

its own feet and might prove more difficult for RCC to defend. Also might be more susceptible to attack in future.

As stated Deptel 5367, we prepared participate on technical committee working out arrangements for maintenance and operation if desired both by Egypt and UK. We have no objection US firms participating on commercial basis but unable make commitment they will wish to do so. ³

SMITH

³ The Embassy in London reported in telegram 4694, Apr. 23, not printed, that the substance of telegram 5580 had been conveyed to the Foreign Office, and officials did not understand how the United States could be associated with the proposals for the maintenance of the base if these were covered only in a technical annex to the Anglo-Egyptian agreement. Since close American association was an essential feature of the accord, the Foreign Office thought a tripartite agreement along the lines it had suggested was preferable and asked that the Department reconsider this matter. (741.56374/4-2354)

No. 1326

741.56374/4-2354 Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Embassy in Egypt

TOP SECRET

WASHINGTON, April 23, 1954—10:50 a. m.

1310. Noform. Ambassador Hussein conveyed to Department through third party following comments from Nasir on new British Suez Base proposals:

1. Iran should not be mentioned in section providing for consultation in case of threat of attack. Some general geographic expression could be used instead.
2. US should not be mentioned in describing consultations to be held in case of threat of attack. Clause could state simply consultations will be held without specifying between whom.
3. Participation of US firms in future operation and maintenance of Base should not be mentioned.

We have not provided Hussein with any information on British proposals, but he appears quite well informed as to their nature.

Believe we should leave it to Egyptians to make above points to British when they begin discussions.

SMITH