, by stirring up rebellion in French North Africa, by seizing the Suez Canal by force and scrapping a treaty in the same manner in which Hitler marched into the Rhineland, by blocking the canal for Israeli shipping in defiance of United Nations orders—finally by his whole loudly proclaimed program of throwing Israel into the sea in alliance with other Arab states and creating an Arab empire under

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.