ISRAEL INFURIATED BY BRITAIN'S MOVE
Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
New York Times (1857-Current file); May 28, 1948; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 4

ISRAEL INFURIATED BY BRITAIN'S MOVE

Spokesman at Lake Success Indicates Arms Embargo Plan Would Be Rejected

By MALLORY BROWNE
Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., May 27—Infuriated by Britain's suggestion for a world-wide arms embargo, a spokesman for the Israeli Government made it plain today that the Jews would reject a Security Council cease-fire appeal based on the British draft resolution.

Arab delegations, on the contrary, were delighted. Some of the representatives of the Arab states indicated that they considered the British proposals acceptable as a basis for further discussion. All welcomed it as constituting the proper "ethical approach" to the situation.

The Jewish statement charged that the British proposal for an embargo on arms shipments to Arabs and Jews alike proved that "the alliance between the British Government and the Arab aggressors is now complete both in the political and military sphere."

Sir Alexander Cadogan's resolution called upon both parties to order a cease-fire for a four-week period during which neither Arabs nor Jews would introduce fighting personnel or men of military age, or import any war material into Palestine. It concluded that if the resolution were rejected by either party, the Security Council would reconsider the Palestine situation with a view to action under Chapter VII of the Charter, which contains the theoretical threat of recourse to economic or even military sanctions.

The Israeli Government spokesman denounced this resolution as "a maneuver to create the best conditions for the Arabs to pursue their aggression successfully for the next four weeks." At the same time, the Israeli spokesman said, the British resolution was an effort to "twist the United Nations Charter so that Chapter VII becomes a weapon against the State of Israel instead of an instrument for its defense under international law."

This denunciation clearly appeared to imply that the Israeli Government intended to reject the resolution if it were adopted by the Security Council. The spokesman indicated agreement with this interpretation.

The British Government's aim, according to the Israeli statement, "is to tie Israel's hand behind its back so that the Arabs may be free to strike Israel down." The "most remarkable aspect" of the proposal, the Jewish spokesman said, was "the attempt to make the Security Council the instrument of Anglo-Arab policies and designs instead of the world's guardian of the peace."

No government, the statement said, whose Charter obligations were not "obscured by alliances with aggressors," could fail to see this. It concluded with a reference to the United States, saying:

"Those who have publicly acknowledged the Arab invaders to be aggressors surely cannot be tricked into denying the victim of aggression the weapons which Israel must have for her defense."

The Israeli statement was bitterest in its denunciation of the British suggestion, made in Sir Alexander's speech, that "if the Security Council should decide upon a general embargo which would effectively prevent the supply of arms to Arabs and Jews alike," then Britain would participate in such action by suspending deliveries that she is at present making to Egypt, Iraq and Trans-Jordan.

This suggestion, the spokesman for the Israeli Government said, was "not a neutral proposal." "It is not neutral in its effect and it does not proceed from a neutral source," he declared. "It is an attempt to perpetuate the advantage which Arab states have gained through stockpiling of British arms for months and years while denying the State of Israel any access to means of defense."

Among the Arab delegates, on the other hand, there was general agreement that now, for the first time, the Security Council had before it a resolution that took full account of both sides of the question. No Arab delegate, however, went so far as to express full acceptance of the resolution.

The prevailing opinion among the Arab representatives seemed to be that the British resolution might lead to a solution if it meant—as several of them took it to mean—that the "eventual settlement" through the United Nations Mediator envisaged in the resolution would be based on non-recognition of the existence of the State of Israel.

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