U.N. ASKS A 4-WEEK TRUCE, PALESTINE ARMS EMBARGO; SANCTIONS ARE TH
By MALLORY BROWNESpecial to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
New York Times 1857; May 30, 1948; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

U. N. ASKS A 4-WEEK TRUCE, PALESTINE ARMS EMBARGO; SANCTIONS ARE THREATENED

KING ABDULLAH IN JERUSALEM



The ruler of Trans-Jordan (extending hand to a follower) being escorted into the Holy City by Arab Legion fighters.

Associated Press Radiophoto

ISRAEL SCORES STEP

Syrian for Acceptance —Plan Would Bar New Troops for Holy Land

SOVIET MOVE BEATEN, 5-0

Supported by U. S., It Sought to Declare Breach of Peace —Gromyko Blames Britain

By MALLORY BROWNE
Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., May 29 —The United Nations Security Council called tonight for a four-week cease-fire in Palestine. Giving the parties seventy-two hours in which to accept, the Council threatened to apply sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter if the peace appeal were rejected by either party or subsequently violated.

After having rejected a proposal by the Soviet Union, which was backed by the United States, to determine that a breach of the peace had occurred in Palestine and to order an immediate and unconditional cease-fire, the Council adopted an amended version of a British resolution calling for imposition of a general arms embargo applicable to all the Arab states and to Palestine.

The vote against the Soviet Union's proposal was 5 to 0, with six abstentions. Seven votes are required for passage. There was no vote on the British resolution as a whole, but most of its paragraphs were adopted by votes of 9 to 0, with two abstentions, those of the Soviet Union and the Ukraine.

U. S. Amends Draft

Once the Soviet proposal had been lost, the United States shifted its support to the British resolution, presenting a series of amendments designed to make it more acceptable to Israel. All the suggested American amendments were accepted by Britain.

The result was a compromise that appeared likely to be accepted by the Arab states but unlikely to be accepted by Israel. A spokesman for the Israeli Government critically described it as "non-intervention, not collective security." He condemned the world-wide arms embargo, which he said would operate to the disadvantage of Israel, and criticized the United States on the ground that it had not pressed a stand against aggression after having branded the Arabs as aggressors in the Council.

Faris el-Khouri of Syria expressed general satisfaction with most of the resolution and said he "hoped" it would be accepted by the Arab states. Mahmoud Bey Fawzi of Egypt was skeptical. Jamal el-Husseini, representative of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee, was also doubtful. He said that acceptance or rejection probably depended on the military situation, which appeared here to be obscure.

Time Limit Retained

The resolution urged all Governments and authorities involved in Palestine "to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of four weeks." This operative clause was adopted by ten votes, Colombia abstaining, after an amendment designed to eliminate the time limit had been rejected, 8 to 3.

The other crucial clauses of the British resolution were those banning the introduction of fighting personnel or men of military age and the import of war material into Palestine during the proposed cease-fire.

On these two major points Warren R. Austin, the United States representative, proposed amendments that were designed, he said, to insure "a real military standstill" in Palestine. Under his version, as accepted by Sir Alexander Cadogan of Britain, the Council called not only on the Arabs and Israel but on "all Governments and authorities concerned" to undertake not to introduce fighting personnel, not merely into Palestine but also into Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon,

Continued on Page 3, Column 4

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

U. N. ASKS A TRUCE IN THE HOLY LAND

Continued From Page 1

Saudi Arabia, Syria, Trans-Jordan and Yemen.

Andrei A. Gromyko of the Soviet Union described this as "one of the most unacceptable paragraphs" in the British resolution. He added that "the addition suggested by the representative of the United States does not in any way change the substance of the paragraph." Mr. Austin's amendment, he said, was "just a matter of form" and "merely a gesture" that did not change the fact that the paragraph was directed "against the Jews alone."

By a vote of 7 to 0, with four abstentions, the paragraph was adopted with the inclusion of a French amendment providing that men of military age introduced into Palestine or any of the Arab states were not to be mobilized or trained during the proposed four-week cease-fire.

It was a United States amendment that extended the ban on the import of arms to Palestine into a general prohibition of the import or export of arms for Palestine or for any Arab state. This amendment implies that the British Government will be obligated, for the four-week cease-fire, to stop the shipments of war material now going to Egypt, Trans-Jordan and Iraq. This clause was adopted by 9 to 0, only the Soviet Union and the Ukraine abstaining.

The other important innovation of the British resolution was a provision that the United Nations mediator should make recommendations to the Security Council for an eventual settlement for Palestine. This was weakened by a Canadian amendment, supported by the United States, that the mediator should merely "make contact with all parties" during the cease-fire "with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly."

The intent of the Council, it was made clear, is that the mediator should utilize the four-week period in an effort to get Israel and the Arabs to agree to a peaceful settlement.

