
THE EAGLE AND THE SPHINX: AMERICA AND ARAB NATIONALISM, 1945-1970

Douglas Little

One hundred thirty-two years ago this month, Mark Twain booked passage on the transatlantic steamer *Quaker City* bound for the Middle East. Before the year was out he would walk the streets of all the major cities of the Arab world. In *The Innocents Abroad*, a scathing account of his calamitous errand among the Arabs that sold over 100,000 copies in 1869, Twain provided his readers with a classic set of orientalist stereotypes straight out of *The Arabian Nights*. “Rags, wretchedness, poverty and dirt, those signs and symbols that indicate the presence of Moslem rule more surely than the crescent flag itself, abound,” Twain remarked after visiting Jerusalem. “The Arabs are too high-priced in Egypt,” he complained after fending off “a howling swarm of beggars” just outside Cairo. “They put on airs unbecoming such savages.” Nor did nineteenth-century America’s greatest humorist find much to laugh about in Damascus. “I never disliked a Chinaman as I do these degraded Turks and Arabs,” Twain growled after a brief stay in the world’s oldest city, “and when Russia is ready to war with them again, I hope England and France will not find it good breeding or good judgment to interfere.”¹

A century later, of course, almost all of America’s Middle East watchers would question Twain’s good judgment about Russia. Few, however, seem to have questioned his orientalist portrait of the Arabs, which provided a convenient rationale for dismissing revolutionary nationalists like Gamal Abdel Nasser as demonic wogs, Soviet dupes, or perhaps both. A CIA psychological profile of the Arab states prepared early in the Cold War captured this combination of orientalism and anticommunism quite well. Arab nationalism, the agency’s Middle East experts argued in September 1949, resulted not merely from bitter resentment of imperialism and Zionism but also from some cultural peculiarities. According to the CIA, the Arabs often seemed “lazy, lacking in constructive ability, and skillful mainly in avoiding hard work.” Moreover, they possessed “a remarkable capability for intrigue,” which frequently led them “to commit astonishing acts of treachery and dishonesty.” The implications for U.S. policy in the

Douglas Little, Department of History, Clark University

Middle East seemed obvious. “The Arab states today,” the CIA concluded, “constitute a very weak link in the defense chain being forged by the Western powers to contain Soviet expansion.”²

During the next few minutes, I’d like to suggest that it was orientalism and anticommunism, not bad karma or the Israel lobby, that put the American eagle on a collision course with the sphinx of Arab nationalism between 1945 and 1970. We can break this quarter-century down into two distinct periods. The first, from 1945 to 1958, was characterized by considerable confusion in Washington, where orientalist assumptions led both the Truman and the Eisenhower administrations mistakenly to equate Nasser’s brand of Arab nationalism with Soviet subversion. The second, from 1959 to 1970, was marked by profound irony, with Washington clearly distinguishing between Nasserism and international communism but just as clearly concluding that Nasser and other Arab radicals posed a far graver threat to U.S. interests in the region than the apparatchiks in the Kremlin.

Although America has paid lip service to national self-determination ever since Woodrow Wilson issued his Fourteen Points at the end of the First World War, U.S. policymakers have always been reluctant to apply that principle to the Arabs. When Arab emissaries informed the peace-makers at Versailles that “the Arabic speaking peoples thought themselves entitled to independence,” for example, Wilson himself expressed second thoughts and urged them to accept a League of Nations mandate instead.³ Wilson’s decision to edge away from Arab independence stemmed less from potential diplomatic complications than from philosophical reservations. Robert Lansing, Wilson’s secretary of state, had spelled out the nature of those reservations on the eve of the Versailles conference. “The more I think about the President’s declaration as to the right of ‘self-determination,’ the more convinced I am as to the danger of putting such ideas into the minds of certain races,” Lansing grumbled on 30 December 1918. “Will it not breed discontent, disorder and rebellion? Will not the Mohammedans of Syria and Palestine, and possibly of Morocco and Tripoli rely on it?” The concept of self-determination, Lansing concluded, “is simply loaded with dynamite.”⁴

