



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
165

Box
60

Folder
947

Tensions in the Middle East, 1955.

1/. The Gaza episode which occurred ~~two~~ ^{last} weeks ago has pointed up the heightened tensions which exist in the Near East - just as Berling, Matan, and Foreman have pointed up the tensions which exist in the Far East. In both instances the ~~single~~ ^{isolated} episodes are part of a larger problem which these episodes will not solve. To treat them independently is to fail in constructive state man ship. One can condemn, or one can condone them, but unless the root of the trouble is looked for - the times remain unaltered and the tensions will break out disorderly again or later again.

4. Talk the Suez affair Egypt charges that an Israeli
border attack resulted in the death of 38 Egyptians and the
wounding of 31 others. There were 8 Israelis killed - and Israel
claims that the clash was provoked by Egyptian military ships
crossed the Israeli border near Gaza for gunnery practice and in doing so shot at the
Israeli coast guard. The U.N. observer has supported Egypt's charges. The Security
Council has recommended Gen. Burema Chief U.N. Truce
Supervision Org. in Palestine to return and report on the affair. It will then
make its decision, and will, in all probability, condemn the
aggressor. That is its duty.

3). But if it does no more than that - it will have accomplished
very little indeed!. It has condemned aggression in that part
the world before - both Israeli & Arab ever since the State of Israel
was established in 1948. But except for the armistices which it

7/ How does Israel feel about Egypt? (Part 1)

8/ This applies to Israel's attitude to other Arab neighbors - hard
place - cooperate with them -
Arab League will not have it so! Israel must disagree!

9/ The very weakness of the Arab League in recent months - due
to internal ~~disagreement~~ ^{disunity} and rivalry - was a contributing
factor to Egypt's overpowering break Israel -
E. has thereby carried the role of backstop & domination in

Arab League.

Recently Iraq - has swung out that orbit - by forming
an alliance with Turkey - and thereby assuming a role
independence which E. interpreted as weakening of its
own power & prestige. - The United front was broken!

E. stormed against & denounced the Turkish - Iraqi Pact
which was sponsored by the U.S. - as a Middle East front -
ultimately to include Russian of Soviet of Communism.

This Pact breached the bargaining power of the Arab League -
who hoped to play off the East against the West as an
endless game of career moves ^{and play games} ~~from the Arab~~.

E. felt to need to re-emphasize her leadership, the Arab
held by an intership of athletes travellers and
batle against Israel - the one battle cry which
is related about to raise & unite the Arab world.

that our joint blindness - and the degree, worst today (5)
is the reason, that blunders.

12/ The present advice. on coming into office arranged a new
evaluation a re-offered, ~~the~~ Near East policy, the Am.
part. This was quite proper - Unfortunately it was
accompanied by a ~~statement~~ in a review for the re-offered - that the previous
administration had been partial to Israel - how - in fact!
① Not the case. - gave comfort to the Arab League politicians
to hope that U.S. - would side with them in straying the State pool
- that they can afford to carry on with their refusal to
make peace with Israel - continue their war, boycott,
blockade and incitement.
② the Arab refugee problem - Refuse to sit down

13/ Our joint. hoped to win over the Arab States ^{by using their personal} to a military
~~alliance~~ defers union of Soviet. It could be made
Eg. by pressing England to withdraw its troops from the
Levy - It was prepared to offer a regional union which
would exclude and thereby isolate, Israel. - as late as recently
as a week ago John D. Jernegan, Deputy Asst. Secy of the
State Dept - U.S. not yet ready to include Israel in
any collective security arrangement in Near East.
④ It did not succeed - because the Arab League - unwillingness

formally to identify itself with the West - It could (b)
thereafter play its game, both sides against the middle.

(b) State Dept - then decided to put around Arab League - by
creating a security bloc which would contain only one
member of the League - Turkey - Iraq. - This part was signed.
- on site, without Arab objections. ~~the American army was~~
despatched to Iraq.

(c) Israel, knowing that the army of Iraq would disturb the
military balance in the Near East to its disadvantage - was
reassured by an State Dept - that the defection of Iraq
from League would weaken its disright League - & so benefit
Israel in the long run. - And saying Israel was strong enough to defend
itself. (Note)
(d) Israel is not reassured.

14. It had been hoped that corresponding military assistance
would be given to Israel to redress the balance, power -
and that the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 - which promises
the border - would be reaffirmed. Abandoned power in the
State Dept. As new hopes to capitulated in the League
washed to perform indefinitely both actions +

15. This would again be interpreted by Arab States as an aid / covering
and oppression ~~and~~ evening, then still further in their non-organizing
and the situation will deteriorate still further.
Our Govt should stop sending ~~an~~ arms until peace is finally
established.

