

of such a statement? Is he to ignore the activities of the ex-Grand Mufti, the Arabs' rejection of the United Nations Partition Decision, and their choosing the instruments of war to destroy the new Israel state?

That this anti-Israel attitude in our Jordan Embassy is not casual or marginal, but rather consistent and central, was apparent throughout the interview. Mr. Mills' view of the history of the area is dominated by an anti-Zionist bias and the nostalgic wish that Palestine had not been colonized by Jews. "It is clear to me," he said, "that if Feisal had remained alive the Zionists would not have been able to colonize Palestine." And he also expressed the fear that further immigration into Israel, "which Ben Gurion wants," would cause an explosion. While Mr. Mills deplores both past and future Jewish immigration, it is significant that the Emir Feisal, as a matter of historic record, at one time welcomed the idea of Jewish colonization.

Arab views on Israel were even thrust into quarters relating primarily to Israel-American concerns. At one point in the briefing a member of the embassy staff implied that Israel had received much too much assistance from the United States. When it was noted that this aid had not all been extended by our government but that much of it was in the form of loans or private contributions and bond purchases, another staff member felt compelled to comment, "Yes, and they are tax exempt!" Surely our diplomats in Ireland, Italy, Greece, and Lebanon -- all countries receiving substantial funds from former nationals now United States citizens -- would not have felt it necessary to add such a prejudiced comment. America is stronger in the world today as a result of these close and affectionate relationships abroad.

We were shown two films produced, I understand, by the Cultural Affairs Department of the Embassy. The first of these films was on Jordan's national history, and the second described the religions of the country. They represented quite a remarkable achievement in that the one made no reference at all to Israel and the other none to Judaism. After this showing I should not have been surprised if I had found that the Ambassador's map of the Middle East had omitted the State of Israel, a practice common to Arab cartographers. The question of whether or not the United States actually produced these films is irrelevant. They were shown within a United States embassy to a group of American visitors.

In one of his comments Ambassador Mills said, "We [meaning the United States] are riding two horses going in two directions and we, like the British, may fall in the middle." Perhaps the two directions to which Mr. Mills referred are the direction in which he is going and the direction of the announced and clearly stated American Middle East policy. I am not suggesting that it is easy to explain to Arab leaders that our policy is to be positively interested in both Arab and Israeli. But we dare not allow our diplomats to shy away from what is difficult when the pursuit of any other policy has little to offer except stimulating conflict and blocking the reconciliation without which we can have scant hope of a stable Middle East, much less one in which the ideals of democracy can take root and grow.

No wonder that high Jordanian government officials spoke to us of Ambassador Mills as "the Jordanian ambassador to the United States"! But who, then, one asks, represents the United States in Jordan?

However, I would not want to leave the impression that we were distressed by the total United States effort in Jordan. My comments must be