Reaction in Congress: U.S. Must Not Act Alone
By E.W. KENWORTHY Special to The New York Times
New York Times (1857-Current file); Jun 6, 1967; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 18

Reaction in Congress: U.S. Must Not Act Alone

By E. W. KENWORTHY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 5—The dominant Congressional reaction today to the outbreak of hostilities between Israel and the Arab states was that the United States should take no unilateral action.

In both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the hope was that somehow the United Nations could get the belligerents to agree to a cease-fire.

Failing this, there was hope that the Soviet Union would agree to meet with the United States, Britain and France to work out a big power approach to the crisis.

Although two or three House members suggested that the United States should act alone, if necessary, in coming to the aid of Israel, no leader in either body supported such action.

The prevailing sentiment was most forcibly expressed by Senator Richard D. Russell, Democrat of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the subcommittee on armed service appropriations.

Russell Opposes Lone Action

Mr. Russell, who has given undeviating support to the war in Vietnam even though he has always questioned the wisdom of the United States involvement there, told reporters that he was "unalterably opposed to any unilateral intervention" in the Middle East.

Whatever action the United States takes, he said, should be multilateral. And, he added, "the multilateral action should be multi-multilateral."

At 9:30 A.M., after Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara had briefed President Johnson at the White House, they went to Capitol Hill for a meeting with Congressional leaders and the chairman and ranking members of Senate and House committees most immediately affected.

U.N. or Big-Power Attempt to Attain a Cease-Fire Is Generally Supported

They were joined there by Richard Helms, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The meeting lasted just over one hour.

Those who attended declined comment, beyond saying that the briefing had dealt solely with the military situation and not with policy decisions. They added that the two secretaries and Mr. Helms had, at that moment, no clear idea of whether action had been initiated by Israeli or Arab forces nor what the situation was.

Just 'Fragmentary Reports'

Mike Mansfield, the Senate Democratic leader, said, "You could have read the same things in the press. All they did was give us what fragmentary reports they had."

The Administration, Mr. Mansfield told reporters, was taken by surprise. It had anticipated, he said, that there was still some room for diplomatic activity because the United States had asked Israel for restraint and "the Soviet Union had supposedly asked Egypt to restrain themselves."

There was no suggestion in the meeting with Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara, Mr. Mansfield said, that the United States take military action.

"Now that the flame had been lit," he said, "I would anticipate that the Security Council would, of necessity, be forced to face up to the situation. But what it will do remains to be seen."

Asked whether the Administration was under much pressure from the Senate for unilateral action, Mr. Mansfield said:

"Both the Administration and the Senate have—to use a modern colloquialism—kept their cool about this."

But he also said that there might have been more pressure to help Israel if it had not been for "the situation in Vietnam."

There were differences of opinion over whether United States involvement in Vietnam was directly related to President Gamal Abdel Nasser's decision to request the removal of United Nations forces from Egyptian soil and his subsequent announcement of a blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba.

There were also differences of opinion about how much encouragement President Nasser had received from the Soviet Union to take his actions.

Mr. Mansfield thought that "this had happened apart from the situation in Vietnam." Senator Russell expressed doubt that President Nasser meant to go as far as he had, and thought he probably would not have done so if Secretary General Thant of the United Nations had not yielded precipitately to his request for the withdrawal of United Nations forces.

In fact, Mr. Russell said, "what U Thant needed was a few good Southerners to filibuster the situation."

Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, said that the Middle Eastern crisis was "an outgrowth of our involvement in Vietnam." Last week he had expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would agree to use its influence with President Nasser to ease the crisis in return for American agreement to de-escalate the war in Vietnam.

Today, Mr. Fulbright said that the Russians had "apparently missed a great opportunity to gain tremendous prestige" by acting as peacemakers.

Regardless of these differences of view on the relationship of the Vietnam war and the Middle Eastern crisis, it was apparent that the heavy involvement in Vietnam was largely responsible for the sentiment against any further unilateral intervention.

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