Our part. should ~~enter~~ ^{enter} into no regional defense agreements (?)
in the East which deliberately exclude Israel - and which are
~~communicated~~ ^{communicated} ~~as with that in that conditions~~ ^{such parts}
are hostile parts and will so be interpreted by the people

Israel:-

Our part should happen in unstable times - It resolves
to stand by the Independent Government ^{"by capital & imperial hands"}

Our part should ~~casualties~~ build its difference ^{in that part}
the world community as helping the people, that region
with econ. rather than military aid ^{and} rather than attempt
to purchase Arab friendship with arms. - This will lead to
war not against the Arab - but against Israel! And if not
war - a state of war which will cripple the part. Israel to
devote more & more of its limited budget to the military defense -
to military itself, in the midst of an increasingly armed hostile
Arab world - whose army will be paid for by the donors
by the Am. part.

This is not the way of peace or of state making; this
should not be America's role in the Near East.

Israel wants peace. The Arab states do not.

~~Which country~~ should free America
should America surround the Arab states - and for their
war - ^{by arms} ~~working~~ and penalized and enlarged Israel
by isolating and enlarging its expenses?

TENSIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

With Special Reference to the State of Israel

March 13, 1955

✓ The Gaza episode which occurred two weeks ago on the borders of Egypt and the State of Israel has sharply pointed up the heightened tensions which exist in the Near East, just as Matsu, the Taachen Islands, and Formosa have been pointing up the tensions which exist in the Far East. In both instances the isolated episodes are part of a larger problem which these outbursts of a military or a quasi-military character will not solve. And to treat these episodes independently is to fail in constructive statesmanship. One can condemn them, one can condone them, but unless the root of the problem of these recurrent incidents is looked for, the issues will remain unresolved, and the tensions will break out with increasing vehemence, I am afraid, from time to time later on. ✓

Take this Gaza affair: Egypt charges that an Israeli-provoked border attack resulted in the death of 38 Egyptians and the wounding of some 30 others. The Israeli counter-charge that this clash was provoked by Egyptian military units who had crossed the Israeli border and had encountered an Israeli patrol force and in the ensuing battle, the Israeli pursued the Egyptians into Egyptian territory, fighting ensued, and along with the Egyptians who were killed, eight Israeli were also killed. The United Nations observers on the scene have supported the Egyptian charges. The Security Council of the United Nations has now summoned General Burns, who is chief of the United Nations Truce Supervision in Palestine, to return here and to give a report on the affair. The Security Council will then consider the evidence and will make its decision, and will, in all probability, condemn the aggressor, whoever that aggressor may appear to be in its eyes. And

The Security Council has condemned Israel.

~~this, of course, is its clear duty.~~

But if the Security Council does no more than that, it will have accomplished very little indeed. The Security Council and the United Nations Assembly has condemned aggression in that part of the world between Arabs and Israeli before, on several occasions, in fact ever since the State of Israel was established in 1948. But except for the armistice which it succeeded in establishing between Israel and the Arab forces, who attacked the new-born State of Israel, you will recall, in 1948, in an effort to ~~undo and to~~ nullify by violence the decision of the United Nations, the United Nations has unfortunately been ineffective in liquidating the tensions on the Israeli-Arab border, to stop these frequent outbreaks or to persuade the Arabs to negotiate a peace settlement with Israel.

Not only has the United Nations been ineffective in this regard, but the diplomatic activities of Great Britain, France, and our own country - they too have failed to pacify the Near East. Their diplomatic activities have, in fact, helped to aggravate the situation.

This Gaza affair comes as a climax to a whole series of raids, pillage, murder, sabotage which have taken place in the last two years on the Israel-Egyptian border. I read these facts from the records of the Israel Office of Information which have recently been made available.. ✓

"Between September 1954 and February 1, 1955 Egypt has been condemned on no fewer than 27 occasions for violations of the Israel-Egypt Armistice Agreement, including armed attack, murder and sabotage. Repeated warnings by the Mixed Armistice Commission to Egypt to put a halt to these acts of aggression have had no effect.

"In the period between August 1954 and February 1955 the Egyptians were responsible for nine cases of sabotage and 34 armed clashes in Israel territory, in addition to numerous cases of illegal border crossings and plunder. The main targets of sabotage were the pipelines bringing water to the southern part of Israel

on which all the settlements in the area depend for their very existence. The pipelines were blown up on four occasions causing considerable damage.

"Noting the serious damage incurred, the Mixed Armistice Commission ~~on-th~~ emphasized its "great concern over the repeated acts of planned demolition on main water pipelines in Israel by well-trained, organized and armed groups coming from Egyptian-controlled territory."

