U. N. COUNCIL ORDERS TRUCE IN PALESTINE WITHIN 3 DAYS ON PENALTY OF S
By THOMAS J. HAMILTONSpecial to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
New York Times 1857; Jul 16, 1948; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

U. N. COUNCIL ORDERS TRUCE IN PALESTINE WITHIN 3 DAYS ON PENALTY OF SANCTIONS

CHAPTER 7 INVOKED

Security Body Employs It for the First Time— The Vote Is 7 to 1

SOVIET, UKRAINE ABSTAIN

End of Jerusalem Fighting in 24 Hours Is Demanded— U. S. Move Largely Adopted

The text of the Security Council resolution, Page 8.

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

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., July 15—Invoking Chapter VII of the Charter for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the Security Council tonight ordered Israel and the seven member states of the Arab League to stop the fighting in Palestine within three days and in Jerusalem within twenty-four hours.

The Council resolution, which in its main lines corresponds to that introduced by the United States last Tuesday, was adopted at 9:38 o'clock by a vote of 7 to 1, with Syria opposed and the Soviet Union, the Ukraine and Argentina abstaining.

According to the resolution, fighting in Jerusalem must stop by 9:38 tomorrow night and throughout Palestine by 9:38 Sunday night, New York daylight time.

Under the resolution the Council found that the situation in Palestine constituted a threat to the peace, and said that the failure of any of the governments or authorities concerned to comply would constitute a breach of the peace, "requiring immediate consideration by the Security Council with a view to such further action under Chapter VII of the Charter as may be decided upon by the Council."

Sanctions Involved

The Charter authorizes the Council in such an event to order all members of the United Nations to carry out economic and diplomatic sanctions. As a last resort the Council can order the use of military force. However, Dr. Philip C. Jessup, acting United States representative, did not answer today when Faris el-Khouri, Syrian representative, asked what the next step would be if the Council's order was not obeyed.

[Abdul Rahman Azzam Pasha, secretary general of the Arab League, suggested an international cordon sanitaire to "freeze" the situation in Palestine until a satisfactory settlement could be reached by Israel and the Arabs.

[While the fighting in Palestine continued on various fronts, the Egyptian Defense Ministry reported that Cairo had been bombed from the air, press serv-

Continued on Page 8, Column 2

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

U. N. ORDERS HALT IN PALESTINE WAR

Continued From Page 1

ice dispatches said. There were no details.]

Count Folke Bernadotte, United Nations Mediator for Palestine, who urged the Council yesterday to specify in its resolution that in the event of non-compliance it would order economic and political sanctions, to be followed if necessary by armed force, said as he left the meeting that he was not "100 per cent satisfied."

Count Bernadotte, who had originally planned to leave by air tomorrow morning for his headquarters on the Island of Rhodes, delayed his departure until Saturday to make arrangements for reestablishing and enlarging the supervisory machinery that he had in operation at the time the previous truce expired.

The provisional government of Israel had already accepted both a thirty-day extension and a ten-day extension of the previous truce, which was in effect from June 11 until July 9, but the Arab League rejected the thirty-day extension "under present conditions," and has not replied to Count Bernadotte's proposal for a ten-day extension.

The prevailing belief here was that King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan, whose Arab Legion is the only effective Arab fighting force in the field, would support compliance with the Council's order. However, King Farouk of Egypt, who has been accused by the Israeli Government of renewing the attack in the Negeb before the previous truce expired, also is an important factor. Opinion here was divided as to whether he would persuade other members of the Arab League to defy the Council's order, or as a final resort would continue unaided.

As far as the Israeli Government is concerned, Aubrey S. Eban, its representative at the Security Council, told the Council today that it would refuse to accept restrictions on immigration "for an indefinite period." Under the Council's resolution of May 29, which was re-affirmed tonight, the admission of war material and fighting men by either side was forbidden, and those men of military age allowed to immigrate are not to receive military training.

The Council resolution provides that the truce is to remain in effect, "subject to further decision by the Security Council or the General Assembly * * * until a peaceful adjustment of the future situation in Palestine is reached."

Issue for Next Assembly

This provision seemed to guarantee that the Palestine question would be one of the dominant issues before the next session of the General Assembly, which will meet in Paris on Sept. 21, whether or not the Arabs accept the truce.

Today's session of the Council began shortly after 11 A. M. and, except for a two-hour-and-half recess for lunch, lasted until 9:58 tonight. The basic elements in its dramatic session was the fact that six countries—the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Canada and Colombia—were already pledged to support the United States resolution.

Since seven votes are required for a majority in the Security Council, this meant that the United States had to obtain at least one more vote both for the individual paragraphs of its resolution and for the vote on the resolution as a whole.

The Soviet Union and the Ukraine, while certain to support the sections of the resolution ordering the Arabs to stop fighting, were bitterly opposed to the renewal of the previous restrictions on Israel and to giving Count Bernadotte the power to determine what countries would participate in the new control machinery. Above all, they were opposed to incorporating in the resolution the slightest suggestion that Count Bernadotte would have the right to suggest any departure from the partition resolution adopted by the General Assembly last November.

Syria, as a member of the Arab League, naturally was opposed to any coercive measures. This left only the representatives of China and Argentina, Dr. T. F. Tsiang and Dr. Jose Arce, and although Dr. Arce did not speak until today, both of them were known to oppose coercive measures.

