

# U.S. Bids U.N.

# Order Truce

# In Holy Land

## Asks Enforcement Under the Charter

### Britain Supports Move, Jews, Arabs Oppose It, Reds Silent; Vote Today

By Fitzhugh Turner

LAKE SUCCESS, July 13.—The United States asked the United Nations Security Council this afternoon to order an immediate and indefinite truce between Arabs and Jews in Palestine, and sought to invoke for the first time the provisions of the U. N. Charter leading to economic sanctions and military force to end a threat to peace.

In a resolution which had the support of Great Britain, the United States also asked the Security Council to order a special unconditional cease-fire in Jerusalem as a matter of "urgent necessity" to prevent further destruction of the Holy City's shrines.

The resolution would give Arab states and the government of Israel three days from the hour of its adoption to stop fighting in Palestine as a whole, and twenty-four hours in Jerusalem.

#### Both Sides Denounce It

The proposal was introduced late in the afternoon. Arabs denounced it before the Council. Jews said they would denounce it. And Russia and other members were yet to be heard from. But the United States and Great Britain intended, apparently, to force it to a vote after the Council reconvenes at 11 a. m. tomorrow.

Jewish disappointment was strong over the resolution's clause that the new truce remain in force in accordance with provisions of the old one—which forbade immigration of men of military age to Palestine, and ordered an international arms embargo. A representative said Israel was in favor of an unconditional cease-fire, but that the recent four-week truce was past history. Israel, he said, could not accept its revival since its rejection by the Arabs.

#### Bernadotte Urges Action

Philip C. Jessup, American delegate to the Security Council, presented the resolution as the climax of a day of comparatively blunt talk for the United Nations. It started in the morning when Count Folke Bernadotte, the Council's mediator just back from Palestine, declared his belief that every possibility for a voluntary end to hostilities had been exhausted. He asked the Council for firm, quick intervention.

"For the moment," he said, "I have done my utmost, and for the moment I cannot do more. It is now up to you, gentlemen, to decide what you want to do. It is necessary that quick decisions—I should like to say immediate decisions—be taken, because for every day we discuss, hundreds or perhaps thousands of lives are spilled in Palestine, both Jews and Arabs."

Count Bernadotte said Jerusalem and its holy places face "utter destruction" if fighting continues. "If you still have confidence in

(Continued on page 10, column 1)

# U. S. Bids U. N.

(Continued from page one)

me," he said, "I am willing to continue my work as mediator, and I am very pleased to know that out in the field both Arabs and Jews have told me that they want me to continue." . . .

Dr. Jessup, in introducing the resolution, commented that the mediator's report speaks for itself.

"It is the time for action," the American delegate said. "Fighting is now going on in Palestine . . . because one party has not agreed to any suggestion or appeal to avoid fighting, although the other party—the provisional government of Israel—declared its readiness to accept each and every suggestion and appeal. The Security Council must face its responsibility."

His resolution, however, did not name Arab states as aggressors, nor did it call for immediate imposition of penalties. It merely called attention to Arab rejection of truce appeals in its preamble, and addressed its cease-fire order to both sides.

The proposed resolution added that failure by either side to comply with the truce would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the U. N. Charter. This in turn would require immediate consideration by the Security Council of action under other provisions of the Charter's Chapter VII—complete or partial interruption of economic relations under Article 41, or armed intervention by member nations under Article 42.

Arab rejection was announced by Faris el Khouri of Syria in a long and eloquent speech. He repeated Arab pleas for "simple justice" in Palestine, deplored power politics, asserted Arab willingness to demilitarize Jerusalem and asked again to submit the Palestine issue to the International Court of Justice.

"I say if the proposal of the United States is achieved, you may suppose that the Arabs are not going to fight the great powers," he added. "But if you do it, do you suppose your forces are going to remain there forever? As soon as you leave, the disturbances will break out anew. You can't solve the problem permanently without justice."

For Israel, Audrey Eban delivered long and equally eloquent pre-resolution speech in which he agreed it is for the Security Council to forbid armed force in settlement of the Palestine problem. He repeated Israel's dislike for Count Bernadotte's mediation proposals, saying, among other things, "We insist that immigration into Israel is the business of Israel alone."

For the United Kingdom, Sir Alexander Cadogan expressed general agreement with the American resolution, but suggested two minor changes. One was substitution of the "the other party" for the resolution's "provisional government of Israel," a phrase abhorrent to Britain. The other was provision for investigation by the mediator of breaches of the former truce as well as the new one.

Countering Israeli charges of Arab breaches of the four-week truce, the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine submitted to the U. N. today a six-page listing of alleged Jewish violations between June 11 and July 9.