

U. N. Votes for a Mediator; Special Assembly Is Ended

By THOMAS J. HAMILTON

After hearing both the Soviet Union and the Arab delegates denounce the United States for its sudden recognition of the new Jewish state in Palestine, the United Nations General Assembly

decided last night to send a Mediator to the Holy Land to do what he could to arrange a truce and carry on public services.

The vote was 31 to 7, with sixteen abstentions and four delegates absent, and the General Assembly, which was called into special session at Flushing Meadow on April 16 at the request of the United States, adjourned for good at 8:32 P. M.

The failure of the General Assembly either to repeal the partition resolution of last November or to provide military force to keep the peace means that the fate of Palestine will be decided by the impending war between Jews and Arabs, not by any United Nations action.

The mediation resolution conforms substantially with a United States proposal announced last Wednesday, after it had become obvious that the General Assembly would not accept the original United States plan for a temporary trusteeship.

However, the General Assembly refused to accept a United States plan for a temporary trusteeship over Jerusalem, which was rejected earlier in the evening by a vote of 20 to 15, less than the necessary two-thirds majority.

Two other proposals regarding Jerusalem were rejected, but presumably the provisions of the partition resolution on Jerusalem, which was to have been established as an international enclave under the administration of the Trusteeship Council, still stand.

In addition, the Assembly de-

Continued on Page 4, Column 4

U. N. FOR MEDIATOR; ASSEMBLY IS ENDED

Continued From Page 1

cided two weeks ago to create a Special Commissioner, or Mayor, for the Holy City, and Harold Evans, a Philadelphia attorney and official of the Quaker organization, has already accepted the appointment from the British High Commissioner for Palestine, Lieut. Gen. Sir Alan G. Cunningham.

Until President Truman's announcement the proceedings, which began with a meeting of the Assembly's Political and Security Committee at Lake Success earlier in the day, were merely a losing race against the clock. The British mandate over Palestine was to be terminated at 6.01 P. M., New York daylight time, and the question was whether the Assembly could take action before then on either the Jerusalem trusteeship or the Mediator for all of Palestine.

Russians and Arabs Seek Delay

Both the Soviet bloc and the Arab bloc sought to delay a decision by the committee, the Soviet bloc, because it wanted to make sure that the British mandate would end without any resolution that could possibly impair the validity of the partition resolution, the Arabs, because they wanted to prevent the United Nations from taking any additional action to place Jerusalem—which presumably is a prime objective of the Trans-Jordan troops—under the protection of the United Nations.

The Vote on Mediator

The United Nations General Assembly's vote on the appointment of a mediator for Palestine follows:

For (31)—Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Against (7)—Byelorussia (White Russia), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukraine, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia.

Abstentions (16)—Australia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Haiti, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Siam, Syria, Venezuela, Yemen.

Absent (4)—Burma, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Paraguay.

The fateful hour when the British mandate was at an end came just as the General Assembly was about to start voting on a series of amendments to the United States Jerusalem plan.

Precisely at 6:01 the representative of Iraq, Awni Khalidi, mounted the rostrum and said that since it was no longer possible to complete action on the plan before the end of the mandate, it might as well be dropped. His statement provided a dramatic moment, but this was as nothing compared with the astonishment and bewilderment created half an hour later by President Truman's announcement that the United States had given de facto recognition to the new Jewish State.

The State of Israel was proclaimed in Tel Aviv earlier in the day, before the end of the mandate, and the Soviet Union, Poland and Guatemala, had already indicated that they would recognize it. The President's announcement took the United States delegation completely by surprise.

News agency messages about the White House announcement were immediately passed around from delegate to delegate, and the Colombian representative, Dr. Alberto Gonzalez Fernandez, asked the United States delegation to give the Assembly an official announcement.

Warren R. Austin, chief United States representative, had returned to New York, but Francis B. Sayre, United States member of the Trusteeship Council, could reply only that he had seen the reports "on the ticker" but had no official information.

U. S. Delegation Surprised

The United States delegation immediately telephoned to the State Department for confirmation of the report, which obviously took it as a complete surprise. More than half an hour later Dr. Philip C. Jessup, who has represented the United States at virtually all meetings of the Political and Security Committee over the past three weeks, was recognized and he read the text of the President's statement. Dr. Jessup read also a com-

panion statement from the State Department declaring that this action would not alter in the slightest the determination of the United States to press for a truce in Palestine.

Before Dr. Jessup spoke, the Soviet representative, Andrei A. Gromyko, who had been informed of Mr. Truman's statement, charged that the United States had put the United Nations in a "ludicrous situation" and called it "unprincipled conduct." He added spherically that the Soviet Union had conducted itself in a "principled manner" in support of the interests of the people of Palestine and had no reason to blush.

This reference to the reversals in the United States opinion was taken up immediately by the Arab delegates. As they pointed out, the United States, after supporting partition at the General Assembly last year, proposed the special session to consider further the future government of Palestine.

Some delegates attributed Mr. Gromyko's bitterness to the fact that the United States, which had been expected to steer clear of recognition of the state of Israel to avoid difficulties with the Arab rulers, in effect had beaten the Soviet Union to the punch. The Arab delegates, who had assumed that the United States proposal of last March to suspend the partition resolution meant that it had shifted to their side, were correspondingly bitter.

Mr. Gromyko indicated that his Government would recognize the new state, but he said that so far he had no official word from Moscow. In his speech to the Assembly, Mr. Gromyko argued against the resolution for a United Nations mediator because he said it would amount to the imposition of some "kind of temporary regime" in Palestine, but already, he declared, there was a Government in the country.