Lansing’s successors evidently concurred, because down through the end of the Second World War, U.S. policy toward the Middle East was guided by the orientalist assumption that the primitive Arabs remained badly in need of European tutelage. “Arabs are a very uncertain quantity, explosive and full of prejudices,” Dwight Eisenhower remarked privately as Allied troops stormed Algiers during Operation Torch in late 1942. “We sit on a boiling kettle.”⁵ And this, many Americans worried, might just be the Kremlin’s cup of tea. As early as May 1944, for example, the U.S. Office of Strategic Services warned the Kremlin had “embarked on a drive to secure for herself the balance of power in the Arab world, both politically and economically,” by championing “nationalist aspirations of independence and freedom from foreign control” and engineering “a reduction

in British influence.”⁶ And in the wake of V-J Day, neither Britain nor France seemed strong enough to retain the upper hand. “The whole Arab world is in ferment . . . and wants forthrightly to run its own show, . . . without imperialistic interference, be it British or French,” one State Department Middle East expert cautioned President Harry Truman in November 1945. “If the United States fails them, they will turn to Russia and will be lost to our civilization.”⁷

As America’s interests in the Middle East deepened during the late 1940s, so did its conviction that the Arabs were treacherous, unreliable, and vulnerable to Soviet subversion. The Truman administration’s recognition of Israel in the spring of 1948, for example, stemmed not merely from guilt over the Holocaust and concern over domestic politics but also from determination to halt “our shilly-shallying appeasement of the Arabs,” which according to White House counsel Clark Clifford had left the United States “in the ridiculous role of trembling before threats of a few nomadic desert tribes.”⁸ For Clifford and many other American Middle East watchers, the Arab world remained synonymous with oriental despotism, not very different from the one that the bolsheviks had destroyed in Russia a generation earlier. At a State Department regional conference held in Cairo in March 1950, U.S. diplomats serving in Arab capitals agreed that “the Near East is vulnerable to communistic exploitation,” largely because “natural deterrents . . . such as religion, a modern social system, a flourishing economic life, and a democratic political structure, are weak or lacking.”⁹

Some of Foggy Bottom’s Middle East experts felt that these natural deterrents to communism might emerge if America kept its distance from Britain and Israel and focused on developing a Marshall Plan for the Arab world. “Economic aid, which only we can provide,” Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs George McGhee insisted in June 1950, “is necessary if we are to assure increased stability of the non-communist governments of this region.”¹⁰ To write off Arab nationalism “merely as irrational, irresponsible, anti-American and anti-western, or, as essentially different from that which transformed the Western World,” McGhee’s successor, Burton Berry, cautioned two years later, “would risk inviting the USSR and the Communists to assume leadership of nationalist movements in this area.”¹¹

Top U.S. policymakers, however, seem to have shared the reservations of George Kennan, the dean of American Sovietology and a closet orientalist. “I think that [Mr.] Berry is making a great mistake in supposing that the mere trappings of self-determination can imbue them [the Arabs] with qualities comparable to those of the advanced states of western Europe,” Kennan thundered on 3 April 1952. “It seems to me that by virtue of the drastic decline in British influence . . . the fortunes of the area as a whole are already at the mercy of these unreliable and unpromising nationalist forces.” Then he offered a benediction straight out of Clark Clifford’s

prayer book: “Perhaps we can still rescue some of the most vital of the western positions there if we act rapidly, with determination, discarding our fatuous desire to be ‘liked’ and making it clear that the Russians are not the only serious people in the world.”¹²

