

0290.02.0416

**"No Change in US Policy on Israel; 'Support Unweekend'", a
Newspaper Clipping from the Jerusalem Post, May 1962**

Published on 11 May 1962, this newspaper article from the Jerusalem Post contains an article titled, "No Change in US Policy on Israel; 'Support Unweekend'", on the continued U.S. aid to and sympathy with Israel.

Jerusalem Post
11. 7. 1962

No Change in US Policy On Israel; 'Support Unweakened'

State Department Tells U.S. Zionist

Jerusalem Post Diplomatic Reporter

The U.S. Government has not changed its policy towards Israel and there has been "no weakening of its warm intentions toward, or support for, Israel." This was stated recently by the State Department in an official letter to Mr.

Louis Segal, General Secretary of the Farband Labour Zionist Order in reply to letters sent by Mr. Segal to President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Mr. Segal had complained about the stand taken by the U.S. during the Security Council session on the Nukeib action.

The letter, signed by Mr. James P. Grant, Acting Assistant Secretary of State, declares: "The U.S. maintains a number of international friendships around the world... Our goodwill and support are demonstrated by the fact that the level of U.S. economic assistance to Israel is substantially higher now than for several years past."

Regarding the Security Council meeting Mr. Grant thought that Israel had not made adequate use of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization in dealing with the Syrian provocation that preceded Nukeib. He added that "Israel might have taken the whole issue to the Security Council before launching its retaliatory raid."

With regard to the recent

increase in U.S. aid to Egypt, Mr. Grant states: "We think our help is leading to better U.S.-U.A.R. relations and is encouraging the U.A.R. to devote its attention to pressing domestic problems, thus increasing its interests in stability and orderly development in the Near East as a whole."

'Reasonable Efforts'

Referring to the U.S. attitude towards direct Arab-Israeli negotiations, Mr. Grant notes that "almost every major statement of U.S. policy regarding the Near East over the years has emphasized our encouragement of, and willingness to lend full support to, any reasonable effort to bring about a permanent Arab-Israeli settlement. However, the Arabs remain unconvinced that Israel would be willing to settle on any save its own terms."

"So we believe they will continue unwilling to sit down at the peace table" until some progress is made on some of the major, specific problems which divide the two sides. In this regard Mr. Grant points to the U.S.-backed efforts of Dr. Joseph Johnson to work toward a solution of the refugee problem.

(See Leader—Page One)

THE State Department's declaration that U.S. policy toward Israel has not changed, made in a recent letter to Mr.

AMERICAN
ASSURANCES

Louis Segal of the Farband Labour Zionist Council, is welcome and reassuring. This is especially the case in view of U.S. actions in the recent past which caused some perturbation both here and in the U.S. itself. The lead taken by the U.S. in the Security Council's indirect censure of Israel for the Nukeib action, and, more important, her opposition at the previous Assembly to the 16-nation proposal for direct Arab-Israeli negotiations were all the more disturbing precisely because the U.S. has historically supported moves toward peace negotiations for the settlement of disputes. The statement in the letter that there has been "no weakening of U.S. intentions toward, or support of, Israel," should therefore allay doubts that may have arisen on this score. It is, at the same time, significant to note that the letter was written three weeks ago, prior to the arrival in Israel of Dr. Soblen. If mistakes were made in the hasty handling of his deportation, it is now clear that they were the result of internal administrative considerations rather than any undue U.S. pressure.

On certain specific aspects of U.S. policy in the area, however, the positions of the two countries remain at variance. The State Department, as clearly expressed in the letter to Mr. Segal, feels that, given Arab intransigence, there is no practical reason to press for direct negotiations. Rather, progress must first be made on some specific, outstanding issues, notably the Arab refugee problem. In order to convince the Arabs of Israel's willingness to negotiate on equitable terms. For this reason the U.S. is backing the efforts of Dr. Joseph Johnson. Israel, of course, would welcome whatever progress Dr. Johnson might be able to achieve, but maintains, however, that the refugee problem is not a cause but a symptom.

And it is the cause — namely the Arabs' steadfast refusal to come to terms with the existence of Israel — that must be tackled if peace is to come to the area. This can only be done if the Arabs are convinced that their intransigence is harming their cause, is isolating them from other nations, is in fact contrary to their own true interests. Once the Arabs were persuaded of this, the way would be cleared for negotiations, and ultimately for the solution of the refugee problem as well.

A second important point of difference reflected in the State Department letter regards Israel's use of the U.N. apparatus to settle border disputes. The State Department states that Israel did not exhaust these possibilities before launching the Nukeib action, and suggests that we might have referred the Syrian aggressions to the Security Council.

In fact, of course, Israel has always sought to cooperate with the U.N.T.S.O. in trying to settle border flare-ups, and the recent incidents in Jerusalem are the latest case in point. This was also done after the Syrian attacks, but, for whatever reason, the U.N. apparatus proved incapable of handling the matter, and Israel was forced to defend its sovereignty and protect its citizens in their peaceful pursuits. Because of the Soviets' declared position in the Security Council any resolution favourable to Israel will either be vetoed or emasculated in order to avoid the veto.

These differences of approach between Washington and Jerusalem are of course tactical, and not differences of principle. But, as in the case of all closely related nations, these differences, in the context of the whole, gain a special hue, for they are differences caused by certain diverging interests, but enclosed by mutual understanding. That this understanding and support remains unshaken is the important substance of the State Department letter.

The State Department appears to have a mistaken view of the basic attitude of the Arab States. The Arabs will never reconcile themselves to the existence of Jewish State - Israel - in their midst. The solution of any major issue of the conflict will not make them change their inflexible policy of uprooting Israel from the Middle East.

11. 7. 1962