

(C.W.B. February 27, 1948)

Dr. Karel Lisicky (Czechoslovakia) chairman of the UN Palestine Commission, presenting the Commission's special report, said the only way of implementing the partition of Palestine "consists in providing for assistance by non-Palestinian military forces available not in some symbolical form but in effective, adequate strength."

UNITED STATES ATTITUDE

Warren B. Austin (United States) said United States policy would not be unilateral. It would conform to and be in support of United Nations action on Palestine.

Mr. Warren declared that "If the Security Council should decide that it is necessary to use armed forces to maintain international peace in connection with Palestine, the United States would be ready to consult under the Charter with a view to such action as may be necessary to maintain international peace."

Such consultation would be required as agreement had not been reached making forces available to the Security Council under Article 43 of the Charter.

The Charter of the United Nations, Mr. Austin added, does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement whether it is pursuant to a recommendation of the General Assembly or of the Council itself.

"The Council was authorized to 'take forceful measures with respect to Palestine to remove a threat to international peace.' What this meant was that the 'Council under the Charter can take action to prevent aggression against Palestine from outside' and by these same powers action to prevent a threat to international peace and security from inside Palestine."

SPECIFIC STEPS SUGGESTED

"But this action must be directed solely to the maintenance of international peace.... directed to keeping peace and not to enforcing partitions."

The United States Government believed "we should have in mind the desirability of the following specific steps which the Council might take at once:"

1. To accept the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly.
2. To establish a Committee of the Council comprising the five permanent members "to look at once into the question of possible threats to international peace arising in connection with the Palestine question" and to consult with the Palestine Commission, the mandatory power, and representatives of the principle Palestine communities.
3. To call upon all governments and peoples "particularly in and around Palestine" to take all possible action to prevent or reduce the disorders now occurring in Palestine."

UK STANDS BY DECLARATIONS

Arthur Creech Jones, U.K. Colonial Secretary, said withdrawal of British forces and stores from Palestine was already well under way and should be completed by August 1. The Palestine Administration was taking all practical steps to terminate its control by May 15.

Military withdrawal and winding up of civil administration were both being carried out against a background of increasing violence.

The general security position in Palestine had degenerated very seriously since the resolution of the General Assembly was passed, November 29, due to lack of restraint by both communities in Palestine aggravated by activities of groups beyond the borders, the intrusion of armed bands and, on the Jewish side, by the continuance of illegal immigration.

"CLEAR AND REPEATED WARNINGS"

The situation confronting the Council, Mr. Creech Jones said, was one which the U.K. government had foreseen and against which they had uttered clear and repeated warnings which went to a large extent unheeded.

The U.K. Government could not "reasonably be asked to contribute to whatever line of action the United Nations may now think necessary to implement the General Assembly resolution."

British public opinion would not permit "new expenditure of life and treasure" nor the use of British forces and "the squandering of British lives to impose a policy in Palestine which one or others of the parties is determined to resist."

"We have played our part to the limit of our resources," Mr. Creech Jones added, "We cannot now take a course which may entangle her (the U.K.) again".

The U.K. Government must stand on its many declarations, withdraw its troops by August 1 and "refuse either individually or in association with others, to impose the United Nations plan by force."

SPECIAL ASSEMBLY PROPOSED

Dr. Alfonso Lopez (Colombia) proposed that:

1. The Council ask the Big Five to consult on joint action to meet any threat to the peace arising from enforcement of the Assembly's resolution of last November for dividing Palestine into Jewish and Arab countries and making Jerusalem an international city.
2. The Council appoint a Committee of five to examine the advisability of requesting an extraordinary session of the Assembly for reconsidering the partition resolution.
3. The Council ask Britain to postpone the date for terminating her mandate until July 15, 1948, and also to postpone the evacuation of troops from Palestine.