Just these sorts of concerns had preoccupied Harry Truman and his secretary of state, Dean Acheson, when they discussed the Middle East with British prime minister Winston Churchill and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden three months earlier. “Here we had a situation which might have been devised by Karl Marx,” Acheson told his boss and his guests on 5 January 1952 as they cruised down the Potomac aboard the presidential yacht *Williamsburg*. “Vast masses of people in a state of poverty; practically no middle class . . . ; a small owning and governing class, incompetent and corrupt; and foreign influences, against which agitators could arouse the population, which, after being aroused and destroying foreign influences, could be used to bring about a communist regime.” If Britain and America continued “merely sitting tight,” Acheson warned, “we would be like two people locked in loving embrace in a rowboat which was about to go over Niagara Falls.”¹³

Gamal Abdel Nasser swept the Anglo-American dinghy over the cataract six months later, when he overthrew King Farouk and unleashed a nationalist revolution on the banks of the Nile. Because Nasser promised political reform and economic modernization, Truman’s advisers believed that they might do business with the new regime, as did the new policy-making team that Dwight Eisenhower brought on board in January 1953. But Nasser’s deep-seated Anglophobia, which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles termed “pathological,” and his neutralist rhetoric, which Dulles regarded as “naive,” raised suspicions in Washington.¹⁴ Egypt’s cold war with Britain, Eisenhower recalled in his memoirs, “seemed to be rooted in a virulent nationalism and unreasoning prejudice, as well as in genuine misunderstandings” that were exacerbated by “Communist meddling” and Soviet arms sales. “Nasser,” Ike told his top advisers after Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal in July 1956, “embodies the emotional demands of the people of the area for independence and ‘for slapping the white Man down.’”¹⁵ Three years later, Eisenhower dismissed Arab nationalism as merely the latest manifestation of oriental despotism. “If you go and live with these Arabs,” he told the National Security Council in June 1959, “you will find that they simply cannot understand our ideas of freedom or human dignity,” ideas that were equally incomprehensible inside the Kremlin.¹⁶

Even as Ike offered this orientalist verdict, however, many U.S. officials had begun to regard Nasser as something other than an irrational Soviet-backed thug. The turning point had come in July 1958, when Colonel Abdel Karim Qassim seized power in Baghdad, toppling the pro-Western Hashemite monarchy with help from the Iraqi communist party. Eisenhower’s initial reaction was to blame Nasser and to send 14,000 U.S. marines to Lebanon to shore up the pro-American regime of Prime

Minister Camille Chamoun.¹⁷ Before the summer was out, however, Washington learned that Nasser regarded Qassim as anathema, partly because of Egypt's long-standing rivalry with Iraq for leadership of the Arab world but mainly because of Baghdad's recent tilt toward Moscow. When Ike labeled Nasser "the biggest blackmailer this country has ever faced" in mid-October, John Foster Dulles reminded his boss that "our real enemy in the Near East was the USSR and not Arab nationalism."¹⁸ Three weeks later, Eisenhower signed off on NSC-5820, which concluded that U.S. policy toward the Middle East must be predicated on the realization that "to be cast in the role of Nasser's opponent would be to leave the Soviets as his champion." Far better, the Eisenhower administration decided on 4 November 1958, to channel Nasserism in "constructive" directions and to "contain its outward thrust" by improving relations between Washington and Cairo.¹⁹

During the following four years, Egyptian-American relations did in fact improve considerably. U.S. policymakers applauded Nasser's decision to outlaw the Egyptian communist party and privately encouraged his covert efforts to topple Qassim in the spring of 1959. Against his better judgment, a tight-fisted Ike agreed later that same year to offer Egypt \$153 million worth of surplus U.S. grain, and Nasser responded by cooling his fiery anti-Israeli rhetoric. The rapprochement between Egypt and America deepened after John F. Kennedy took office in January 1961, in part because the New Frontiersmen distinguished more clearly than their predecessors between Arab nationalism and international communism and in part because JFK himself sympathized with Nasser's efforts to modernize Egypt and overcome the legacy of British imperialism. When Washington offered Cairo another \$500 million worth of American wheat in June 1962, Nasser reiterated his pledge to keep the Palestine issue "in the ice box."²⁰