"On January 21, 1955 an Egyptian army unit drove up to the armistice line and took up firing positions. Part of this unit crossed the frontier and attacked an Israel military post. Of the three Israel soldiers on duty, one was killed and two wounded. The Egyptians retreated only on the approach of Israel reinforcements. On January 24th the Israel-Egypt Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Egypt for this attack. The Commission's resolution was worded as follows:

"Decides that this aggressive action carried out by a unit of the Egyptian army is in flagrant violation of Article II, Par. 2 of the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt;

"Notes with extremely grave concern this aggressive action and calls upon the Egyptian authorities to terminate these aggressive acts against Israel."

"Only a few hours after this resolution was passed, on the night of January 24th, an armed band crossed the frontier into Israel from the Gaza strip and penetrated 4 miles into Israel territory, attacking the settlement of Ein Hashlosa. Two of the settlement's plowmen were ambushed, one killed and the other wounded. Three days later, Egypt was again condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission for this act of aggression and the Commission passed the following resolution:

"Notes with grave concern the serious situation prevailing along the Gaza strip, resulting from these repeated attacks;

"Notes once again with extremely grave concern, that despite obligations imposed upon Egypt by the General Armistice Agreement and a number of Mixed Armistice

Commission resolutions, these penetrations and killings of Israel citizens have not been terminated;

"Calls upon the Egyptian authorities to put an immediate end to such aggressive acts."

~~So this Gaza incident, which is prominent before the public today, must~~ ^{and} ✓
~~not be viewed as an isolated episode where irresponsible Israeli soldiers or~~
~~civilians attacked without any provocation Egyptian forces.~~ The Gaza affair is
a link in a chain of sad and evil acts, all stemming from one thing, all flowing
out of one situation, namely, the refusal of Egypt to make peace with Israel.
consistently,
And Egypt has, ~~officially~~, through its official spokesmen told the world that
it has no intention, under any conditions whatsoever, to make peace with the
State of Israel.

On December 27, 1954, Major Saleh Salem, the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, called together journalists - the visiting journalists of foreign countries and told them, "Egypt's policy has not ceased to rest on the principle of 'no peace with Israel' in any form and at any time. Egypt will not make peace with Israel even if Israel were to implement the UN resolutions on Palestine." In the following month, the same Major Salem speaking for the Egyptian government stated: "Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war even if Israel should fulfill the UN resolutions. It will not sign a peace with her. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel Aviv, we should never put up with that." 22J

And so the Egyptians prefer the status quo, that is, the cold war which the armistice has established on the restless frontiers ~~and borders~~ of Israel - a status quo which must inevitably break out from time to time in bloody acts of hostility and reprisal which everybody regrets. Egypt, and ~~some of~~ the other bordering Arab states, will not accept the fact of Israel's existence. They

are still hoping that it will collapse, ~~or hope~~ that by their concerted boycott and blockade, Israel's economy will collapse; ~~and they are hoping too~~ that by increasing their military strength which they hope to ^{get} ~~grab~~ from the United States ~~and from other countries~~, they will ~~intime~~ become strong enough to have a second round with Israel and this time accomplish what they failed to accomplish in 1948 - that is, to destroy Israel.

How does Israel feel about Egypt? In 1952, when Mr. Ben-Gurion will still Prime Minister of the State of Israel, following the dismissal of King Farouk of Egypt by General Naguib, ~~you will recall~~, Prime Minister Ben Gurion issued a public statement on August 18, 1952, in which he said:

"Israel wishes to see Egypt free, independent, progressive. There were no grounds nor are there now, for any quarrel between Egypt and Israel. There is no cause for territorial disputes, nor any reason for political or economic problems. We have no enmity against Egypt for what was done to us four years ago. We have never sought to exploit Egypt's political difficulties with a great Power by attacking her or taking revenge upon her, as she did upon the establishment of our State." Israel wants peace. Egypt is planning for war.

This applies also, this attitude of Mr. Ben Gurion, to all the other Arab neighboring states. Israel wishes to live with them in peace and ^{friendship} ~~amity~~ and cooperate with them for the development of that entire, vast area of the Near East where there is room for everybody and for many, many millions more. But these states organized in the Arab League will not have it so! They insist that Israel must disappear.

The ^{weakening} ~~breaking up~~ of the Arab League in recent months, ~~or the weakening of the Arab League~~, due to internal dissention and rivalry was in fact a contributing factor to ~~this aggressiveness~~, this increased aggressiveness of Egypt against Israel. Egypt has always coveted the role of leadership and domination among the

Arab states and in the Arab League. Recently Iraq, one of the Arab states, has swung out of this orbit by joining a new alliance, an alliance with Turkey, ultimately to include also Pakistan, and by so doing it asserted a political independence which Egypt interpreted as a weakening of its own power and prestige. The united front of the Arab states in which Egypt looked upon itself as the king pin was broken! And Egypt stormed against and denounced this Turkish-Iraqi pact, ~~which was sponsored by our own government, by the way, as a Middle East front against Soviet aggression.~~ This pact ^{also} lessened the bargaining power of the Arab League with the West, ^{had} The Arab League which has played off and hoped to continue to play off indefinitely the East against the West in order to get increasing concessions, ~~perhaps~~ from both sides.

