SECURITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS ISRAEL FOR GAZA ATTACK
By KATHLEEN TELTSCHSpecial to The New York Times.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Mar 30, 1955; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

SECURITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS ISRAEL FOR GAZA ATTACK

U.N. Members Unanimous—Egyptian Raid on Negev Wedding Is Deplored

By KATHLEEN TELTSCH
Special to The New York Times.

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., March 29—The Security Council voted today to condemn Israel's attack last month on Egyptian forces in the Gaza Strip.

In a rare instance of unanimity, the eleven members approved a joint resolution sponsored by Britain, France and the United States to censure Israel for the assault, in which thirty-eight Egyptians and eight Israelis died.

Before the balloting the United States and others castigated Israel, contending that the attack was premeditated and could not be justified by Israel's argument that it had been preceded by months of harassment by Egyptian infiltrators.

Although the attack was condemned on all sides, the United States, Britain and others also brought into debate and deplored last Friday's raid on an Israeli wedding party in the northern Negev village of Patish. The Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission has held Egypt responsible for the attack.

Among Western diplomats the sentiment was that the resolution was a strong one but could have been tougher. Omar Loutfi, Egypt's representative, indicated to Council members that he felt it should have called also for reparations, plus some provision that sanctions would be invoked against Israel.

Council Meets Again Today

The Council will meet again tomorrow to take up another joint resolution by the same sponsors. This seeks to strengthen the United Nations' truce machinery. It calls on both sides to agree to tighter border controls along lines suggested by Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns of Canada, Palestine truce supervisor. These reforms would set up joint frontier patrols and an agreement by local military leaders to curb illegal crossings of the demarcation line.

As a vote approached this afternoon, the Soviet Union and Western delegates tangled briefly but vehemently. This occurred when Arkady A. Sobolev, Soviet delegate, made a passing attack on Turkey's military defense pacts with Iraq and Pakistan. He charged that the Western-supported pacts were contributing to tension in the Middle East.

This was the second time recently that the Soviet delegate had used the Palestine debate as a springboard for charges that Middle East countries were being forced to join "aggressive military blocs."

The charges were immediately called propaganda by Selim Sarper of Turkey and Sir Pierson Dixon of Britain.

There was no official Israeli comment tonight on the newly adopted resolution. Israel did, however, submit a series of proposed changes in the second resolution.

The most forceful of these asked the Council to condemn Egyptian-Israeli armistice agreefiltration" as violations of the Egyptian-Israeli armistice agreement, signed in 1949. Since Israel is not a member of the Council,

Continued on Page 11, Column 1



The New York Times

SPONSORS OF CENSURE: Delegates at yesterday's Security Council meeting. From left: Henri Hoppenot of France, Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. of U. S. and Sir Pierson Dixon of Britain.

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

SECURITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS ISRAEL

Continued From Page 1

the suggested amendments would have to be proposed formally by a member to be voted.

The Western-sponsored resolution on Gaza, which called on Israel to take all necessary measures to prevent such actions in the future, was adopted today without the submission of any amendments. It noted that the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission had found that a "prearranged and planned attack" had been ordered by Israeli authorities and carried out on Feb. 28 by Israeli Regular Army forces.

The key paragraph condemned the attack as a violation of the Palestine cease-fire, which the Council ordered six years ago. It declared also that the attack was "inconsistent" with the armistice.

The same theme ran through most of the declarations of rebuke leveled at Israel by the Council members: That members could not condone a policy of organized retaliation by Israel regardless of the repetition of incursions across the border by Arab infiltrators, and similar acts.

Mr. Lodge recalled that Israel had been censured two years ago for an attack on the Jordanian village of Kibya, and also more recently. He said that this was the fourth case of Israeli retaliation and the "most serious because of its obvious premeditation."

Henri Hoppenot, French representative, said that as a friendly ally of Israel he had cast his condemnation vote with difficulty. He went on to add, however, that the resolution should serve as a "last warning" to Israel. Later, French sources said this implied that a future incident like the Gaza attack might be met with a demand to cut off Western arms aid to Israel.

For Britain Sir Pierson declared that, coming after the Kibya incident, the attack at Gaza was a "complete disregard" of the Council's call to Israel to cease retaliation. He said also that Britain disapproved Egypt's thesis that she was still at war with Israel and could exercise "belligerent rights," and shared Israel's hope for the present armistice to be replaced with a permanent peace. However, he declared, "peace cannot be won at the point of a gun."

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