

4. The U.S. does not question that evacuation should take place, but believes the present situation should be replaced by some form of defense arrangement. It does not insist upon any specific type, such as MEDO.

5. The installations in the Canal Zone are of vital importance to the U.S., perhaps more so than to the British.

6. Without a definite defense commitment by Egypt and the other Arab States, it would be very difficult to justify to Congress the expenditure of funds for economic and military assistance.

7. During present discussions with the U.K. the issues should be referred to sub-committees instead of attempting to obtain agreement on principle at this stage. Once the practice questions involved are thoroughly understood, it should be easier to reach a meeting of minds on the broad question of principles.

8. Although this does not apply to General Naguib, himself, the U.S. has received lately disquieting reports that persons surrounding Naguib actually believe a policy of "neutrality" would best serve Egypt's interests. (The Ambassador denied this.)

No. 133

Editorial Note

On January 29, 1953, the National Security Council, at its 129th meeting, with the President presiding, directed the Senior NSC Staff to develop an agenda of policy questions for consideration by the Council, to include those items desired by each Council member. (S/S-NSC files, lot 66 D 95, "Record of Actions by the National Security Council, 1953") That same afternoon the Senior NSC Staff drew up a list of policy questions requiring urgent or immediate consideration by the Council. Included on this list was NSC 129/1, "United States Objectives and Policies With Respect to the Arab States and Israel." (S/P-NSC files, lot 62 D 1, "1953, Record of Planning Board Meetings-NSC Files") NSC 129/1, April 24, 1952, is printed as Document 71.

The first drafts of a revision of NSC 129/1 found in Department of State files are dated April 12 and 14, 1953. They were considered at an April 15 meeting of the NSC Planning Board and an amended draft, dated April 24, was prepared. The Planning Board considered and amended the April 24 draft at a meeting on April 27 and directed the Board Assistants to prepare an amended version of that draft and a coordinated staff study for final review by the Planning Board. An amended draft and a staff study, both dated May 4, were considered at the May 6 meeting of the Planning Board. At that meeting, the Board reviewed the May 4 draft and agreed that it should be made available to the Secretary of State for use as background information during his forthcoming visit to