"The Jewish State is, in fact, in existence," he said. This declaration was enough to start reports that Russia had recognized Israel, but later Mr. Gromyko denied it.

Egypt Charges "Fake"

Mahmoud Bey Fawzi, Egyptian representative, charged that the whole procedure of the General Assembly had been a "fake," that the hopes that humanity had longed for were being "shamelessly betrayed" and that "politics" were more "insidious" than high ideals.

Faris el-Khouiri of Syria recalled that Mr. Austin had emphasized to the Security Council that its Truce Commission should operate on the basis of a political standstill. He asked how Mr. Sayre could say that the recognition of the Jewish state did not affect a truce.

Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon said the Arab states had "trusted our friends" in the United States delegation last fall, but the United States had ended by supporting partition. Again at this session, he said, the Arab states had done so, and he pointed out that only twenty-two hours before Mr. Sayre had said that the solution of the Palestine question depended on reconciliation, not on force.

"If this is politics, I will have nothing to do with it," said Dr. Malik. "For four weeks we were dupes and the whole thing was a show and a game."

Both Dr. Jorge Garcia Granados of Guatemala, one of the strongest supporters of partition, and Dr. Guillermo Belt of Cuba, a long-standing opponent, both attacked the President's announcement as another reversal of the United States position.

Dr. Belt brought laughter from the delegates when he said: "Now it develops that the representatives of the Soviet Union and Poland are better informed in Washington than the United States delegation." He added that he had intended earlier to vote for the appointment of a mediator in Palestine, but had decided to oppose it "because the United States recognized the Jewish state at 11 minutes past 6."

Backs Move for Mediator

Despite bitter protests from Dr. Julius Katz-Suchy, Polish representative, the Political and Security Committee approved the resolution to appoint a mediator for Palestine at 1:30 P. M. by a vote of 35 to 6, with 10 abstentions.

The six members of the Soviet bloc stood alone in voting against the resolution. Both Arab delegates and a handful of supporters of partition were among the abstainers.

The committee made only three changes in the resolution as approved by the subcommittee Thursday and published in THE NEW YORK TIMES yesterday. One, a drafting change proposed by France, directed the mediator to promote "a peaceful adjustment of the future situation in Palestine," inserting the words "a" and "future."

Another change, proposed by

New Zealand, would direct the mediator to accept instructions from the General Assembly as well as from the Security Council.

The hardest fight, however, developed over a Greek amendment to abolish the Palestine Commission immediately, instead of merely suspending it on June 1, as proposed by the subcommittee. The Greek amendment, which had the effect of restoring the original United States proposal concerning the "five lonely pilgrims," was approved by a vote of 24 to 15, with eleven abstentions. Although some delegates insisted that the point was of no practical importance, others thought that the abolition of the Palestine Commission would weaken the effect of the partition resolution, since it was established to carry it out.

In any event, the Arab states and other long-standing opponents of partition, together with the United States, Brazil and Canada, and several other countries that voted for partition, supported the Greek amendment. Most of the Soviet bloc, France and New Zealand voted against it. Venezuela, Czechoslovakia and Chile were among those abstaining.

The committee then rejected, 26 to 14, with eleven abstentions, a New Zealand amendment that would have thanked the commission for its work, and merely suspended its functions.

Twenty Separate Votes Taken

A total of twenty separate votes was required to complete action on the resolution, since the committee voted paragraph by paragraph on the subcommittee's draft, in addition to voting on numerous amendments.

This time-consuming procedure was demanded by Dr. Katz-Suchy, who resubmitted most of the amendments that had been rejected by the subcommittee Thursday. The Polish representative attacked the Greek amendment and many provisions of the resolution as an indirect attempt by the United States to defeat partition.

Previous Soviet attacks on the United States policy also were revived by Vassily A. Tarasenko, Ukrainian representative, who charged that the United States wanted only "a half solution," which would pave the way for its penetration into Palestine "if not today, then tomorrow; if not tomorrow, then the day after tomorrow."

By this time the prospect of getting an Assembly resolution for an interim settlement for either Jerusalem or Palestine was already in doubt, but Dr. Guillermo Belt, Cuban representative, introduced a motion to close the debate.

As soon as this was adopted, by a vote of 23 to 15, the Yugoslav representative, Dr. Joza Vilfan, made a final attempt to delay action by invoking an Assembly rule on resolutions requiring expenditures of United Nations funds. He pointed out that Secretary General Trygve Lie had not submitted an estimate of the amount needed for the maintenance of the United Nations Mediator and that the Assembly rules provided that this estimate must be considered by the Assembly's Administrative Committee before the Assembly took action.

Lie Cites Authority

Mr. Lie replied that he estimated the total cost at \$100,000, but pointed out that, under a resolution adopted by the General Assembly last year, the Secretary General had the right to allocate funds up to \$2,000,000 for activities that "have anything to do with the maintenance of peace."

Under this authority, Mr. Lie said, he had already appropriated funds for United Nations activities concerning the Palestine and Kashmiri questions. Dr. T. F. Tsiang, committee chairman, then overruled Dr. Vilfan and the voting began.

To save time, the United States and other supporters of the resolution had little to say. However, Dr. Jessup, replying to taunts by the Soviet bloc that there was no requirement for the General Assembly to take action by 6:01, said that "no negative attitude of a mechanical minority can block the decision of this great Assembly."

Dr. Jessup said that a consciousness of the necessity of action was written "in a place strange and alien to the Soviet Union, written in the hearts of men and women who want to know the truth" and were believers in peace and the Charter of the United Nations.