Yet although JFK's advisers were relieved by this latest evidence that Nasserism was a rational phenomenon distinct from Marxism, no one in Camelot had any illusions that radical Arab nationalism was necessarily compatible with U.S. interests in the Middle East over the long haul. The fallout from the pro-Nasser revolution that rocked Yemen in the autumn of 1962 showed just how incompatible Arab nationalism and U.S. interests might be. After having watched the Yemeni monarchy do its best impersonation of an oriental despotism for more than a decade, junior officers seized power in Sana'a on 27 September 1962, proclaimed a republic, and appealed to Nasser for help. The initial reaction in Washington, where few could have found Yemen on a bet, was surprisingly calm. "The establishment of a republican, pro-Nasser regime in Yemen would significantly increase the pressures against conservative regimes in Saudi Arabia and Jordan," the CIA concluded on 8 October. "We do not believe, however, that it would be particularly conducive to the spread of Communist influence in the area nor necessarily detrimental to U.S. interests."²¹ But before

the year was out, the House of Saud had begun to run guns to royalist guerrillas in the mountainous no man's land just across the Yemeni frontier, Nasser had dispatched the first contingents of what would become an 80,000-man Egyptian expeditionary force in southwest Arabia, and a proxy war was brewing between Riyadh and Cairo that would eventually threaten American access to Persian Gulf oil.

Early in the new year, executives from ARAMCO and five other multinational oil firms paid a call at Foggy Bottom. Arguing that the Kennedy administration was foolishly treating Egypt "as our chosen instrument in the Near East," the oil men suggested on 11 January 1963 that the United States shut off Nasser's access to surplus U.S. wheat until he pulled his troops out of Yemen. Although the State Department's Middle East experts agreed that Nasser's meddling in the Arabian peninsula was most unwelcome, they cautioned against putting his regime "in a position where it acts like a cornered rat," because "he can foment Palestinian refugee unrest . . . and stir up trouble for the oil companies."²² Diplomatic pest control became a more pressing problem with the approach of spring, however, when the escalating proxy war in Yemen prompted Saudi crown prince Faysal to hint that unless the Kennedy administration treated Nasser like the vermin he so clearly was, the House of Saud might take a long, hard look at ARAMCO's mammoth oil concession.

Meanwhile, a pro-Nasser Ba'athist junta had seized power from Iraq's Abdel Karim Qassim in a bloody coup on 8 February 1963, sparking concern that Western oil holdings farther up the gulf might also soon be in jeopardy. "If Arabs ever took over [the] world, they would start instantly to tear it down," Harold Glidden, the number three man in embassy Baghdad, growled as the rumors of expropriation grew stronger in late May, because "Arab values of vengeance, prestige, and obsession with feuding" had made them "absolutists rather than relativists."²³

Few in Washington seem to have disagreed. Indeed, by the time that JFK left for Dallas in November 1963, the CIA was monitoring developments in Baghdad carefully, Congress had voted to freeze U.S. grain shipments to Egypt, and the man in the Oval Office had politely accused the Arab world's leading nationalist of bad faith. Washington and Cairo were rapidly drifting apart not because of knee-jerk anticommunism or Israeli influence but rather because Nasser's brand of revolutionary Arab nationalism was now judged to be extremely contagious and potentially fatal to American interests in the region.

The lanky Texan who succeeded Kennedy in the White House in late 1963 did not disagree with this harsh assessment. An ardent friend of the Jewish state and an outspoken foe of radical Arab nationalism since his days as Senate majority leader during the late 1950s, President Lyndon Johnson carried in his intellectual baggage some heavy orientalist stereotypes. Like most U.S. policymakers, LBJ viewed the Middle East as a backward and exotic corner of the world badly in need of westernization. At a White House dinner in April 1964, for example, Johnson toasted Jordan's King

Hussein for having “brought that ancient land of the camel, the date, and the palm to the threshold of a bright and a hopeful future.”²⁴ On the other hand, LBJ had little time for more militant Arab leaders like Egypt’s Gamal Abdel Nasser, who preferred a less comforting path toward modernization. Put most simply, Lyndon Johnson neither trusted nor liked Nasser, who seems to have struck him as a cross between Ho Chi Minh and Geronimo.

