Dulles Soft-Pedals Talk of Sanctions to Speed Up Vote on Mid-East

To look down on the Senate from the gallery these last few days was to look down on a kind of sit-out strike. Despite numerous quorum calls, few Senators were on the floor most of the time and the chamber by its desultory and lackadaisical air provided its own vivid commentary on what the Senate thinks of the Administration's plea that the Mid-East resolution is urgent.

As we went to press, the strategy of White House and State Department was to create the impression that the U.S. was moving away from sanctions in order to mollify the Senate and get it to pass the resolution. The Senate, on the other hand, which is overwhelmingly anti-sanctions, was stalling to see what Mr. Dulles does on the issue at the UN. Mr. Dulles is trying hard to ingratiate himself with the Senate leadership in order to speed a vote.

If sanctions come up before the Mid-East resolution has been passed, a bi-partisan coalition can put an anti-sanctions amendment on the resolution. This is what Mr. Dulles fears.

One Way to Train Seals

Majority Leader Johnson, in his protest against "government by leak" in the Senate last week, attacked not only premature disclosures but disclosures on the basis of favoritism to certain newspapers. "I certainly hope," Senator Johnson said, "we can devise a consistent method of operation that will treat all members of the press fairly and equitably. . . ." Behind these remarks lies the story of one of the ways in which the State Department succeeds in manipulating the press. A correspondent who faithfully echoes the State Department line is rewarded by leaks and invited to select private briefings from which more critical correspondents are barred. If correspondents get too far out of line, they run the risk of being scooped by more complaisant competitors.

State Dept. and U.S. Oil Interests Opposed to Israeli Pipeline Bypassing Suez

A key factor in the question of guarantees for Israel of free passage through the Gulf of Akaba is State Department hostility to the idea of a pipeline from Elat to Haifa which would bypass Suez. This is the background against which to study the tortuous and evasive replies made by Mr. Dulles at his press conference of February 19 when asked what he meant by the phrase "free and innocent passage" in his proffered assurances of Israeli access to the straits of Tiran.

Egypt could stop ships carrying essential war or other materials to Elat on the ground that this did not constitute "innocent" cargo and thus in effect restore belligerent rights in a new guise. The day after the press conference, the *Wall* Street Journal in a dispatch from Washington helped to clear up Mr. Dulles' unwillingness to be more precise.

In a long story on the plans of oil men to bypass Suez and Syria, the *Wall Street Journal* said, "For the proposed Israeli line, U.S. officials have little affection. Israel will soon complete a small eight inch line from the Gulf of Akaba. . . . They would like to build a larger pipeline on the same route as a substitute for the Suez canal. 'That would be scraping the bottom of the barrel,' declares one U.S. diplomat, 'Can you conceive of any Arab country allowing its oil to go to Israel?' Israel would have to rely on supplies from non-Arab Iran shipped along a sea route which Egypt or Saudi Arabia could block off in time of war, officials note."

What the WSJ story did not "note" was that Iran is one of the great producing countries of the Middle East, shipping from the Persian Gulf; that Britain and France still have large interests in Iranian oil; and that the Elat-to-Haifa pipeline would serve their needs against the hostility of the Arab States and the U.S. oil companies allied with the Arab States. In the recent Suez crisis, Aramco obeyed Saudi orders not to ship any oil for Britain and France across its pipeline to Syria.

Some Troubles Oil Company Press Agents Don't Talk About

"Lebanon is a republic, and its present President and Cabinet are very favorable to the West. There are about 100,000 Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, but they have not been admitted to citizenship out of fear of destroying the razor-edged balance between Moslems and Christians on which the governmental structure (indeed, the peace of the state) is based."

-Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs, in his report on foreign aid in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week.

Mr. Armstrong does not elaborate but we will. Lebanon's Christians, the only sizable enclave left in the Arab Middle East, live in fear that the faster growing Moslem majority will some day take over. To a Moslem, a "Christian Arab" is an anomaly. Only a Moslem can really be an Arab. So the Christian Copts are second class citizens in Egypt as are the Christian Assyrians in Iraq. The Christians fear the same fate in the Lebanon.

Had the Elat line been in operation, it could have been used for Iranian supplies to Western Europe. But this would have eased the squeeze on Britain and France from which U.S. oil companies profited by a price rise on crude and gasoline, and it would have undercut Arab power to blackmail Western Europe. Eisenhower and Dulles are in an all-out campaign to woo the uncommitted Arab States; therefore the thumbs down on an Israeli pipeline which would end Nasser's transit monopoly at Suez.

When Britain Threatened War Against Israel in Defense of Egypt

One reason for British hostility to sanctions against Israel is that Britain herself once applied armed threat to get Israeli troops out of Sinai without thereby earning Egyptian credit. James G. McDonald lifted the curtain on this hitherto secret bit of history in his recent executive session testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (pages 835-36).

