ISRAEL BIDS U. S. BACK ITS WORDS
By HARRY GILROYSpecial to The New York Times.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Aug 31, 1954; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 4

ISRAEL BIDS U. S. BACK ITS WORDS

Sharett Calls on Britain Also to Build Nation's Security—Arming of Arabs Decried

By HARRY GILROY
Special to The New York Times.

JERUSALEM, Aug. 30—Prime Minister Moshe Sharett called today for deeds to back up recent reassurances given to Israel by the United States and British Governments.

His statement came in a review to the Knesset (Parliament) of Israel's relations with "enemies near at hand and friends afar."

Mr. Sharett said Britain and the United States had evinced a lack of concern for Israeli security in the British-Egyptian Suez Canal pact and in their offer of arms to Arab nations.

"We have been told that there is no intention whatever of abandoning Israel and that if the balance of strength came to be seriously upset, special care would be taken of our security," he said.

Expressing appreciation for these statements, Mr. Sharett noted that Britain was headed "by the illustrious statesman [Sir Winston Churchill] whose faith in the future of the Zionist enterprise is one of the abiding elements in his political career."

"Nor have we any reason for not believing in the sincerity and good intentions of the President of the United States and his Secretary of State," the Israeli leader added.

Mr. Sharett said Israel still looked "for deeds that will demonstrate the sincerity of the assurances and will translate them into the language of facts."

The Prime Minister's analysis of the factors affecting Israel's security covered these points:

¶Egypt is achieving her main national objective with the end of British occupation of the Suez Canal zone, but the canal is not Egyptian. Egypt has violated her obligation to assure passage through the canal for Israeli ships. Britain erred in not requiring that the agreement with Egypt end this blockade.

¶The transfer of the canal zone increases Egypt's military strength. Britain should have made her withdrawal conditional on an Egyptian peace with Israel or else should have offered to strengthen Israel.

¶The Suez agreement provides that the base can be reactivated in the event of an attack on Egypt, the other Arab League states—Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Yemen —or Turkey. Israel is omitted and the political implication is that she is being abandoned to her fate.

¶The United States is starting on a policy of giving military and economic assistance to Egypt and also is aiding Iraq with arms. Israel resents the fact that Washington is adding to the odds against her and is critical of the fact that no conditions for peace or for ending the blockade are attached.

¶The United States' economic aid to Israel has been of great value. Arab countries also are entitled to such help. But any country that requests it should be called upon to refrain from deliberate economic harm to its neighbors.

¶So long as the Arab nations refuse to make peace, Israel will proclaim that any arms they receive are intended to be used against her. Giving arms to these states for the defense of democracy is a delusion. It also is a fallacy to think that the gift of arms will stabilize the Arab nations internally.

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