U.S. Military Analysts Expect Short War, With Israel Winning
By WILLIAM BEECHER 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. 1

U.S. Military Analysts Expect Short War, With Israel Winning

By WILLIAM BEECHER
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 5 — A number of American military analysts, while admitting that the situation was still very confused in the Middle East, were of the opinion that the war would probably be short and that Israel would prevail.

Analysts at the Pentagon said that the Egyptian Army was a lot stronger today than in 1956, when Israeli forces swept through the Sinai Peninsula, but that Israel still was believed to have a better-balanced, better-trained, better-led military force.

Several experts, while conceding that predictions are treacherous, said they believed Israel should be able to "punch through" Egyptian forces in one of two directions in Sinai and elsewhere in a week to 10 days.

In 1956, Israel was able to overwhelm opposition in Sinai in 100 hours, but at that time Egypt was fighting on two fronts, with a British - French force pressing in from the north along the Suez Canal.

"Nobody, of course, knows how much better the Egyptian Army has become," said one general, "but we don't think they've had time enough to become a first-class fighting force."

Analysts speculated that Israel might want to fight hold-

Continued on Page 19, Column 1

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

U.S. ANALYSTS SEE ISRAEL AS VICTOR

Continued From Page 1, Col. 5

ing actions along its borders with Syria and Jordan on the north and east, and push the offense in the southwest against Egypt.

They thought that Israel would either move due south to seize a broad belt of land along the Gulf of Aqaba, or southwest along the coastal plain of Sinai to the banks of the Suez Canal.

"If she could accomplish either objective, she would then be in a position to welcome an armistice, with the United Nations forces positioning themselves between the Egyptian and Israeli forces," one analyst said.

"Of course, Israel would then be unlikely to agree to vacate the whole Sinai Peninsula, as in 1956, arguing that that would allow Nasser to reimpose a blockade in the gulf anytime he wished," he added. "More likely, Israel would insist on control of the access to the port of Elath."

If, at that point, it looks as if Israel has delivered a severe blow to Egyptian forces and is in a position to guarantee her access to the gulf, she probably would be willing to accept the good offices of the United States Government to end hostilities, they said.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic might be willing to go along with such a move, the analysts suggested, if the alternative would appear to be Israeli control of the east bank of the Suez Canal.

If Cairo and its allies stalled the Israeli advance, neither side would be able to sustain a major war effort for very long, they said.

It is estimated that Israel, Egypt and Jordan have enough war matériel on hand to fight for about 30 days without outside replenishment. Israel's main supply problem would be oil and gas for her aircraft and tanks if Arab air strikes destroyed much of her internal storage. The Egyptians' main problem might be spare parts for their tanks and trucks.

All parties to the conflict are believed to have sizable

The analysts said that, in their opinion, there was an outside chance that the Egyptians and their allies might be a lot more successful than anticipated and drive several columns of troops and tanks into Israeli territory.

"If the survival of Israel suddenly appears to be at stake, our Government has a difficult decision to make," one analyst said. "Would we then intercede? No one knows."

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