

Spirit of Unity Marks Israel's 19th Anniversary Celebration

By PHILIP SLOMOVITZ

JERUSALEM—Israel's problems were forgotten—or ignored—as a united nation marked the state's 19th anniversary with numerous events over a long week-end. There were festivities in the synagogues and homes Saturday, public functions Sunday morning, a torchlight "tattoo" parade Sunday night and the formal parade Monday morning.

As on the eve of the Sabbath, the legal holiday on Monday actually commenced at noon Sunday, normally a work day.

The chief factor of interest on the diplomatic front—the boycott of Monday's parade by the major world powers—Britain, the United States, France and Russia—became a laughing matter here. Israel adhered to the agreement with Jordan that there should be no display of war tanks or

armored weapons. Why, then, the Big Powers' boycott? It is interpreted here as a flirtation by Britain and the U.S. with the Arab nations and France's relief in being able to minimize a prejudiced attitude toward Israel. Russia's pro-Syrian role accounts for the USSR position in local thinking.

But while the Big Powers boycotted the Monday parade, their envoys attended President Shazar's formal reception the preceding afternoon. This is what has made the boycott a farce.

Meanwhile, there has begun a year-long plan for Israel's 20th anniversary celebration in 1968, and the advance projected program is for a military display that will "atone" for the 1967 "shortcomings." (Related story Page 40.)



THE JEWISH NEWS

DETROIT MICHIGAN

A Weekly Review of Jewish Events

Michigan's Only English-Jewish Newspaper — Incorporating The Detroit Jewish Chronicle

Our Campaign
Triumph . . . Expo
'67 and Jewry . . .
Seeds of Bias in
Soil of Faith . . .
Chagall Festival
Editorials
Page 4

VOLUME LI.—No. 9

17100 W. 7 Mile Rd.—VE 8-9364—Detroit 48235, May 19, 1967

\$6.00 Per Year; This Issue 20¢

Egyptian Army Moves Regarded as War of Nerves Based on Threat

(Direct JTA Teletype Wire to The Jewish News)

JERUSALEM — The critical situation along the Syrian border and the saber rattling by Egypt's President Nasser were reviewed here by Israel's cabinet Tuesday night in discussions led by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and Foreign Minister Abba Eban. The meeting had been summoned in a special, mid-week session due to the fact that last Sunday's meeting had to be postponed because of the observance of Memorial Day and the celebration of Israel's 19th anniversary.

Eshkol reported on Egypt's army moves and bellicose statements against Israel of the last few days. It was learned reliably after the cabinet meeting that Israel attaches no special significance to the Egyptian army moves. These movements are seen here as designed to bolster Syrian morale and to emphasize Egypt's central role in the Arab world. Past experience has convinced the Israelis that Nasser would not let Syria push him into anti-Israeli action which he would consider untimely.

This evaluation by authoritative circles here was believed bolstered by the fact that the cabinet meeting had not been attended by any of Israel's military leaders, indicating that the situation is considered political rather than military.

Eban told the cabinet that only Syrian cessation of encouraging and engineering sabotage inside Israel would reduce the tensions in the Middle East. He reported he had sent instructions to Israel's diplomats abroad to make that point clear to the governments to which they are accredited. The Soviet and British governments, he said, were given the same point of view.

He reported that Britain was informed through diplomatic contacts in London while the USSR received clarification of Israel's views on the current crisis at a conference at the foreign ministry here between Aryeh Levavi, the director-general of the foreign ministry, and Dimitri Chuvakhin, the Soviet ambassador to Israel. The London meeting, Eban reported, was between Israel's Ambassador Aharon Remez and Minister of State George Thompson.

In his evaluation of the situation, Eshkol reiterated the statement he made last week to the effect that the time had come to halt Syrian aggressions against Israel inspired and directed by Syria and to emphasize Israel's determination to strike back if the terrorist aggressions should continue. The premier stated clearly that Israel reserves for itself the right to choose its own time, place and method for replying to Syria's actions.

Eshkol declared in an interview on Kol Israel on the eve of Israel's 19th Independence Day that "Israel will react to prevent continuation of waging 'popular war' against Israel." Syrian authorities have used that phrase to describe their support of Syrian-based guerrilla attacks within Israeli territory.

"There will be no such situation under which quiet and tranquility would prevail only on one side of the border," the premier added. "There will be no immunity to the state that encourages and initiates such war." He cited Syria as the source of all the border troubles but warned that "it is our policy to decide on the timing, place and means to react."

Eshkol also declared that the Israeli army would prevent any diversion of the waters of the Jordan River, and that Israel would assure safe passage of shipping through the Red Sea. FLOSY, the Aden "liberation organization," has warned it will bar the tip of the Red Sea to Israeli shipping when the British withdraw from Aden later this year.