Egypt accordingly felt the need to re-emphasize its leadership in the Arab world, and the best way to do that, of course, is to intensify ^{its} ~~one's~~ attitude of hostility to Israel, ^{its} ~~one's~~ truculence and belligerency, in word and in deed; for the one battle cry which will rally all the Arab states, Egypt believes, is "death to Israel." Hence the intensified acts of hostility on the Israel-Egypt frontier; hence also the ~~trumped-up~~ espionage charges which were launched in Cairo against twelve Egyptian Jews which led to their torture, to the suicide of some of them, to the execution of others, and to life imprisonment, for the remaining.

Our own country has ^{tried} ~~said~~ to be helpful in the Near East, sincerely helpful. But its approach to the problem has not, in all ways, been wise. I have never, in criticising the policy of our government, ever accused it of ~~what you might call~~ malice, or unfriendliness, because fundamentally our government reflects the attitude of the American people, and the American people has, as you know, been consistently friendly and helpful in ^{their} ~~its~~ attitude toward the establishment of the State of Israel, and since the establishment, toward its support. And while there have been fluctuating moments in American policy with reference to Israel, in the decisive moments, when fundamental decisions ^{had} ~~have~~ to be made, such as the

moment in November, 1947, when the United Nations voted on the partition ~~scheme~~ ^{plan}, favoring the establishment of an independent Jewish state - or again in May, 1948

when the question arose of recognizing the State of Israel - in these decisive moments, despite of what preceded them - the maneuvering, the jostling, and the play of ~~oppositional~~ ^{apparently} forces - in the decisive moments our government acted ~~de~~ ^{decisively} in behalf of Israel. That is true of both administrations - democratic and republican.

Both with all good will, mistakes in foreign policy are often made - not only with reference to Israel, which is ^{only} a small ^{the rest is separate} piece in ~~this~~ vast international mosaic, but with other countries, ~~and where~~ ^{however} good will persists, mistakes can be corrected. ~~Now~~ I do not wish to suggest that there are no powerful and selfish forces at work against us, there are no influences brought to play, ^{in Washington} and to bear, aimed not at the justice or at the best interests of the United States, but ~~as to~~ ^{to serve} selfish interests of one kind or another - I do not mean to suggest that these forces do not from time to time impact upon the State Department and at times deflect it ~~and deflect our country~~ from the true and wise course. We have enemies. There is no doubt about it.

Our government has sought to be sincerely helpful in the matter, for example, of the Jordan Valley project - ^{the} utilization of the waters of the Jordan and the ^{Litani} River so as to provide ^{adequate} water for irrigation, not only ⁱⁿ the territory of Israel, but ^{in Syria} in ~~Assyria~~, Transjordan - ~~this great project~~ - in this matter our government has been most constructively helpful, and its special envoy in the Near East, Mr. Eric Johnston, while he has not yet concluded the negotiations between the states involved, for there is considerable difference of opinion among them as to the amount of water which each should receive from this project when completed - nevertheless ~~he~~ ^{this} has reported satisfactory and encouraging progress, ~~and that is~~ ^{an} ~~a movement~~ ^{action} initiated by our government which is definitely in the right direction ^{and which} ~~to~~ benefit the whole of the Near East. ~~As are all acts which aim to help with~~

economic aid and with technical guidance. The Point 4 - all peoples who stand to be benefited and strengthened by such aid; our own country has been very helpful and far-visioned.

It is when ~~our country~~, our government, set out to arm the Near East as a bulwark against Sovietism without first assuring itself that peace actually exists among ~~the~~ ^{these} countries in the Near East themselves; without first assuring itself that these weapons will not be used to precipitate war among ~~these countries~~ ^{them} of the Near East, without first making sure that these weapons will not be used against Israel, against whom these countries ~~of the Near East~~ have seemingly sworn war unto death; without making sure that Israel ~~would~~ ^{will} be included in any military pact for the defense of that region, of which Israel is a vital part; it is ~~there~~ ^{here} ~~where~~ our government has, in my judgment, blundered, and the degree of unrest which is today prevailing in that part of the world and the general deterioration of the situation there is the measure of that great blunder.

