A Peace With Reconciliation
New York Times (1857-Current file); Jun 7, 1967; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 46

A Peace With Reconciliation

The Security Council's unanimous call for a cease-fire should bring the fighting to a halt in the Middle East. It is not too soon to look beyond the approaching truce to the peacemaking that must follow.

The Soviet backdown on the effort to add a troop-withdrawal clause to the cease-fire appeal in a form that would have indirectly endorsed Egypt's blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba was recognition of the military facts of life. Israeli forces obviously are not going to halt, much less withdraw, unless assured that the gulf will remain open. And it must be clear now to Moscow, as to all the world, that peace and blockade are mutually exclusive.

But effective assurance on Aqaba is unlikely to be enough this time to liquidate the crisis. Nor should the United Nations settle for that. What must be avoided, after the experiences of 1949 and 1956, is another armistice that fails to end the war.

No settlement, of course, can expunge a military humiliation that will make the losing side thirst for revenge. But every effort must be made in restoring peace to establish completely new conditions for the future that achieve stability rather than a basis for revived tension.

Indications that Israel may be willing to cooperate in this direction can be seen in Foreign Minister Abba Eban's statement that "more stable relationships" in the Middle East will be one of his country's peace aims and in Premier Eshkol's far-reaching promise to seek no territorial advantages from victory.

Many disparate issues undoubtedly will be raised in the negotiations that lie ahead. President Nasser's closure of the Suez Canal and Arab moves to halt oil shipments undoubtedly are an effort to strengthen Egypt's bargaining position; the fabricated charges of Anglo-American air attacks probably were designed as much to provide a pretext for these moves as to explain away Cairo's military defeat. Israel, in turn, will certainly seek assurances from the U.A.R. and the international community before withdrawing from Sinai and the Gaza Strip.

Israel undoubtedly will want the Suez Canal, as well as the Gulf of Aqaba, opened to ships carrying goods to its harbors; the promises it received along this line in 1956-57 were not honored. Egypt may raise the question of Arab refugees, a continuing emotional issue that keeps the conflict between Israel and its neighbors alive. Some form of United Nations truce supervision to replace the U.N. Emergency Force will be essential, as will an early restoration of relations between the U.A.R. and the United States.

A stable settlement is conceivable only if the United States and the Soviet Union work together for one. It was the agreement between Ambassadors Goldberg and Fedorenko yesterday that made the cease-fire appeal possible. The question now is whether Moscow, which initially concentrated on strengthening its position in the Arab world and weakening that of the United States, will now turn to a Middle Eastern equivalent of the Tashkent spirit.

It should be clear that the arms race in the Middle East, fed by Soviet military shipments, can endanger not only that region but the peace of the world. It can be halted and a stable settlement achieved if, and only if, the Kremlin will cooperate in the effort.

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