

# COMPROMISE WINS

## Security Group Adopts Plea to Arabs and Jews by 8-0

### AUSTIN CLAUSE LOSES, 5-0

#### American, in a Fervid Speech, Asks Rulings for Sanctions Against 'Aggressors'

*Text of Austin's address in Security Council Page 4.*

By MALLORY BROWNE

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., May 22

—The United Nations Security Council called on Arabs and Jews today to stop the fighting in Palestine within thirty-six hours from midnight tonight.

By a vote of 8 to 0, with three abstentions, the Council adopted a compromise resolution urging "all governments and authorities" to abstain from "hostile military actions" in the Holy Land and, to that end, to order their forces to cease fire. The three states that abstained from voting on this measure were the Soviet Union, the Ukraine and Syria.

After Warren R. Austin had strongly denounced the Arab invasion of Palestine as "aggression," the Council rejected the United States proposal to determine the existence of a threat to and breach of the peace. The vote on this key clause was 5 to 0, with six abstentions. Seven votes were required to adopt it.

#### Seeks to Bolster Amendment

When the implicit threat of international sanctions and possible force was thereby eliminated and it became clear that there would not be a majority for the paragraph that would "order" the parties to stop fighting, Mr. Austin centered his efforts on strengthening a British amendment and on tightening the time limit.

Declaring that the United States had voted for the watered-down resolution "solely because of the call upon the parties to cease fire," Mr. Austin said his delegation regarded it as "a provisional measure."

If the parties do not comply, he said, "the Security Council must consider further action" to carry out its duty under the United Nations Charter. The United States delegation made it clear that if there were no cease-fire by noon on Monday (Eastern standard time, or 1 P. M., daylight time), when the time limit expires, the United States would press harder than ever for action under Chapter VII of the Charter.

#### TEXT OF RESOLUTION

Following is the text of the resolution adopted:

#### THE SECURITY COUNCIL,

Taking into consideration that previous resolutions of the Security Council in respect to Palestine have not been complied with and that military operations are taking place in Palestine;

CALLS UPON all Governments and authorities, without prejudice to the rights, claims or position of the parties concerned, to abstain from hostile military actions in Palestine and to that end to issue a cease-fire order to their military and para-military forces to become effective within thirty-six hours after midnight, New York standard time, on 22 May.

CALLS UPON the truce commission and upon all parties concerned to give the highest priority to the negotiation and maintenance of a truce in the city of Jerusalem;

DIRECTS the truce commission established by the Security Council by its resolution of 23 April 1948 to report to the Security Council on compliance with the two preceding paragraphs of this resolution;

INVITES all parties concerned to facilitate by all means in their power the task of the United Nations mediator appointed in accordance with the General Assembly resolution of 14 May.

The climax of the meeting was not the passage of the diluted

**Continued on Page 4, Column 1**

# U. N. COUNCIL ASKS FOR A CEASE-FIRE

Continued From Page 1

resolution. It was the speech of the United States representative, which charged the Arab states with being "aggressors."

The United States draft resolution deliberately avoided any reference to aggression. In the afternoon session of the Council, however, Mr. Austin, making one of his most eloquent and forceful speeches at Lake Success, told the Council bluntly that the international character of the threat to peace in Palestine could no longer be ignored.

Defending the United States proposal to order both parties to stop fighting at once and to threaten implicitly to invoke economic and, ultimately, military sanctions, Mr. Austin ridiculed the Arab contention that Arab armies were in Palestine to preserve peace. He accused the Arab states of having invaded the Holy Land and of "making bloody war" there. He insisted that the Council must take effective action or become a laughing stock of world opinion.

Mr. Austin called the refusal of King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan to answer the questions put to him by the Security Council "the very best evidence of the illegal purpose" of Trans-Jordan in invading Palestine.

Answering the Syrian argument that the invasion of Palestine was legal because Palestine was an associate member of the Arab League, which was a "regional arrangement" authorized by the Charter, the United States delegate observed that the Charter said specifically that "no enforcement action" should be taken under any such regional arrangement without the permission of the Council.

Mr. Austin sprang a surprise by announcing that the Government of Syria had proclaimed a blockade of the coastal waters of Palestine and had announced its intention of applying this blockade to foreign shipping.

Noting that the proclamation of such a blockade of foreign shipping constituted in international law a claim to "belligerent rights," Mr. Austin insisted that under the circumstances it was impossible to claim there was no threat to the peace in Palestine.

## Curbing of Abdullah Urged

Banging the table, he insisted that under the Charter every member was "bound to help keep Abdullah where he belongs." He pointed out that Article 1 of the Charter stated that the purpose of the United Nations was to take "effective collective measures" and not to continue trying measures that had been proved ineffective.

It is "not necessary to step right off under Article 41 or Article 42," those calling for economic sanctions or military action, Mr. Austin said. "There are other sanctions" that could be taken in this case, he remarked.

Giving the British viewpoint on this crucial paragraph, which called on the Council to determine the existence of a threat to the peace, Sir Alexander Cadogan explained that his Government was "not blind to what is being done in Palestine." He maintained that the real question was how to deal with the problem.

Britain, he said, still believes that the best course is "to attempt to build on a truce and mediation in the hope that the pressure of events will lead us to an eventual solution of this terrible problem."

Mahmoud Bey Fawzi of Egypt and Faris el-Khoury of Syria again presented the claim that the Arab

armies were not going into Palestine as "invaders, as aggressors or even as unwanted intruders."

Fawzi Bey said that there was aggression in Palestine but he ascribed it to "world Zionism." Both Arab speakers emphasized the importance of the juridical question, saying that it was impossible to decide whether there was any aggression against Palestine until her legal status had been clarified.

Earlier in the meeting Fawzi Bey compared the Arab interven-

tion in Palestine to that of the United States in Cuba and in Panama.

In an eloquent appeal supporting the United States resolution, Major Aubrey S. Eban, Israel's spokesman, declared that following the adoption of such a resolution it would no longer be possible for Britain to go on financing and supplying arms to Trans-Jordan.

## Colombian View on Aid

Whether this end has been attained by the milder version voted by the Council is not certain. Colombia observed that the wording of the resolution suggested by the United States, calling on "all governments and authorities," could be construed as including Britain in the ban on military actions in Palestine.

There was a strong general impression that, although Britain had defeated the stronger resolution advocated by the United States, the victory would be short-lived. The Council will meet again at 2:30 P. M. Monday, and if the cease-fire call is not observed, Britain, it was said, will probably have to go along in taking more effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.