The present administration on coming into office announced a new evaluation or re-appraisal of the Near East policy of the American government. This was quite proper. They announced their re-evaluation of the foreign policy of the previous administration in other parts of the world. Unfortunately, this announcement that our government plans to re-evaluate its Near East policy was accompanied by the announcement that the reason for this appraisal is that the previous administration had been more or less partial to Israel, and now a new policy of impartiality would be ~~sought for~~ ^{worked out}.

This, of course, was not the case. The previous administration was not partial to Israel. The previous administration helped to establish the State of Israel as ~~did~~ 33 other free countries of the world ~~did~~ as a matter of justice, of morality, realizing that the establishment of this state would in no way harm the fundamental political or economic interests of the Arabs who had five or six independent political states of their own ^{established} in that part of the world, and territory ^{of} over a million square miles,

much of it empty, undeveloped, while the whole territory of the State of Israel would be about 10,000 square miles. But this announcement gave comfort to Arab League politicians and caused them to hope that the American government would now be with them in their efforts to strangle the state of Israel; encouraged them to believe that they can afford to carry on with their refusal to make peace with Israel, to continue their boycotts and their blockades and their incitements; to refuse a reasonable adjustment of the Arab refugee problem; and their refusal to sit down with the representatives of the State of Israel to talk over anything of mutual concern.

Our government then decided to win over the Arab states by suggesting a regional military defense system which aimed, of course, against Soviet aggression. To accomplish this end, which may be very laudable and commendable in itself, it courted the friendship of the Arab states, courted the friendship of Egypt, for example, by pressuring England to withdraw its troops from the Suez Canal, and it was really under pressure from our government that the British withdrew their forces from the Suez Canal. So anxious was our government to win the favor of the Arabs that it was prepared to approve a regional defense union which would exclude the State of Israel and thereby isolate the State of Israel in that part of the world. As late as a week ago, Mr. John D. Jernegan, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the State Department declared at a large gathering of representative Jewish organizations in Washington that the United States was not yet ready to include Israel in any collective security arrangement in the Near East. Now this plan for organizing all the Arab states into a security arrangement failed. The Arab League was unwilling formally and finally to identify itself with the West, because in so doing it would lose the advantages of the game that it had been playing of playing off the West against the East.

So our State Department decided to get around this intransigent Arab League by creating a security bloc along the Soviet frontier with one member of the Arab

League at first, ~~namely, Iraq, and so this~~ ^{and Turkey} Turkish-Iraqi pact was worked out and signed in spite of the violent Arab objections, and America began to send arms to Iraq. ~~We see now where Great Britain is planning to join this Turkish-Iraqi pact.~~

The State of Israel, fearing that the arming of Iraq would disturb the military balance in that part of the world to its disadvantage, was reassured by our State Department that this was really not intended and will not happen, that in fact the defection of Iraq from the League would ultimately weaken and disrupt the Arab League and so benefit Israel in the long run. And anyhow, Israel had nothing to fear because Israel was strong enough to defend itself.

But Israel has not been reassured. Premier Moshe Sharett of Israel denounced the Turco-Iraqi pact ~~this week~~ as being of a "pernicious political character" and charged that it was the result of the Anglo-American policy in the Middle East. The premier and foreign minister, reporting to the Israel Parliament on the general political situation, warned that the Anglo-American policy of supplying arms to the Arab states was altering the political balance within the area and constituted a threat to the security of Israel. The premier, in voicing Israel's opposition to the Turkish-Iraqi defense pact, made it clear that Israel had no common stand in its opposition to this pact with the Soviet Union which was attacking it on other grounds. Basically Israel is not opposed to the American policy of organizing a defense region in that part of the world against the Soviet Union ; its sympathies are and always have been with the West, but for the life of it it cannot see why it should be excluded, deliberately, as a *sine qua non* from such a regional security. The most Western, the most liberal, the most democratic, the most friendly country to the United States, is deliberately *being* excluded and isolated.

It had been the hope that corresponding military assistance would ^{now} be given to Israel to redress ~~this~~ balance of power which has been disturbed, and that the Tripartite declaration which France, England, and the United States made in 1950



מרכז ההסברה

ISRAEL OFFICE OF INFORMATION

11 East 70th Street
New York 21, N. Y.

EGYPT - ISRAEL RELATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Egypt's attitude towards Israel has taken a sharp turn for the worse in the course of recent months. Tension has risen to new heights. The lives and property of Israel's citizens have been attacked with increasing frequency. Egypt has persisted in its attitude of contempt for the resolution of the U. N. Security Council of 1 September 1951 and stubbornly refuses to release the Israel freighter Bat-Galim and allow it to proceed through the Suez Canal. Threats by Egyptian leaders against Israel have continued with growing violence. The execution of two Jewish defendants in the Cairo trial, in spite of pleas for clemency from all over the world, has further exacerbated the situation. The latest instance of Egyptian recklessness took the form of a raid into Israel territory at the end of February 1955. The raiding party penetrated as far as the town of Rehovot, 18 miles inside Israel territory, where on February 25th they murdered an Israel civilian from ambush. The same band operated in the vicinity of Rehovot for a few days. Its tracks were found clearly leading back to the Egyptian-controlled Gaza territory.

