

UN AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

By Andrei Gromyko

Following is a speech made to the UN General Assembly on May 14, 1948.—Eds.

WHAT is the status of the Palestine question now? We know that the special session is considering this question and has been doing so for four weeks. We know that new proposals were submitted by the Government of the United States in connection with this question, and that these proposals differed from the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November 1947. We know that these novel proposals were subjected to rather careful consideration in the appropriate committee of the General Assembly. We also know that the United States proposals for the establishment of trusteeship over all of Palestine failed of adoption and failed to receive the support upon which the Government of the United States apparently counted when it submitted those proposals. Lastly, we are aware of the fact that the Government of the United States, through its delegation at the General Assembly, at least no longer presses for its original proposals.

That is a positive fact. It proves that the step which was taken, because of certain considerations, by the Government of the United States of America has failed. It may be said that the United States proposals on trusteeship were actually rejected by the overwhelming majority of the members of the General Assembly. Novel proposals were also submitted by the delegation of the United Kingdom—I am referring to the proposal for the establishment of some kind of emergency or temporary regime in Palestine—but I think that many delegations will agree with me when I say that even these proposals of the United Kingdom failed to muster general support in the General Assembly, and it may be considered that these proposals as well have been rejected by the General Assembly.

By virtue of this situation, some days ago the United States of America, with the support of the representatives of some other states, submitted another and still newer proposal for the creation in Palestine of some kind of regime, which cannot be described as the regime contemplated by the United Kingdom proposals and which at the same time cannot be called a trusteeship regime. It is now being called the establishment in Palestine of a medi-

ator, with the appropriate appurtenances and machinery.

However, the USSR delegation wishes to ask this question: Are there any reasons for setting up in Palestine this post of mediator appointed by the United Nations? It is the profound conviction of my delegation that there is no reason to do so if we take into account the present *de facto* situation in Palestine, which is as follows: In Palestine there exists one of the two states contemplated in the decision of the United Nations rendered last November. The Jewish state is in fact in existence. The delegation of the United States has not confirmed for our benefit whether the United States Government has in fact recognized Israel, but even if this is not so, a fact remains a fact. One of the two states provided for in the resolution of the General Assembly of 29 November is in existence in Palestine.

Under these circumstances, the imposition of some kind of temporary regime upon Palestine—a regime which the Government of the United States may consider some kind of vague trusteeship—is unfounded, to say the least, and such a step on the part of the General Assembly would even be insufficiently serious if the members were to take a look at the actual situation in Palestine.

Even if the resolution submitted by the Sub-Committee were to be adopted, everyone would understand that this would not jeopardize the existing decision for the partition of Palestine into two independent states which is still in force. Nevertheless, the delegation of the USSR objects to the adoption of this new resolution because it would merely confuse the situation which prevails at the present time. The adoption of such a resolution would be utilized by the enemies of the United Nations decision for the partition of Palestine with a view to confounding the confusion which already prevails.

For these reasons my delegation cannot accept these novel proposals and will vote against the draft resolution. I should like to call the attention of delegations to the fact that in my opinion we have, in the course of our discussion, lost sight of several aspects of the question. In the first place, we have lost sight of the fact that so far in Palestine there is one state, the Jewish state, but no other state, whereas there was a decision for the establishment of two states. For some reasons which are, may I say, peculiar, the delegations of the Arab states do not consider it possible to

endorse the creation of the new Arab state. Owing to circumstances which are no less peculiar, the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom do not consider it proper to support the creation of a new Arab state in Palestine.

After all, however, the United Nations must base itself, first of all, on the interests of Palestine and its people. This was the consideration which was taken into account by the General Assembly when it adopted its decision on 29 November 1947. We are told that the United States and the United Kingdom are greatly concerned to see to it that the struggle between Arabs and Jews in Palestine should come to an end. The delegation of the USSR, however, cannot accept this. The United States and the United Kingdom have done their best to wreck any and all proposals designed to put an end to the struggle between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine. Not a single one of the proposals which were least significant but a little bit effective enjoyed the support of the United States or of the United Kingdom. As a result of this also, Palestine is the scene of carnage. The Arabs and the Jews are paying with their heads and their blood for this situation, the responsibility for which weighs heavily on the shoulders, first of all, of the United States, which undertook this political game directed not only against the interests of the local population of Palestine but also against the interests of the United Nations, because the United States has placed this organization as a whole in a situation which is embarrassing, a situation which, more than that, is ludicrous.

If the information which we have received to the effect that the United States has recognized the Jewish state is correct, what is the situation? With one hand, in the Political Committee and in the General Assembly, the United States is dragging through certain proposals, while with the other hand it is endorsing other plans. This, I submit, is a policy devoid of principle, and one which is directed not only against the interests of the people of Palestine but against those of the United Nations as a whole.

In this respect, the USSR pursued a consistent policy. It based itself, in the first instance, on the interests of the peoples of Palestine. The USSR has no reason to blush for its behavior in the consideration of this question—in contradistinction to the Governments of some other states.

CAMP KINDERLAND

on SYLVAN LAKE

HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.
Modern Progressive Children's Camp of the
Jewish Peoples' Fraternal Order
SPORTS — EDUCATION
Registrations Accepted Now
1 Union Square, N. Y. GR. 7-8459