

# ANOTHER NASSER VICTORY

by T. G. W. Settle

THE August 21st resolution of the United Nations General Assembly formalized another Nasser geopolitical victory—a resounding one. It was tantamount to another Western defeat and a substantial victory for the Soviet and Afro-Asian blocs.

What were the causes? What were the effects of the Iraq coup and the British-American troop landings? Why was the voting unanimous on August 21st? What of Israel? Let us examine these questions objectively, without the platitudes prevalent in our press and public discussions.

Nasser's recent meteoric rise was ignited in 1956 by the British garrison's withdrawal from Suez (at United States insistence?). It was then obvious, as night follows day, that Nasser would seize the Canal when convenient to him. But when he soon did so our public seemed surprised. The West wasted months in futile and "face-losing" conferences.

When, later, the British, French and Israelis started reoccupation, our press screamed. And, apparently, fear of United States economic sanctions and Soviet missile-and-

volunteer bluffing caused the Eden Government to halt in mid-stream and, pusillanimously, re-evacuate Suez.

Thus was Nasser rescued from impending disaster and left with a gratuitous victory. Seldom, if ever, in history has so important a victory been snatched from such certain defeat.

During 1957 Nasser consolidated his gains and manipulated the West's ineptness, the Soviet's hard realism, and the Arabs' nationalism and fear of Israeli aggrandizement. Early this year, Egypt and Syria were welded into the United Arab Republic, with Yemen's adherence.

Then, in July, our public was again surprised by the Iraq assassinations and the elimination of the West's principal remaining "stalwart" in the region, Nuri Es-Said. It was a major success for Nasser.

---

*(The writer, a retired U.S. Naval Officer, has spent a major part of his life overseas, including periods in the Middle East. The writer's views herein do not conform, necessarily, with those of any agency of the U.S. Government.)*

The U.S. and British troops foolishly landed in Lebanon and Jordan. An earlier landing in Iraq might have changed the situation.

Doubtless nothing could have pleased Nasser and Khrushchev more than these landings. These "aggressions" did nothing toward retrieving our loss of Iraq. But they threw all of the Arab League nations (including Lebanon and Jordan, ultimately) into Nasser's lap. And the landings took the heat off Israel while putting us "over a barrel." We are damned by most of the world. We cannot extricate ourselves without further losses.

OUR landings, and the ignominious withdrawals, placed the seal upon Nasser's dominance. Our ouster, and Soviet "presence" in the Arabic Mid-East, were formalized on August 21.

The technical details of the August resolution are significant. That it was sponsored by the Arab League nations demonstrates Nas-

ser's attainment of primacy in that regional grouping. The United States, Britain and our associates voted for it as the least painful way out of our dilemma. The Soviet bloc, and the rest of the Afro-Asian bloc, voted for it, of course, because our geo-political defeat is tantamount to victory for them.

The inescapable conclusion is that the deficiencies and errors of the press and other public communications media in handling Mid-East news during the past two years has been principally responsible for Nasser's present supremacy in the Arab world, for our ouster from, and Soviet "presence" in, the Arab Mid-East. Also, our world prestige is sinking to a new low. Our remaining "toe holds" in Aden and the Persian Gulf oil spots are precarious ones.

One may surmise that Nasser has a certain wry gratitude toward our press. They have so effectively, if unwittingly, assisted in his rise to dominance.

### "Words of Wisdom"

Henry Ward Beecher once received a letter from a student asking his advice in the matter of an easy career in life. To this the eminent theologian replied:

"Young man, you cannot be an editor. Do not try the law. Do not think of the ministry. Let alone all ships and merchandise. Abhor politics, and do not practice medicine. Don't be a farmer, a soldier, or a sailor. Don't study. Don't think. None of these is easy. Oh, my son, you have come into a hard world. I know of only one easy place in it, and that is *in the grave.*"

Leonard E. Read

# Recipe for a GOOD MEAL

*'There's more to this recipe than gourmets or culinary artists  
usually talk about, for this salmagundi has  
a bit of social philosophy in it.'*

IT WAS a Sunday morning. The two of us had given no thought to any eating for the day except the conventional orange juice and coffee and the unconventional sautéed chicken livers and bean soup for breakfast. Let the rest of the day take care of itself! Then the not-so-unconventional thing happened: three guests for dinner!

What to do? Westchester County abounds with restaurants of moderate quality. Why not the five of us dine out? That's the expedient even if the expensive thing to do—sort of the escapist way. But to the gent who likes to cook, this is also to run from a challenge; it is to accept commonplace check-writing while rejecting exciting culinary creation.

An inventory of the refrigerator

revealed some staples but nothing in the way of main-course fare except a cup of canned tuna and perhaps a cup and a half of leftover fricasseed chicken—not much of a start for a table of five. Yet, it was this paucity of supplies that presented the challenge. The Chinese approach came to mind—a little meat for flavor and many vegetables for good diet and bulk.

Two utensils were brought forth

---

*Leonard E. Read is President of The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., a well-run, nonprofit, educational foundation that champions private property, the free market, the profit and loss system and limited government.*