2. When the regime of King Farouk was overturned in the summer of 1952 by the Revolutionary Council led by General Naguib, the then Israel Prime Minister David Ben Gurion, publicly expressed Israel's readiness to cooperate with the new regime. In a public statement on August 18, 1952 Mr. Ben Gurion declared:

"Israel wishes to see Egypt free, independent, progressive. There were no grounds, nor are there now, for any quarrel between Egypt and Israel. There is no cause for territorial disputes, nor any reason for political or economic problems. We have no enmity against Egypt for what was done to us four years ago. We have never sought to exploit Egypt's political difficulties with a great Power by attacking her or taking revenge upon her, as she did upon the establishment of our State."

3. These friendly overtures which have been frequently repeated, have brought no response. Indeed, the record of recent months indicates a growth in Egyptian hostility and a deliberate rejection of a policy of reconciliation.

B. BORDER UNREST GROWS

4. Between September 1954 and February 1, 1955 Egypt has been condemned on no fewer than 27 occasions for violations of the Israel-Egypt Armistice Agreement, including armed attack, murder and sabotage. Repeated warnings by the Mixed Armistice Commission to Egypt to put a halt to these acts of aggression have had no effect.

5. In the period between August 1954 and February 1955 the Egyptians were responsible for nine cases of sabotage and 34 armed clashes in Israel territory, in addition to numerous cases of illegal border crossings and plunder. The main targets of sabotage were the pipelines bringing water to the southern part of Israel on which all the settlements in the area depend for their very existence. The pipelines were blown up on four occasions causing considerable damage.

6. On January 21st an Egyptian army unit drove up to the armistice line and took up firing positions. Part of this unit crossed the frontier and attacked an Israel military post. Of the three Israel soldiers on duty, one was killed and two wounded. The Egyptians retreated only on the approach of Israel reinforcements. On January 24th the Israel-Egypt

Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Egypt for this attack. The Commission's resolution was worded as follows:

"Decides that this aggressive action carried out by a unit of the Egyptian army is in flagrant violation of Article II, Par. 2 of the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt;

"Notes with extremely grave concern this aggressive action and calls upon the Egyptian authorities to terminate these aggressive acts against Israel."

7. Only a few hours after this resolution was passed, on the night of January 24th, an armed band crossed the frontier into Israel from the Gaza strip and penetrated 4 miles into Israel territory, attacking the settlement of Ein Hashlosha. Two of the settlement's plowmen were ambushed, one killed and the other wounded. Three days later, Egypt was again condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission for this act of aggression and the Commission passed the following resolution:

"Notes with grave concern the serious situation prevailing along the Gaza strip, resulting from these repeated attacks;

"Notes once again with extremely grave concern, that despite obligations imposed upon Egypt by the General Armistice Agreement and a number of Mixed Armistice Commission resolutions, these penetrations and killings of Israel citizens have not been terminated;

"Calls upon the Egyptian authorities to put an immediate end to such aggressive acts."

8. The incidents in January were the continuation of a long series of incidents which had been increasing in number and gravity in the latter part of 1954. As early as October 2, 1954 the Mixed Armistice Commission, in condemning Egypt for the murder of two Israel farmers on September 20th near Migdal Ashkelon, had called upon Egypt "immediately and finally" to put an end to these acts of aggression. Since January 1955 the incidents have continued despite the demands of the Mixed Armistice Commission that Egypt refrain from continued aggression. On February 1, 1955 fire was directed from Egyptian positions against an Israel patrol, and once again, Egypt was condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission. The following day Egyptian soldiers fired at a member of an Israel border settlement at work in the fields. Later in February, an armed band was intercepted by an Israel patrol at Yad Mordecai in Israel territory. On February 25th two Israel police cars were fired at in Israel territory near Yavne. The same day, an armed band from the Gaza strip killed an Israel citizen near Rehovot, deep inside Israel's territory. Throughout this period illegal border crossings for the purpose of theft, espionage and illegal harvesting continued unabated.

C. ESPIONAGE, SABOTAGE BY INFILTRATORS

9. Egyptian Army Intelligence officers have been systematically organizing marauders who are sent into Israel, apparently from the Gaza strip, for purposes of espionage and sabotage. At the end of September 1954 a group sent to commit sabotage was caught after it had sniped at farmers and blown up houses in a border settlement. In December 1954 four youths were caught trying to gather military information in Israel. They admitted they had been trained and sent by Egyptian officers in Gaza.