McDonald was then U.S. Ambassador to Israel. He recalled that in December, 1948, war had broken out again and that Israeli troops "were about to cut off the Egyptian army at El Arish, Rafah and near Gaza." McDonald received an urgent message from the State Department transmitting an ultimatum from the British "that unless the Israeli troops at once withdrew from Sinai, Britain would enter the war against Israel."

McDonald related that Ben Gurion "at first exploded but finally he said, 'Well, we can take on the six Arab countries, but we really can't take on the British Empire, too. There will not be an Israeli hoof on Egyptian soil in 48 hours." McDonald told the Senators, "I have often wondered what Anthony Eden thought about that British act of saving Egypt in December of 1948 when he felt himself forced to launch his ill-advised and unfortunate attack on the Suez eight years later."

Justice Brennan's Resistance Undermined By His Own Champion

(Continued from Page One)

honey, his principal champion on the committee, undermined his resistance. The prospect of defending a nominee for the Supreme Court who refused, on mere legal grounds, to take a firm position against Satan and sin was too much for O'Mahoney. To McCarthy's delight, O'Mahoney began to "clarify" the question for Mr. Justice Brennan. He cited the President's resolution against Communism in the Middle East as if it were authoritative gloss on Holy Writ and told the Justice the question asked by McCarthy had already been settled. "Do you believe," Senator O'Mahoney insisted, all but prodding the Justice in the ribs, "that international Communism is a conspiracy against the United States?" "That," the Justice said, taking his cue, "I can answer." But then Senator Jenner wanted to know whether he drew any line between international Communism and the Communist party and Brennan again tried to explain that there were particular cases before the court involving this very issue. Senator Hennings tried to rescue him with a series of questions designed to show that conspiracy prosecutions were peculiarly dependent on the particular facts in each case but this was too subtle to save him. A few minutes later Brennan's shoulders were pinned to the mat. When McCarthy asked him, "You do agree that Communism constitutes a conspiracy against the United States?", Brennan finally answered "Yes."

Brennan's Courage Fails

The retreat had begun, and McCarthy pressed harder. He wanted to know about those speeches the Justice had made criticizing Congressional committees. He soon had Justice Brennan saying, "sorry you read them that way" and "I was not concerned with any particular committee as such" though quite obviously they were aimed squarely at McCarthy. He even said he didn't believe he had called those investigations "Salem witch hunts" at which McCarthy, in his best inexorable voice, said "Yes, you did," and proceeded to quote a passage from the Boston speech about "practices reminescent of Salem witch hunts." McCarthy tightened the screws. He wanted to know what were those "hopeful signs" Brennan had noted in his Monmouth speech that people were at last "sickened" of investigatory excesses. McCarthy was having a wonderful time and interjected in a stage whisper while waiting for Brennan to reply, "I'm giving him a good opening there." Indeed, he was. For the main sign at the time was the discussion beginning in the Senate for a censure motion against McCarthy. It would have been exhilirating if the Justice at that point had said, "Of course, if you insist on the truth, I was talking of you, Senator McCarthy, and of the rising reaction in the country and the Senate against your abuse of investigatory powers." But Brennan only mumbled vaguely about reformed rules of procedure. It was painful to watch. Was he really compelled to crawl in order to be sure of reaching the Supreme Court? The new Justice was only saved from further humiliation by the bell. Senator Eastland recessed the hearing. How little unalloyed courage there is.

McCarthy Throws in the Sponge

What happened overnight is a mystery. For with the new Justice on the ropes, McCarthy suddenly threw in the sponge. At 8 a. m.-two and a half hours before the hearing was to resume-the radio already carried McCarthy's letter to Senator Eastland saying he thought further questioning would serve no useful purpose because the record "now confirms that Justice Brennan harbors an underlying hostility to Congressional attempts to investigate and expose the Communist conspiracy." It was a pleasure to hear gray-haired Senator Watkins, looking like a stern Grant Wood elder, comment later at the hearing "I completely and utterly disagree with what he (Mc-Carthy) has said." It was even more cheering to have Senator Watkins say to Mr. Justice Brennan, "though you have not always been in agreement with the way we did our job, a good many Americans have that same point of view and I don't disagree with that although I am one of the investigators on the Internal Security Committee and have been since it was organized." Something suddenly had made McCarthy lose his nerve; perhaps the change of atmosphere made him feel his fight was hopeless. The hearing was a reminder of what the country has so recently and narrowly escaped. It looks as if we have just seen the last stand of low blow Joe.

Extra Copies Still Available for Your Friends of Last Week's Sensational "B-26's for Arabia" Revelations

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C. Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:* Name	I. F. Stone's Weekly Room 205 301 E. Capitol St., S. E. Washington 3, D. C.	Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office
CityState	NEWSPAPER	
Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:		
(To) Name		
Street		
City		

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 801 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone: Circulation Manager Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mall rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.