

representative of the Soviet Union, supported by the representatives of Poland, Yugoslavia, the Ukraine, and Byelo-Russia. Speaking for the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko accused the United States of attempting to wreck the partition decision and impose its own plans, based on political, economic, military, and strategic considerations. The Security Council had, he said, made no attempt to implement the partition decision by peaceful means, and the argument that such implementation was impossible would be justified only if attempts had been made and had failed. Trusteeship had been considered previously as a possible solution, but the United Nations had accepted partition as the just solution. The new American proposals were, in his view, intended to make Palestine a "quasi colony" of the United States, despite the fact that its peoples were now ready for an independent existence. Mr. Gromyko also accused the mandatory Power of using every possible means to impede the implementation of partition. The new proposals were, he said, quite unacceptable, and the Soviet Union would vote against them.

Speaking for the United Kingdom, the Right Honourable Arthur Creech-Jones said that the conclusion to be drawn from the fact that the Security Council did not accept the plan of partition with economic union and had not provided the Commission with armed assistance was that, in the light of present conditions in Palestine and the difficulties encountered by the Commission, the Assembly must give second thoughts to the problem of the future government of Palestine. In defending the United Kingdom's policy in Palestine, Mr. Creech-Jones said that the partition resolution was in some respects "utterly unrealistic," and it had proved completely impracticable to give full co-operation to the Palestine Commission, a body which was confined by its terms of reference to the rigid implementation of a resolution of definite terms which overlooked British warnings and the actual conditions in Palestine. Over a very wide field, short of implementation, British co-operation had been complete. In the circumstances, the United Kingdom did not think that any proposals for definitive settlement could be effected unless they were backed by very substantial means of enforcement. He suggested that it might result from that necessity that the United Nations would be obliged to aim at a more modest objective and to use all the practical means at its disposal to prevent developments in Palestine from endangering the peace of the world without seeking at this time to arrive at a final solution.

The debate was concluded by statements on behalf of the Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency. For the Arab Higher Committee, Jamul el-Husseini upheld the right of self-determination for the peoples of Palestine and denounced the partition decision. He indicated that his organization would consider the trusteeship proposals if they aimed at establishing an interim Government for a short and previously