The United States added a clause calling on all governments "to take all possible steps" to assist in the implementation of the resolution.

The Security Council set 7 P. M., Eastern daylight time, Tuesday as the latest hour by which Israel and the Arabs should communicate their acceptance, and adjourned until 2:30 P. M. Wednesday. The new president of the Council for June will be an Arab, Mr. el-Khouri.

Briton Clashes With Russian

The defeat of the Soviet resolution came toward the end of a long and stormy session, marked by a sharp clash between Britain and the Soviet Union. Mr. Gromyko, applauded from time to time by the audience, vehemently attacked British policy in Palestine as "hypocritical through and through."

Britain's aim, he said, is to prevent the real independence of the peoples of Palestine. Sir Alexander Cadogan replied acidly that Mr. Gromyko had "surpassed his own bad record" in descending to "vulgar abuse and general vilification."

The vote on the Soviet proposal was taken in three parts. The Soviet delegation had amended its resolution by adding to the first paragraph a clause blaming the Arabs for the trouble in Palestine. The revised clause read:

> Considering that the Security Council's resolution on May 22 on the cessation of military operations in Palestine has not been carried out in view of the refusal of the Arab states to comply with this decision.

Even the first part of this text, down through the words "has not been carried out," was rejected, 5 to 0, with six abstentions. Only two delegations, the Soviet and Ukrainian, voted for the clause blaming the Arabs. The four other paragraphs of the resolution were rejected 5 to 0.

Backed by a ruling of Alexandre Parodi of France, the president, the Council evaded a question put to it by Britain, Colombia and Belgium: Are the five permanent members of the Council, and in particular the United States and the Soviet Union, really prepared to take effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter? Particularly, it was asked, are they ready to send forces to Palestine if neccessary?

M. Parodi ruled that the provisions of Articles 39, 40 and 41 did not make it necessary for the Big Five to agree in advance on the enforcement measures they intended to take. He emphasized that the Charter envisaged many measures that could be taken before the stage of military action was reached.

The end of the morning session was marked by an outburst from Dr. José Arce of Argentina. He wished to adjourn until Tuesday, since, he said, the speeches were "merely political," the debate was "a farce leading nowhere" and it was obvious that "nobody wanted to reach a decision anyway." His motion received only his own vote.

Situation Held Worse

Mr. Gromyko, whose speech was the first and main one of the morning session, began by pointing out that the situation in Palestine had not only not improved but grown worse day by day. Events there, he said, "cannot be called anything but military." This action, he said, was taken not only against the new State of Israel, but also "to forestall the creation of the new Arab independent State of Palestine" envisaged in the partition plan of the General Assembly.

The Soviet delegation, Mr. Gromyko continued, "deems it essential that the Security Council should change its tone, that it should speak in a more determined manner." The Soviet Union's resolution, which he described as "similar in all its essential features" to that submitted by the United States last week, would "go far toward correcting the situation which has arisen in Palestine" and toward "normalizing" it.

The British resolution, Mr. Gromyko said, "would only complicate the situation in Palestine" and "would intensify the struggle between the Jews and the Arabs" and the "bloodshed, for which a great responsibility is borne by the present Government of the United Kingdom."

The Soviet representative criticized the British resolution for its "numerous and serious defects," of which the first was that it was "basically opposed" to the partition plan as outlined in the Nov. 29 resolution of the Assembly. For that reason, he said, adoption of the British resolution by the Council "would constitute an unlawful act."

If the Council adopted the British draft, Mr. Gromyko went on, it "would mean that the Security Council would have adopted one more paper decision, a decision which would be on paper and would stay on paper, an empty decision which the Jewish state cannot accept." Asking what the British expected to achieve by this resolution, he said it was "designed to secure a lengthening of the Palestine struggle."

Throughout the last year Britain "has played an overt game which was designed to prevent at any cost the creation of independent states in Palestine or the attainment of independence by the peoples of Palestine," Mr. Gromyko continued.

Indeed, he said, "hypocrisy in this case is complemented by cynicism." Britain, "juggling with phrases and words," is asking the adoption of a decision that "would insure the clamping down of sanctions upon the new Jewish state, in other words, sanctions imposed on the victims of aggression," the Soviet delegate asserted.

In a message to the Council president from Fouzi el-Mulki, Foreign Minister for Trans-Jordan, King Abdullah was said to have visited the sacred mosque in Jerusalem and examined the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to "make sure no damage befell it." It was reported here that a shell had hit the church but that it was a dud.

The Foreign Minister, referring to the Council president's statement that Arab forces had blown up a synagogue, declared that the synagogue was destroyed because it was being used as a fortress from which Israeli fighters directed firing against Arabs.

The Arabs shall continue to protect holy places as they "have done since the days of Caliph Omar," the Foreign Minister stated.

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