

The Assembly's decision was accepted by the Jews, but denounced by the Arabs, who had opposed the partition of Palestine throughout and had supported the plan for a unitary State. The representatives of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Syria, and the Yemen charged that the Assembly's decision was the result of pressure brought to bear by the Great Powers, and declared that they could not admit its validity and would not consider themselves bound by it. Following the adoption of the plan by the United Nations, the security situation in Palestine seriously deteriorated, and extensive fighting broke out between Arabs and Jews. The United Nations Commission, which was to carry out the plan, reported that it could not perform its functions in view of armed Arab opposition, the fact that the Mandatory was unwilling that it should go to Palestine in time to carry out the necessary preliminaries to the plan before the mandate ended, and the failure of the Security Council to place any armed forces at its disposal.

At this stage it became clear that, principally as a result of the failure of the Assembly and of the Security Council to agree on any enforcement measures, the partition plan could not be carried out as the Assembly had envisaged it. In these circumstances, on 19 March the United States representative announced in the Security Council that in the view of his Government a temporary trusteeship for Palestine should be established under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. This announcement came as a surprise, for it involved abandonment, for the time being at least, of the principle of partition which the United States had hitherto vigorously supported, and it was regarded by the Jews as a grave setback to their efforts to secure a Jewish State in part of Palestine. On 31 March the United States proposed in the Security Council that a special session of the General Assembly should be held, at which the whole question of Palestine should be thrown open for further consideration. This proposal was adopted, it being agreed that the session should open on 16 April.

The New Zealand Government had been under no illusions as to the difficulties inherent in a plan involving partition, and precisely for that reason the representative of New Zealand had consistently emphasized the necessity for making adequate provision for its enforcement. Nor did the New Zealand Government claim that a decision of the Assembly in favour of the plan could be any more than a *recommendation* to member States. However, the facts that the plan had been brought forward after extensive consideration in a specially appointed United Nations body, and that it had been adopted in the General Assembly by a majority of the United Nations, gave it, in the New Zealand Government's view, the