These sentiments became very clear after Egyptian students staged violent anti-American demonstrations in Cairo in December 1964. When the Johnson administration hinted that it might suspend American economic aid to Egypt in retaliation, Nasser delivered a blistering reply on the banks of the Suez Canal. “Those who do not accept our behavior can go and drink from the sea,” he told a huge crowd on 23 December. “We will cut the tongues of anybody who talks badly about us.” Lest LBJ miss the point, Nasser added: “We are not going to accept gangsterism by cowboys.”²⁵ This outburst helped place America’s confrontation with the Arabs into a context any self-respecting Texan could appreciate—“cowboys and indians.” While neither Johnson’s memoirs nor his private papers make it clear whether he ever cast the problem explicitly in terms of Western civilization versus oriental barbarism, the newly created Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) did remind him of the Vietcong.²⁶ And when PLO raids against Israeli villages along the Syrian frontier lit the fuse for the Six Day War during the spring of 1967, the Johnson administration knew who wore white hats and who wore black. White House aide John Roche probably put it best in late May when he told LBJ in the vernacular of the Lone Star State: “I confess that I look on the Israelis as Texans and Nasser as Santa Ana.”²⁷

This kind of thinking seems to have guided Lyndon Johnson’s policies, and those of his Middle Eastern friends, during the Six Day War and its immediate aftermath. Almost everyone in Israel, of course, hoped that Nasser would be cut down to size, preferably sooner rather than later.²⁸ So did his Muslim enemies like the Shah of Iran, who told a U.S. official just a few hours after the war erupted that he “considered the long-range objective of both the United States and Iran to be ‘how Nasser could be destroyed’.”²⁹ The Israelis provided their answer when the shooting started on 5 June. And Lyndon Johnson quickly made his own preferences clear shortly after the shooting stopped by warning the Kremlin to think twice before rearming the Arabs.

Ironically, it was America’s effort to cut Nasser down to size that soon prompted him to do something that he had been unwilling to do for fifteen years—align himself with Moscow. Two weeks after the guns fell silent in the Six Day War, Soviet president Nikolai Podgorny arrived in Cairo, where Nasser made him an offer he couldn’t refuse. “What is important is that we now recognize that our main enemy is the United States and that the only possible way of continuing our struggle is for us to ally ourselves with the Soviet Union,” Nasser explained on 22 June 1967.

“Of course we will hear some people around the country saying that the British left through the door and the Soviets came in through the window,” he admitted. “However, once we are actually receiving your support, and when complete cooperation has been established between us, this will have a very good impact, both inside Egypt and in the Arab world.”³⁰ In short, by the time that Lyndon Johnson departed the White House for the friendlier confines of the LBJ Ranch eighteen months later, the Kremlin had replenished Nasser’s arsenal and American orientalism had set in motion a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Richard Nixon, like his predecessor, had long regarded Nasserism with a mixture of fear and loathing. Unlike LBJ, however, the California Republican had actually visited Egypt, where Nasser invited him to watch Soviet engineers complete work on the Aswan Dam in July 1963. Nixon came away convinced that his host was a garden variety Third World revolutionary. “Like Sukarno and Nkrumah, Nasser had devoted the best of his energies to revolution,” Nixon recalled in his memoirs. “Now he was more interested in a grandiose crusade for Arab unity than he was in the vital but less glamorous task of managing and improving Egypt’s economic, political, and social structure.”³¹

