Egypt's Intentions Stated
M. SAMIR AHMED,
New York Times (1857-Current file); Aug 16, 1954; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 16

Egypt's Intentions Stated

Denial Made of Ideas for Aggression, Israel Accused of Endless War

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In a letter published in The New York Times of Aug. 9 the chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs made statements which, in the interests of accuracy, call for comment.

Is it not ironical that the same Zionists who tried very hard, both in London and Washington, to prevent British evacuation from Suez (as reported in The New York Times) are those who now describe the agreement which brings about evacuation as one which "may be greeted as a welcome sign of change in the rigid situation that has prevailed between Great Britain and Egypt"?

Zionists now attempt to capitalize on this sign of rapprochement and understanding between Egypt and the West for the benefit of Zionism, despite the fact that Zionists and their fellow-travelers have always attempted to block the way of Egyptian-Western friendship.

Now they proceed to claim that Egypt continues "intentions of aggression against Israel." Far from continuing intentions of aggression, Egypt has no such intentions against Israel or any other nation.

Expansion Threat

However, it must be clear to the whole world, as it is clear to Egyptians, that the expansion of Israel population-wise constitutes a threat of inevitable aggression on the part of that country. It is a known fact that there are strong elements among the Israelis who maintain that their country should extend from the Euphrates to the Nile.

So long as there exists a policy in Israel which brings added thousands of immigrants to its territory, then the Arabs are entitled to their fears that there must come a time when Israel will seek more territory. Under these conditions present bounds would break; in the minds of the Arabs, there is no escaping this conclusion.

Responsible American officials have, in public statements, voiced their understanding of Arab fears in this connection. Moreover, these fears are borne out by repeated border clashes, 90 per cent of which were condemned by Maj. Gen. Vagn Bennike, until recently Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and by the United Nations Mixed Commission, as violations on the part of Israel. The massacres at Nahhalin and Kibya were eloquent warnings to the Arabs of things to come. Obviously they see a threat to themselves and their lands; obviously they are determined to secure themselves against aggression.

It ill behooves any spokesman for Israel to talk of violations of United Nations decisions. Surely the chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs must know that for six long years Israel has consistently and flagrantly failed to implement resolutions passed by the United Nations for the solution of the Palestine dilemma. Surely he is aware of the world-wide criticism which has been leveled at Israel on this account —and of her continued intransigence in the face of that criticism.

Abiding by Truce

Less than a fortnight ago the Egyptian Premier, Col. Abdel Nasser, declared that Egypt would not attempt to solve the Palestine problem by force. This statement was simultaneously corroborated by the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Dr. Mahmoud Fawzi, who declared that the relations between Egypt and Israel are governed by the terms of the Palestinian Truce of 1949, that Egypt has abided by these terms in the past and intends to do so in the future.

Moreover, any military aid which may be forthcoming to Egypt will go to her upon the condition that it be used solely to build defensive strength against foreign invasion and, in case of attack, solely for self-defense.

Again, it is the attitude of Israel during the past six years which forces Egypt to maintain a policy of self-preservation which is partly implemented by a blockade of war matériel passing through the Suez Canal to Israel. Egypt cannot permit the tools of war to go to a nation which it has every reason to believe will resort to aggression to bring about expansion. Food does go to Israel through the Suez Canal; war matériel does not. All vessels bearing cargoes for Israel are subject to search during their passage through Suez. This right is one which was granted to Egypt, and Egypt alone (because the Suez Canal lies in her territory), by the signatories of the Constantinople Convention of 1888, respecting the free navigation of the Suez Canal. It is manifestly a means of self-preservation.

To Aid Peace

The foundations of peace can be built only upon a demonstrated effort to comply with international decisions which are intended to end disputes among nations. Yet the cause of peace in the Near East cannot obviously be served by Israelis talking peace while engaging in an endless war of border aggressions, nor can peace be won by groundless accusations against Egypt of violating United Nations decisions while the accusers are, in point of fact, the real violators. Finally, it is certainly not in the interest of peace for Israelis to try to avert or block the way of Egyptian-American understanding, as they are now attempting to do.

M. SAMIR AHMED,
Third Secretary, Embassy of Egypt.
Washington, Aug. 11, 1954.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.