Warren Austin (United States) said the U.S.

could not support the Colombia proposal. He then submitted the draft resolution of which the main proposals have been quoted. This draft resolution, in its introductory paragraph, calls upon the Security Council to accept, "subject to the authority of the Security Council under the Charter," the requests addressed by the General Assembly to the Council in paragraphs (A), (B), and (C) of the General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 on Palestine.

These requests concern the taking of necessary measures by the Council as provided for in the partition plan for its implementation (guidance and instruction by the Council to the Palestine Commission, action by the Council if by 1 April 1948 provisional Councils of Government could not be established either in the Jewish or the Arab state), consideration by the Council of the question whether the Palestine situation during the transition period constitutes a threat to the peace, and, finally determination by the Council as a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression under Article 39 of the Charter of "any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged" by the Assembly's Palestine resolution.

The Council adjourned till this afternoon.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA: By 13 votes to none with four abstentions, the Economic and Social Council adopted a resolution laying down the membership and terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Latin America (C.W.B. February 13, p. 10). The abstentions were Byelorussia, Canada, United States, USSR.

J.H. Warren (Canada) declared that his delegation was still hesitant and doubtful concerning the wisdom of establishing yet another regional body. The Canadian delegation believed in world-wide solutions on a multilateral basis. For this reason, he would abstain from voting.

Membership of the Commission is open to UN members in north, central and south America, the Caribbean area, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom.

Terms of Reference provide that the Commission shall initiate measures for facilitating concerted action for dealing with urgent economic problems arising out of the war, for raising the level of economic activity in Latin America, for strengthening the economic relations of Latin American countries both among themselves and with the rest of the world. The Commission shall also make studies of economic and technological problems within territories of Latin America.

A Proposal to include the USSR in the Economic Commission for Latin America was defeated by 13 to 2 (Byelorussia and USSR) with two abstentions (China and Lebanon). The Polish delegate was absent.

ECONOMIC REPORT ADOPTED: The Economic and Social Council, February 24, adopted unanimously a Canadian resolution taking note of the "Economic Report -- Salient Features of the World Economic Situation, 1945-47" published by the UN Secretariat and recommending to the Secretary General that, in preparation of future reports, the views expressed by members of the Council, during the debate on the report, be taken into consideration.

IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: The Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council, adopted February 20, by eight votes to three, and Australian resolution which would direct the Commission on Human Rights to give particular attention to the implementation aspects of the Bill of Human Rights.

The vote:

For Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, New Zealand, Peru, United Kingdom.

Against: Byelorussia, Poland, USSR.

Abstentions: Brazil, France, Lebanon, Netherlands, Turkey, United States, Venezuela.

INTERNATIONAL COURT'S FIRST CASE: The first case to come before the International Court of Justice at the Hague since its inauguration in 1946 as the principal judicial authority of the United Nations opened yesterday. Questions at issue arise from the Corfu channel dispute between the United Kingdom and Albania.

John E. Read (Canada) is one of the sixteen judges hearing the case.

MARITIME ORGANIZATION: The UN Maritime Conference meeting at Geneva decided, February 23, that the proposed new inter-governmental maritime organization should be empowered to "provide machinery for cooperation among governments in the field of governmental regulation and practices relating to technical matters of all kinds affecting shipping, engaged in international trade, and to encourage the general adoption of the highest practicable standards in matters concerning maritime safety and efficiency of navigation."

This text, which is subject to later final drafting, will form the first paragraph of the first article of a convention establishing the new organization.

GREATER FOOD PRODUCTION PLANNED: The final plenary of European national Food and Agriculture Organization committees, in Rome, February 21, adopted in the presence of the FAO director-general, Sir John Boyd Orr, and the Ministers of Agriculture of Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg and Italy, the following principal recommendations:

1. An overall plan for increased European food production.
2. Ever-increasing cooperation between east and west Europe as well as between FAO, the Economic Commission for Europe and the timber sub-commission.
3. Stepped up milk production for children of war-damaged countries.