SOVIET BACKS U. S. ON PALESTINE EDICT
By THOMAS J. HAMILTONSpecial to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Jul 15, 1948; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

SOVIET BACKS U. S. ON PALESTINE EDICT

Four Other Countries Support U. N. Threat of Sanctions to Halt War in Holy Land

By THOMAS J. HAMILTON
Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., July 14—The Soviet Union and four other countries gave their support today to a United States proposal that the United Nations Security Council invoke Chapter VII of the Charter and order both sides to stop the fighting in Palestine. These announcements apparently guaranteed the passage of this part of the resolution introduced by the United States yesterday, but left in doubt the fate of the sections to which the Soviet Union objected.

It was expected that Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet representative, or Dmitri Z. Manuilsky, Ukrainian Foreign Minister, who is this month's chairman of the Council, would demand tomorrow that it vote paragraph by paragraph on the United States resolution. Apart from these two countries, the United States can count on six votes—one short of the needed majority—for most of its resolution.

[An offensive by Israeli forces in Galilee resulted in the capture of three towns in the vicinity of Nazareth. At the same time Israeli units pressed their attack from the coastal plain in an effort to dislodge the Arabs from Latrun, key point on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem supply road. On the Jerusalem front, the Arabs opened an attack on Israeli-held Mount Zion.]

The United States resolution would determine that the situation in Palestine constitutes a "threat to the peace" and would bind the

Continued on Page 15, Column 1

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

SOVIET BACKS U. S. ON PALESTINE EDICT

Continued From Page 1

Council to consider further action on a "breach of the peace" if either side refused to comply with the order to stop fighting. Such action could go all the way from an economic and diplomatic boycott to the use of armed force, but the United States has not revealed what measures it would propose in such an event.

It is generally believed, however, that it would propose nothing more drastic than economic sanctions, and most delegates assume that as a first step, at least, the United States would go no further than to raise the embargo on the shipment of arms to Israel while retaining the ban on shipments to the Arab states.

Mr. Gromyko took the unusual step today of appealing to the United States to accept the changes he suggested, pointing out that a resolution supported by the two great powers would "carry more weight." He reminded the Council that the section ordering both sides to stop fighting was "substantially" the same as the Soviet resolution that was rejected by the Council on May 29. The principal changes suggested by Mr. Gromyko were as follows:

(1) Instead of calling for the demilitarization of Jerusalem, the Security Council should call for the withdrawal of both Israeli and Arab military forces and for putting into effect the international regime recommended by the General Assembly.

(2) Elimination of other paragraphs of the United States resolution, in particular the sections that would make the provisions of the previous truce applicable to the new one and would instruct Count Folke Bernadotte, United Nations mediator, to supervise observance of the agreement.

(3) In addition, he protested that the last paragraph of the United States resolution "hinted" that the Council expected the General Assembly to adopt a resolution superseding the partition resolution, and requested the United States delegation to explain what it had in mind.

By abstaining on the parts of the United States resolution they do not like, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Manuilsky apparently can assure their defeat, and, on the other hand, their votes will assure the passage of those they accept. The Council, which again had morning and afternoon sessions today, will meet at 11 A. M. tomorrow. It adjourned before 6 o'clock this afternoon to permit delegates to make arrangements for the necessary log rolling.

Others for U. S. Proposal

Support for the United States resolution as a whole was announced today by Fernand van Langenhoven, Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, Dr. Roberto Urdaneta Arbelaez and Alexandre Parodi, representatives of Belgium, Canada, Colombia and France, although the Belgian and Colombian representatives also supported the Syrian proposal to ask the World Court for an advisory decision on the international status of Palestine.

These announcements, together with the votes of the United States and Great Britain (which had accepted the United States resolution with minor changes, guaranteed six votes. Although Mr. Manuilsky did not state his position, he is expected to follow the lead of Mr. Gromyko, and thus there will be eight votes for the portions of the United States resolution acceptable to Mr. Gromyko.

