Washington Emphatic
By JOHN W. FINNEY Special to The New York Times
New York Times (1857-Current file); Jun 7, 1967; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

Washington Emphatic

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 6—The United States has emphatically rejected as "wholly false" and "malicious" the Egyptian charge that American planes took part in the attacks on the United Arab Republic.

The Administration reacted with unusual severity today to the Egyptian charges, which it viewed as a device by President Gamal Abdel Nasser to stir anti-American sentiment in the Arab world.

Before dawn, an American protest was delivered to the Egyptian Embassy here, calling on the Cairo Government to halt its "hostile and provocative" statements, which were termed "totally and demonstrably false."

'Invented,' Rusk Says

Later, in the West Lobby of the White House, Secretary of State Dean Rusk suggested that the charges were being "invented" by Cairo "to create difficulties for Americans in the Near East."

Later, after the United Arab Republic announced that it was breaking diplomatic relations with the United States, the White House issued an expression of regret.

Then the United States went through the formality of declaring that it was suspending relations with Egypt. The Government sent military transport planes to Libya and chartered airliners to Lebanon to begin an evacuation of Americans in the Middle East.

Basic Policy Question

In Administration circles, the basic policy question was how to protect the security interests of Israel without causing greater damage to American interests among Arab nations.

From a position of military victory, Israel would be in a position to demand sweeping concessions from the Arab side as her terms for a settlement. But the Administration's concern was that if the United States went along with too severe a pro-Israeli settlement it might undermine political stability and American influence in the Arab nations of the region.

At this point, according to officials, the Administration sees no clear solution. For the moment, the Administration's only concern is to seek an immediate cease-fire.

The pressures that the Admin-

Continued on Page 19, Column 1

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

LINKS WITH ARABS BELIEVED PERILED

Rusk, Assailing Cairo Step, Suggests It Is an Effort to Harass Americans

Continued From Page 1, Col. 3

istration will be under to meet Israeli demands were indicated in a Senate speech by Jacob K. Javitts, Republican of New York. The Senator declared:

"This is the time to dent Nasser's prestige."

Contending that the past pattern was for Israel to win a war only to be "chased back within its borders," Senator Javits argued that any settlement must provide for forcible terms with strong guarantees to protect Israeli interests.

A settlement, he suggested, should guarantee freedom of passage for Israeli ships through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, and restore United Nations forces on both sides of the Egyptian-Israeli border.

Similar terms for a settlement were hinted by Israeli diplomatic sources here. Basically, Administration officials were inclined to go along with such a settlement. At the same time it is realized that such a settlemen would be politically unacceptable to Mr. Nasser and that its imposition would set off a wave of anti-American sentiment in the Arab world.

Peril to Investments

The concern of American officials was that the Egyptian charges would set off anti-American demonstrations in other Arab countries, jeopardizing the safety of American citizens and imperiling American investments, particularly in the oil-producing countries.

There was little surprise when Algeria, ranking among the "revolutionary" Arab states, followed Mr. Nasser's lead by breaking relations. United States officials, fear that such conservative Arab states as Jordan, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia might feel compelled to bow to the pressure.

Depending somewhat on the outcome of the political settlement, in the opinion of United States experts, Mr. Nasser, will probably be able to survive a military defeat by Israel. But there is concern in State Department circles that King Hussein of Jordan, one of the more pro-American Arab leaders, may not be able to survive the crisis.

Fear for Hussein

Because of pressures within the Arab world, it was pointed out, King Hussein has already been forced to cast his military lot with Mr. Nasser against Israel.

Now if his military forces are crushed, it is feared, King Hussein may lose political control, particularly over the large group of Palestinian refugees.

King Hussein's political fate will certainly be sealed, State Department experts believe, if Israel demands an adjustment of her border with Jordan.

State Department specialists also see a possibility that some Arab nations will nationalize extensive Western oil interests if the anti-American sentiment goes unchecked or if a seemingly pro-Israeli settlement is imposed upon the Arab nations.

It is acknowledged that the Arab nations will be under some economic restraint because of their dependence upon Western markets, particularly in Europe for their oil. But one official with long experience in Middle Eastern oil negotiations warned: "Don't usderestimate the willingness of the Arabs to commit suicide when it comes to such an emotional issue as Israel."

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