10. Despite condemnations by the Mixed Armistice Commission, repeated well-organized military operations have

taken place against the vital water pipeline to the Negev, Israel's arid southern area. For the second time within a month, the main pipeline near Nir Am was blown up with TNT on September 7th by a group of trained saboteurs. On October 25th a similar attack on the pipeline near Mefalsim took place.

11. Noting the serious damage incurred, the Mixed Armistice Commission on the latter occasion emphasized its

"great concern over the repeated acts of planned demolition on main water pipelines in Israel by well-trained, organized and armed groups coming from Egyptian-controlled territory."

12. Attacks on the Negev pipeline have not ceased. In December 1954 the pipeline near Uza was blown up. The Egyptian authorities have taken no steps to prevent the continuation of these planned attacks.

D. THE CASE OF THE BAT GALIM

13. On September 28, 1954 the Israel freighter Bat Galim, carrying a cargo of tinned beef, hides and plywood en route from Eritrea to Israel, was detained by the Egyptian authorities at Port Tewfik at the entrance to the Suez Canal. In an attempt to justify this illegal action, the Egyptian Government charged the crew of the Bat Galim with having committed various crimes in Egyptian territorial waters, ranging from trespassing to the killing of Egyptian fishermen.

These allegations were put forward not only to explain the detention of the vessel, but also to justify the detention of its ten crew members in a military prison under inhumane conditions, and the confiscation of the ship's treasury and cargo.

14. Investigations by United Nations Military Observers of the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission, carried out at the request of the Security Council of the United Nations, proved the complete falsehood of these allegations, and, as a result, the Egyptian Government was forced to withdraw the charges, even from its own courts, and to release the crew. The Bat Galim itself and its cargo are still held by Egypt.

15. At meetings of the Security Council of the United Nations held on January 4 and January 13, 1955, Egypt's attitude was severely criticized by the majority of representatives. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, on behalf of the United States, said:

"... we cannot fail to state our view that Egyptian restrictions on ships passing through the Suez Canal whether bound to or from Israel, or whether flying the Israeli or some other flag, are inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement, contrary to the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, and a retrogression from the stated objectives to which both sides committed themselves in signing the Armistice Agreement."

16. Under the Charter of the United Nations, decisions of the Security Council, as distinct from recommendations of the General Assembly, are binding upon all members. Egypt, by flouting the Security Council decision of September 1, 1951, which called upon her "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound, and to cease all interference with such shipping..." has consistently and deliberately violated the Charter which she signed in 1945. The records of the United Nations contain no parallel to this wilful and persistent defiance of the Security Council.

17. On January 13, 1955, the President of the Security Council, Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand, summed up the wish of that body to see the Bat Galim released through the Suez Canal within the context of the 1951 resolution. Egypt has to this day ignored this expression of international opinion.

E. CAIRO SENTENCES SHOCK WORLD OPINION

18. While assaults increased against Israeli citizens, and Egypt persisted in her defiance of United Nations's wishes concerning the Bat Galim, twelve Jews were charged with espionage on behalf of Israel before a military court in Cairo. During the trial, the defendants testified that torture had been used to extract confessions from them. One defendant, Elias Cremona, died under torture before coming to trial;

another, Max Bennett, committed suicide during the trial; a third, Victorine Nino, threw herself from a window during pre-trial interrogation, but survived; the French Consul-General in Cairo, who attended all sessions of the trial, reported that the body of one of the defendants, Moshe Marzouk, a French citizen, bore the marks of the brutal treatment he had received during the interrogation.

The crimes of which these people were accused were described in the London Times as "too amateurish to be taken seriously." Mr. Roger Baldwin, Chairman of the International League for the Rights of Man, who was in Cairo during the trial, described the charges of espionage and sabotage as "childish and irrational."

19. On January 27, 1955, two of the defendants, Moshe Marzouk, a physician, and Shmuel Azar, a school teacher, were sentenced to hang; two defendants were given life terms, and four others long sentences. The death sentences, which were confirmed by Colonel Nasser, the Egyptian Prime Minister, were carried out on January 31 despite pleas for clemency from all over the world and from all quarters, including the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Governments of the United States and France, the Latin American delegations to the United Nations, and prominent individuals the world over.

20. Condemnation of the brutality of these sentences was world-wide. The Washington Post (February 4) called the hangings "judicial lynching" and described them as representing the lengths to which the Egyptian Government would go in its "desperate effort" to retain the seniority of the Arab bloc. The New York Herald Tribune of February 1 said: "... the hasty executions stemmed as much from political conditions as from the demands of justice." Mr. Baldwin stated that "the conclusion is inescapable that the executions were ordered for political reasons, despite prior private official assurances of leniency."

