ISRAEL MOVED TO ANGER
By HARRY GILROYSpecial to The New York Times.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Mar 6, 1955; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. E4

ISRAEL-EGYPT CRISIS: VIEWS OF BOTH SIDES

ISRAEL MOVED TO ANGER

By HARRY GILROY

Special to The New York Times.

JERUSALEM, March 5—The Israeli Government is likened by one experienced foreign observer to a pair of brothers in an unfriendly neighborhood. One tries to win friends, the other relies on his fists. For six months the diplomat has had a chance, but now the fighter is asserting himself.

All Israelis say their goal is peace. They agree that they must be strong and ready to fight. They differ in the amount of real or fancied provocation they can bear before resorting to force.

The diplomatic members of the family have faith in the United States. They regard the large American contributions to Israel's development as indisputable proof of good-will. They accept, reluctantly, the necessity for a Middle East defense scheme. They are willing to believe that in the long run a bond between the Arabs and the West may help Israel. The reservation they make, most vehemently, is that Israel should be safeguarded with arms aid and guarantees until the Arabs abandon hostility.

Opposing View

The more aggressive members of the Israeli family doubt the good sense of American policy and possibly the good faith. They feel that any help given to the Arabs encourages hostility to Israel. They regard marauding acts across the border as part of covert Arab warfare just as much as the economic blockade and political moves against Israel.

What has put the hardfisted part of the family in the ascendancy, even if only temporarily?

If any one event produced the change it was the signing of the Turkish-Iraqi pact. The Israelis suffered a profound shock when they learned that the leaders of Turkey and Iraq subscribed to the United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine. To the Israelis these words mean alteration of their borders, forcible repatriation of several hundred thousand Arab refugees and removal of Jerusalem as the nation's capital.

The fact that the Turkish-Iraqi pact is linked with the United States-British regional defense plan added to the psychological impact here.

Then the old anger about marauding along the Gaza Strip boiled over. There has been much speculation whether the Gaza incident of Monday night was associated with the return of former Premier David Ben-Gurion as Defense Minister. An official source indicates that was not the case.

The diplomatic part of the family here has been preaching as its doctrine:

Keep your nerves steady. It is a long struggle. The Arab world must adjust to Israel. Our strength is in internal progress and good international relations. Let us hope that if we do not react to injuries the Arabs will first halt their aggressions against us and then make peace.

Stronger Approach

The other part of the family has argued that the Arabs have no respect for that policy and neither have the great powers. The quieter Israel is, it is said, the easier it is for the Americans and British to sell Israel down the river.

Premier Moshe Sharett, commenting on relations with Egypt two days after the Gaza incident, said that if Egypt proclaims that it maintains a state of war with Israel it must face the consequences. Mr. Sharett is the diplomatic brother in the Government of Israel. But this time he was speaking for both schools of thought.

There is a real danger in the present situation. If the Egyptians now hit back at Israel, the feeling here is for returning the blow with interest.

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