into Jewish and Arab states by next Oct. 1. It brought the British decision to advance the date of surrendering her twenty-five-year Palestine mandate to May 15—now eight weeks away.

The second statement meant that partition was dead, for the present at least, as a U.N. solution for Palestine. It brought an announcement yesterday by David Ben Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive, that “a Jewish State exists and shall continue to exist because we will defend it.”

Guerrilla Fighting

Since the Nov. 29 recommendation, a grim guerrilla war has been fought in Palestine; so far 1,700 Jews and Britons have been killed. The Middle East Arabs threatened to launch a full-scale war this spring to block partition.

A United Nations Palestine Commission—established by the General Assembly to carry out partition—has run into pyramiding difficulties. On Feb. 16 the commission told the Security Council that it could not carry out the U.N. plan unless it received “military forces in adequate strength.”

All through this period there had been second thoughts among some of the great powers—and particularly in the United States—on the partition issue. Cabinet members in the Truman Administration issued warnings—in public and in the privacy of the White House—that it would be dangerous to carry out the decision in the face of Arab opposition. In these warnings two words were repeated with drumming insistence. They were oil and Russia. The argument was that the Arabs would cut off our oil and that Russia would gain a foothold in the strategic Middle East.

Political Warning

On the other hand, there was contradictory counsel. The President was warned that he could not back away from the partition decision without alienating voters and thereby losing next November’s election. These counselors argued that the Arabs were bluffing; that, no matter what the United States did, the Arab leaders’ fear of Russia was so great that they would not turn to Moscow.

The Palestine Commission’s Feb. 16 report forced the United States to give an answer to the vital question: Would the United States support enforcement of the partition recommendation?

On Feb. 24, Mr. Austin gave the answer before the Security Council. He said in effect: Under the United Nations Charter the Security Council does not have authority to enforce a political settlement; the Council does have authority to use armed force if it finds that “a danger to the peace exists.”

Ten days later—on March 5—the Security Council asked the Big Five powers—the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China—to meet informally and to report back within ten days with “recommendations which the Council might give to the Palestine Commission with a view of implementing the resolution of the General Assembly.”

Four of the big powers—Britain, disassociated herself from the group—met seven times between March 5 and last Friday. There were wrangles and hard feelings. Over Russian objections the United States tried to reopen consultations between the Jews and Arabs to seek a new solution, Andrei A. Gromyko, the Russian delegate, charged that the United States.

A NEW U.S. POLICY ON PALESTINE IS OFFERED THE U.N.

Partition Out

U.S. Switches Stand

On last Oct. 11, Herschel V. Johnson, American delegate to the United Nations, told the General Assembly: “The United States delegation supports the basic principles of a *** partition (of Palestine).”

Last Friday Warren R. Austin, American delegate to the United Nations Security Council, told the Council: “We believe that the Security Council should *** suspend *** efforts to implement the proposed partition plan.”

The five months between these two statements have been months of first hope, then bitterness and, finally, despair over the future of Palestine.

The first statement led to the recommendation of the General Assembly on last Nov. 29 to divide Palestine