F. CAIRO THREATS CONTINUE UNABATED

21. In this recent period marked by growing border unrest, Egyptian defiance of the UN, and disregard of world opinion in regard to the mock trial in Cairo, Egyptian leaders and official publications have maintained their anti-Israel propaganda offensive. Not only is all prospect of peace rejected, but threats against the very existence of Israel are made.

22. An editorial in "Al Gomhouria," official mouthpiece of the regime, stated recently:

"Egypt and the Arabs must turn in the name of humanity and its culture to all nations of the world who will aid in wiping Israel off the face of the map because of its barbarism."

(Oct. 15/54)

The following statement was made on "Saut El-Arab" (Voice of the Arabs), the official broadcasting station:

"Egypt sees Israel as a cancer endangering the Arab people. Egypt is the physician who can uproot this cancer. Egypt does not forget that it is her obligation to take revenge, and she is mobilizing all her forces in anticipation of the hoped-for day."

(Nov. 16/54)

23. Recent statements by Major Saleh Salem, Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, stress the refusal to make peace under any circumstances. Speaking to visiting Syrian journalists in connection with Egyptian armament plans, Salem said:

"Egypt's policy has not ceased to rest on the principle of 'no peace with Israel' in any form and at any time. Egypt will not make peace with Israel even if Israel were to implement the UN resolutions on Palestine."

(Dec. 27/54)

Again, in similar vein, Major Salem stated to another group of visitors on January 9:

"Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war even if Israel should fulfill the UN resolutions. It will not sign a peace with her. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel Aviv, we should never put up with that."

(as quoted in the *Manchester Guardian*, January 28, 1955)

TURKEY-IRAQ PACT OPENED TO BRITAIN

Eden Will Discuss Question
When He Reaches Ankara
for Visit Wednesday

By WELLES HANGEN

Special to The New York Times.

ANKARA, Turkey, March 11—Turkey and Iraq have agreed to admit Britain to their alliance. They have decided Britain should not have to wait to join the pact until other Middle Eastern states had acceded.

Sir Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary, will confer with Turkish leaders on this question when he arrives here Wednesday for a three-day official visit. A diplomatic informant said these simultaneous steps were envisaged:

¶The British-Iraq treaty of 1930, due to expire in 1957, will be abrogated.

¶A new bilateral accord will be concluded between Britain and Iraq governing the status of the Royal Air Force bases in Shaibah and Habbaniya, as well as the British military mission in Iraq.

¶London will adhere to the Turkish-Iraq treaty providing for cooperation for defense among the signatories. This agreement specifically authorizes the signatories to enter bilateral understandings in harmony with the maintenance of regional security.

Parleys are now in progress in Baghdad on the new British-Iraqi agreements. This will eliminate the anachronistic features of the present treaty, such as the requirement that the British Ambassador have precedence on all occasions. It also will redefine the transit facilities now guaranteed to British troops and military equipment.

No precise timetable has been laid down but it is expected the new arrangements will come into force well before the end of the summer.

Meanwhile Turkey and Iraq will develop their own cooperation. However full scale military exchanges probably will not take place until Britain, and preferably also the United States, can participate as members of the alliance.

Turkish leaders will seek to enlist Sir Anthony's support for their present campaign to dissuade Syria from ratifying the announced treaty with Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

The Turks want to concert their diplomatic efforts with Britain and the United States to change Syria's course before Damascus has assumed a binding commitment to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Ankara insists that fast action is necessary lest Syria undertake a formal obligation she would find difficult to disavow later.

March 10, 1955



From Israel

Moshe Sharett Uses Strongest Language In Condemning The Turkish-Iraqi Pact

JERUSALEM, (JTA) — Premier Moshe Sharett of Israel denounced the Turco-Iraqi pact this week as being of a "pernicious political character" and charged that it was the result of the Anglo-American policy in the Middle East. The premier and foreign minister, reporting to the Israel Parliament on the general political situation, warned that the Anglo-American policy of supplying arms to the Arab States was altering the political balance within the area and constituted a threat to the security of Israel. The premier, in voicing Israel's opposition to the Turkish-Iraqi defense pact, made it clear that Israel had no common stand in its opposition to this pact with the Soviet Union which was attacking it on other grounds.

In Washington, Israeli circles sharply disagreed this week with the view taken by the State Department that the Turkish-Iraqi treaty is a development favorable to the Jewish State. They also rejected the State Department's contention that this treaty was breaking up the Arab League. Israelis pointed to Article V of the Turkish-Iraqi pact which makes Arab League membership a precondition for eligibility in the pact. Thus, it is felt, the pact actually gave the League status, prestige, and strength. At best, the pact is seen by Israel as containing lip service for anti-Israel political considerations. At worst, it is viewed as a commitment to the reduction of Israel.