Nixon’s dealings with Nasser after January 1969 merely reinforced all the misgivings he had expressed after his visit to Egypt five and a half years earlier. While the new president was still settling into the Oval Office, Egyptian artillery began to pound Israeli positions along the Suez Canal in the first phase of what by the end of the year would become a bloody “War of Attrition.” When the Israelis, retaliated in January 1970 with a series of “deep penetration” air raids that damaged much of Nasser’s military infrastructure, the leader of the Egyptian revolution persuaded his Soviet comrades to deliver a shipload of surface-to-air missiles plus 1500 Russian military personnel to launch them. Both Nixon and his national security adviser, Henry Kissinger, were stunned by Nasser’s latest deal with Moscow. “It marked a unique turn in Soviet policy,” Kissinger recalled in his memoirs. “Never before had they put their own military forces in jeopardy for a non-Communist country.”³² Furthermore, Kissinger regarded Egypt’s flirtation with Russia as further evidence that Nasser preferred revolution over real politik. “He gloried in his radicalism, which he thought essential to his Pan-Arab ambitions, and for this he must have felt compelled to remain in perpetual confrontation with us in the Middle East,” Kissinger observed nine years after Nasser suffered a fatal heart attack in September 1970. “Nasser could not make the choice between his rhetorical ambitions and his intuition of the limits of Egypt’s ability to achieve those ambitions,” and had “died without ever making the choice.”³³

Kissinger would eventually persuade himself that Nasser’s successor was capable of making the right choice, and Anwar Sadat would ultimately be lionized by the American media as a statesman rather than demonized as a wog. But old stereotypes die hard. En route back to Tel Aviv

from an especially frustrating negotiating session in Cairo with Sadat's foreign minister, Ismail Fahmy, Henry Kissinger must have chuckled when NBC's Richard Valeriani and other weary reporters in the airborne entourage devised an orientalist scorecard for shuttle diplomacy that went like this:

Drop a Stella bottle on Fahmy's head from the balcony on the seventh floor—1 point

Sexual relations with a camel—2 points

Sexual relations with a Nubian maiden—3 points

Sexual relations with an Egyptian soldier—5 points (because the Egyptian soldiers were better looking than the Nubian maidens)³⁴

Had Mark Twain somehow managed to book passage on the Kissinger shuttle instead of the *Quaker City*, I'm certain that he would have had no trouble keeping score.

NOTES

¹ Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad. Roughing It*, ed. Guy Cardwell (New York: Library of America, 1984), pp. 446, 499-501, 366. On the popular success of *Innocents Abroad*, see Maxwell Geismar, *Mark Twain: An American Prophet* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970). pp. 54-55.

² CIA Report SR-13, "Arab States," 27 September 1949, CIA Office of Privacy Coordination, Washington, D.C.

³ Minutes of the Council of Ten Meeting, 6 Feb. 1919, *FRUS: Paris Peace Conference 1919*, 3: 888-94.

⁴ Robert Lansing, *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative* (Boston, 1921), pp. 97-98.

⁵ Ike to Mamie, 27 Nov. 1942, in Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Letters to Mamie*, ed. John S. Eisenhower (New York: Doubleday, 1978), p. 66.

⁶ OSS Research Report 1749, "Communist and Pro-Russian Trends in the Near East," 23 May 1944.

⁷ "Summary of Remarks Made by Mr. [George] Wadsworth to President Truman," 10 Nov. 1945, *FRUS 1945*, 8: 13-15.

⁸ Clifford to Truman, 8 March 1948, *FRUS 1948*, 5: 690-95.

⁹ "Report of Near East Regional Conference in Cairo," 16 March 1950, *FRUS 1950*, 5: 3-4.

¹⁰ McGhee to Acheson, 7 June 1950, *FRUS 1950*, 5: 169.

¹¹ Berry to Bohlen, 23 February 1952, attached to Read to Kennan, 10 Sept. 1963, CR-16-3, State Department Alpha-Numeric File, Record Group 59, National Archives II, College Park, MD.