Of the remaining three members of the Council, Syria as a member of the Arab League is certain to oppose the United States resolution. Dr. T. F. Tsiang, Chinese representative, announced today that he would oppose it and would support the Syrian proposal, and Dr. Jose Arce of Argentina remained silent.

At the end of the meeting Dr. Tsiang introduced an amendment that would add the following paragraph to the United States resolution:

"[The Security Council] calls on both parties to seek, in co-operation with the Mediator, a solution through mutual concessions both in regard to the political organization of Palestine and in regard to immigration."

Israel Opposes Amendment

There were indications that Dr. Tsiang might vote for the United States resolution if the United States would support his amendment. However, strong opposition was expressed by Israeli representatives, and in view of the strong pro-Israel plan adopted today by the Democratic convention it was generally agreed that the United States could not accept it.

On the other hand, a possibility was seen that China or Argentina or even Syria might support the United States on the provisions opposed by the Soviet Union rather than give Mr. Gromyko the whip-hand in deciding which parts of the United States resolution should be accepted.

The only other amendments thus far offered to the United States resolution were introduced yesterday by Sir Alexander Cadogan, British representative. One would refer to "the other party" instead of to "the Provisional Government of Israel," and the other would give Count Bernadotte the power to investigate violations of the previous truce, which ran from June 11 to July 9.

It was not clear tonight whether these would be accepted, but in any event the passage of the stronger parts of the United States resolution appeared certain. Meanwhile, great Britain and apparently the United States were understood to be applying strong diplomatic pressure on King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan, whose Arab Legion is the only effective fighting force possessed by the Arabs, to induce him to comply with the impending resolution.

If King Abdullah complies, King Farouk of Egypt will have the disagreeable alternative of obeying the Security Council resolution or carrying on the war virtually unaided and in defiance of a Council order. This situation was reflected in the statement to the Council this morning by Mahoud Bey Fawzi, Egyptian representative, which was less uncompromising in tone than recent Arab statements.

Fawzi Bey emphasized the report by Count Bernadotte that extension of the truce would operate to the advantage of Israel, and said:

"If you want to offer a cease-fire, if you want seriously to do so, then you must offer an acceptable cease-fire, not an unacceptable one."

He added that the Foreign Ministers of the seven states that constituted the Arab League were meeting at Beirut, Lebanon, to consider an extension, and he said that "if we could not decide right away to extend the cease-fire, that does not necessarily mean that we refuse to continue or to resume the cease-fire."

"The only thing we can usefully do, and justly do," the Egyptian added, "is to offer the Arabs a friendly hand and not to point an accusing finger at them and not to try to suppress and intimidate them."

Fawzi Bey, protested that the United Nations must not allow itself to be "scared away by any rumblings, by any swashbuckling or by any brandishing of pomp, empire and glory in and around its debates."

Although Israeli spokesmen had insisted previously that the Arabs be required to cease fighting unconditionally, the statement today by the Israeli representative, Aubrey E. Eban, indicated that Israel would agree, though unwillingly, to the revival of the terms imposed by Count Bernadotte for the earlier truce. These would forbid Israel to import war material or fighting men and would permit the arrival of men of military age only on condition that they were not mobilized or trained militarily.

Mr. Eban said he wanted to "take the strongest and most formal exception" to the statement in a report from the Security Council's Truce Commission in Jerusalem, which was published in THE NEW YORK TIMES today, that "Jews boast that it would not take them more than a fortnight to conquer the whole city." He protested that no source was given for the statement, and he said he hoped that communications from the commission "would attempt a greater detachment in accuracy than this."

In a brief supplementary statement to the Council this morning, Count Bernadotte repeated his appeal for strong and firm action. He said that if the truce was extended, he would need 300 military observers, instead of the ninety-three on his staff of the previous truce, as well as better communications. He said that in that event he did not think it would be fair to continue keeping Jewish immigrants of military age in camps. He expressed opposition on practical grounds to the British amendment instructing him to investigate violations of the previous truce.

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