These being the conditions, an abstention was as good as a vote against, unless one of the Big Five wanted to veto—which was not in the cards. But if Argentina and China decided to oppose the United States resolution because it went too far, or if the Soviet Union and the Ukraine decided to oppose it because it did not go far enough, it would fail to pass when the Council voted on it as a whole.

As it turned out, Argentina and China supplied the needed votes whenever the Soviet Union and the Ukraine abstained. This produces the paradoxical result that, although the Council in the second paragraph ordered both sides, "pursuant to Article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations," to cease fighting in Palestine, it eliminated the identical phrase in the fourth paragraph, which called on both sides to cooperate with Count Bernadotte in accordance with the cease-fire resolution of May 29.

The separate vote on a phrase within a paragraph was taken at the demand of Dr. Arce, and it got six votes, one short of the needed majority. Syria voted against, the Soviet Union and the Ukraine abstained because they disapproved of the revival of the previous conditions, and Argentina and China were against coercion.

A British amendment, which would have substituted the term "other party" for "Provisional Government of Israel," got only three votes, and a Syrian proposal to eliminate the first paragraph of the resolution, with its finding against the Arab states, got the same.

On the other hand, the Council beat down efforts by the Soviet Union to eliminate the provisions of the resolution giving the Mediator the right to set up his own supervisory machinery. A Soviet amendment, which would have provided for setting up an international regime in Jerusalem, as provided for in the partition resolution, and for the withdrawal of foreign troops, was supported only by the Soviet Union and the Ukraine. Syria voted against, and the other eight members of the Council abstained.

Amendments Approved

Other amendments approved by the Council to the original United States resolution were as follows:

(1) A British amendment instructing Count Bernadotte to investigate charges of violation of the previous truce as well as of the new one. This was accepted by Dr. Jessup and incorporated in the United States resolution, and thus no separate vote was taken. Count Bernadotte, who had previously opposed the amendment on practical grounds, at once served notice that he could not investigate such charges unless he had a larger staff. Mr. Eban served notice that he would demand an investigation of the British action in holding 11,000 Jews of military age on Cyprus, pointing out that Count Bernadotte had said he had not suggested or recommended such action. Both Mr. Eban and Mahmoud Fawzi Bey, Egyptian representative, said they welcomed the amendment because it meant Count Bernadotte would investigate alleged violations by the other side.

(2) A United States amendment calling on both sides to show a "spirit of conciliation and mutual concession." This was offered by Dr. Jessup as a substitute to a Chinese amendment calling for "mutual concessions" regarding both the "political organization of Palestine" and immigration, which was strongly opposed by Mr. Eban since it involved the two vital points in dispute between Israel and the Arab states.

(3) The two final amendments, offered in behalf of Secretary General Trygve Lie, authorize him to provide the staff and funds required.

The provisions of the resolution ordering a cease-fire were virtually the same as those contained in an earlier United States resolution that was resubmitted by the Soviet Union and failed by two votes of passage last May 29.

At that time the United States, the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, France and Colombia voted in favor, and when this was defeated, the Council adopted the milder British version calling upon both sides to agree to a cease-fire and threatening to invoke Chapter VII if the truce did not go into effect.

This time, with the Soviet Union and the Ukraine abstaining on final passage, the needed votes were provided by Great Britain, Canada, Belgium and China.

Mr. Manuilsky concentrated his attack today upon Great Britain, warning the Arab countries that they were merely being divided up into spheres of influence between two groups of oil interests and that they had nothing to expect from Great Britain.

Implicit in his statement was his previous charge that Count Bernadotte was influenced by the oil companies, and the Ukrainian representative asserted that Count Bernadotte's "suggestions" for a lasting settlement in Palestine, which were at variance with the partition resolution, had aroused bitterness on both sides. Mr. Manuilsky thus placed part of the blame for the resumption of the fighting "squarely on the shoulders" of the Mediator.

Count Bernadotte replied that he did not want to take up the time of the Council with a formal denial of these "rather unjustified" charges, declaring that while the debate went on "hundreds of Arab and Jewish lives are being lost."

Britain Loses on 'Israel'

As far as Great Britain was concerned, Sir Alexander Cadogan fought unsuccessfully to keep the word "Israel" out of the resolution and succeeded in getting the Council to order an investigation of previous truce violations, which were largely alleged by the Arabs.

"His Majesty's Government's only object in supporting the resolution," Sir Alexander said, "is to secure an extension of the truce during which negotiations for a peaceful solution can proceed as they have always advocated.

"In working for a suspension of hostilities, His Majesty's Government fully reserve their views on the nature of such a solution. His Majesty's Government cannot but feel that in their view the Arab interest in Palestine has so far been insufficiently appreciated by the United Nations. There is a danger that the Arabs, rightly or wrongly, feel that the Security Council is not a forum in which they can count on proper consideration of their views. It would be wrong to infer from His Majesty's Government's desire to help in bringing the fighting to a stop that they have committed themselves to any set proposals for a final solution. They reserve judgment on this point until the outcome of the Mediator's negotiations. They emphatically reject the suggestion that the United Nations has no power to modify its previous recommendations if it wishes or to adopt, as it must, whatever recommendations seem to it best and most impartial.

"In voting for the resolution His Majesty's Government do not endorse any suggestion that the Arabs are the aggressors or that justice in the dispute is all on one side."

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