(Continued on Page 9)

Egypt Wants UN Out of Gaza; Thant Worried

(Direct JTA Teletype Wire to The Jewish News)

UNITED NATIONS—Secretary-general U Thant confirmed here Wednesday that the United Nations has received a request from the Egyptian government for immediate withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, which, since 1956, has stood on guard on the Egyptian side of the Gaza Strip border with Israel and at Sharm el Sheikh in the Sinai Peninsula watching over Israel's freedom of shipping to and from the Red Sea.

In two statements in which the Middle East situation was described as "very grave," Thant not only confirmed the Egyptian request regarding UNEF's withdrawal, but also announced that he has decided to cancel trips to London and Brussels which he was scheduled to undertake Thursday "in view of the potentially very grave situation in the Middle East."

Syria last weekend complained to Thant that the latter's remarks condemning Damascus-backed El Fatah terrorists, had encouraged Israel to threaten the use of force against Syria.

Ambassador George J. Tomeh, Syrian permanent representative at the United Nations, during a 50-minute meeting with Thant, cited the secretary-general's remarks at a luncheon of the United Nations Correspondents Association, in which Thant described the El Fatah terrorists as "insidious, contrary to armistice agreements."

The Syrian envoy complained to Thant that statements by Israeli leaders since May 1 "contain a very clear threat of the use of force against Syria."

Commenting on the Syrian complaint, a United Nations spokesman said that the secretary-general's remarks last week describing the El Fatah activities in Israel as "very deplorable," could not be interpreted as condoning force by any party. He noted Thant's appeal to all parties to observe the armistice agreements.

Compromise Boycott Bill Just Empty Words

By MILTON FRIEDMAN
(Copyright, 1967, JTA, Inc.)

WASHINGTON—A 1965 compromise by backers of legislation against the Arab boycott has returned to haunt those who succumbed to administration pressures to water down the original anti-boycott bill.

Spokesmen for the Commerce and State departments gave their solemn pledge that, if mandatory wording were eliminated, the administration would vigorously fulfill the objectives sought. Arab dictation to American business concerns would be rejected. All American firms would be encouraged by the government to defy the Arabs. They would be free to trade with Israel without fear of revenge. Washington was prepared to take the strongest stands in Arab capitals—if only the mandatory phrases were eliminated from the law.

In order to be "reasonable" and to "show due respect" to the administration, the forces entrusted with the anti-boycott fight agreed to extract the teeth as requested. The administration-approved remnant easily passed. It would have passed anyway, with some embarrassment to the Executive Department, had the fight for a truly effective statute been waged to its logical conclusion.

Despite the law, the boycott continued, striking company after company. All the Commerce Department did was to keep statistics. These figures proved a source of amusement when a government statistician actually tabulated and added alleged instances of Israeli boycotts against the Arabs. This was halted when it was shown that Israel was forced to issue shipping orders to avoid Arab seaports to prevent arbitrary confiscation of Israeli goods.

The State Department decided not to make firm representations in defense of boycotted American firms. Officials pointed out that the law was not mandatory. In their judgment, strong intercessions would merely offend the Arabs, worsen the boycott, and undermine other aspects of American-Arab relations. The State Department did not want to be seen in Arab capitals as the advocate of Israel even though the rights of American commerce were violated.

So many complaints accumulated that Sen. Jacob K. Javits, New York Republican, and Sen. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., New Jersey Democrat, this session jointly asked the Senate to hold hearings to determine the effectiveness of the implementation of the anti-boycott statutes. The Senate committee concerned, heeding State Department guidance, avoided the issue.

A different situation emerged in the House. Rep. Seymour Halpern, New York Republican, is ranking minority member of the international trade subcommittee. He had fought in vain in 1965 for mandatory regulations. He had warned the House that his experience with administration promises led him to believe that the compromise would undermine the bill. The Arabs later exploited the precise loopholes to which he referred.

Halpern, angered because the Arab boycott rolls merrily on, has gained support. Another subcommittee member, Rep. Fernand St. Germain, Rhode Island Democrat, sought to amend a bill to extend the life of the U.S. Export-Import Bank by adding an anti-boycott clause. The maneuver failed but the Arab issue was revived.

Rep. Jonathan Bingham, New York Democrat, is a new member of the parent Committee on Banking and Currency. Bingham offered another anti-boycott measure. Momentum increased.

Chairman Thomas L. Ashley of the international finance subcommittee has now made known that he will hold hearings this session on the boycott problem.

Halpern has re-introduced his mandatory wording. It would require that "such rules and regulations shall prohibit . . . the taking of any actions, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, by domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States, which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United State . . ."

(Continued on Page 9)