¹² Kennan to Bohlen, 3 April 1952, *ibid.*

¹³ Acheson memcon, 5 Jan. 1952, *FRUS 1952-54*, 6: 737-38.

¹⁴ John Foster Dulles to Walter Bedell Smith, tel. 13 May 1953, and minutes of the 147th NSC Meeting, 1 June 1953, both in *FRUS 1952-1954*, 9: 25-26, 383-384.

¹⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change*, p. 150.

-
- ¹⁶ Ike quoted in Andrew Goodpaster memcon, 31 July 1956, *FRUS 1955-1957*, 16: 64.
- ¹⁷ Ike quoted in the minutes of the 410th NSC Meeting, 18 June 1959, *FRUS 1958-60*, 16: 101.
- ¹⁸ On Ike's intervention in Lebanon, see Douglas Little, "His Finest Hour? Eisenhower, Lebanon, and the 1958 Middle East Crisis," *Diplomatic History*, 20 (Winter 1996): 27-54.
- ¹⁹ Minutes of the 383rd NSC Meeting, 16 Oct. 1958, *FRUS 1958-60*, 12: 175-80.
- ²⁰ NSC-5820/1, "United States Policy toward the Near East," 4 Nov. 1958, *FRUS 1958-60*, 12: 187-90.
- ²¹ On JFK's approach to Arab nationalism, see Douglas Little, "The New Frontier on the Nile: JFK, Nasser, and Arab Nationalism," *Journal of American History*, 75 (September 1988): 501-27.
- ²² CIA, "Situation in Yemen," 8 Oct. 1962, *FRUS 1961-63*, 18:170.
- ²³ DOS memcon, "Round-Table Discussion of Recent Near East Developments," 11 Jan. 1963, 780.00/1-1163, State Department Decimal File, NARG59.
- ²⁴ Glidden quoted in Robert Estabrook to Washington Post, tel. 23 May 1963, "Cables Materials, Folder 3," Box 5, Robert H. Estabrook Papers, Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, WI.
- ²⁵ LBJ toast, 14 April 1964, *PPP, LBJ 1963-64*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC, 1965), 1: 462.
- ²⁶ Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents: The Inside Story of Nasser and His Relationship with World Leaders, Rebels, and Statesmen* (Garden City, NY, 1973), pp. 229-230.
- ²⁷ Lyndon B. Johnson, *The Vantage Point: Perspectives on the Presidency 1963-1969* (New York, 1971), p. 289.
- ²⁸ Roche to LBJ, 22 May 1967, National Security Files, NSC History Files, Box 17, "Middle East Crisis, Vol. 1," LBJL.
- ²⁹ Ambassador Walworth Barbour (Tel Aviv) to DOS, tel. 7 June 1967, "Middle East Crisis, Cables, Vol. 4," Box 107, CO:NSF, LBJL.
- ³⁰ Shah quoted in U.S. Department of State, Historical Office, "U.S. Policy & Diplomacy in the Middle East Crisis, May 15-June 10, 1967," NSF, NSC History Series, Box 20, LBJL, p. 115.
- ³¹ Nasser-Podgorny memcon, 22 June 1967, in Abdel Magid Farid, ed., *Nasser: The Final Years* (Reading, England: Ithaca Press, 1994), pp. 4-5.
- ³² Richard M. Nixon, *RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon* (New York, 1978), pp. 179, 249.
- ³³ Henry A. Kissinger, *The White House Years* (Boston, 1979), pp. 569-70.
- ³⁴ Kissinger, *White House Years*, p. 361.
- ³⁵ Undated unsigned memo, "Travels with Henry—Middle East," Box 11, Richard Valeriani Papers, Wisconsin State Historical Society. For Kissinger's comments about his relations with Valeriani and other reporters, see Henry A. Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Boston: Little & Brown, 1982), pp. 818-20.