

**SOVIETS AND PALESTINE
USSR-ISRAEL DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS**

**1. SOVIET-ISRAELI RELATIONS
UP TO AND INCLUDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATIONS
April 13, 1948
May 18, 1948**

SOURCE:

**SOVIET-ISRAELI RELATIONS
A Collection of Documents
Volume 1: 1941-1949**

**Source: SOVIET-ISRAELI RELATIONS. Documents. 1941-1953
[СОВЕТСКО-ИЗРАИЛЬСКИЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ. Документы. 1941-1953
\(coldwar.ru\)](http://coldwar.ru)**

Language: Russian

Translated into English and transcribed.

E-Book: May 2021

***The Socialist Truth in Cyprus Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
London Bureaux
<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk>***

www.directdemocracy4u.uk



**1. SOVIET-ISRAELI RELATIONS
UP TO AND INCLUDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATIONS**

April 13, 1948

May 18, 1948

CONTENT

**1.1. REFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE USSR
FOREIGN MINISTRY "PALESTINIAN PROBLEM"**

March 5, 1947

**1.2. NOTE OF THE HEAD OF THE MIDDLE EAST DIVISION OF THE FOREIGN
MINISTRY OF THE USSR I. V. SAMYLOVSKIY DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER OF
THE USSR J.A. MALIK**

March 14, 1947

**1.3. CONSIDERATIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST DIVISION OF THE USSR
FOREIGN MINISTRY ON THE POSITION OF THE USSR ON THE PALESTINIAN
ISSUE April 12, 1947**

**1.4. REFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE USSR
FOREIGN MINISTRY ON THE PALESTINIAN ISSUE**

April 15, 1947

**1.5. A. A. GROMYKO, THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR TO
THE UN, AT THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON
THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE**

May 14, 1947

**1.6. NOTE OF THE HEAD OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE
FOREIGN MINISTRY OF THE USSR I. N. BAKULIN TO THE FIRST DEPUTY
FOREIGN MINISTER OF THE USSR A. Y. VYSHINSKY**

July 30, 1947

**1.7. A. A. GROMYKO, THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR TO
THE UN, AT THE PLENARY SESSION OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE UN
GENERAL ASSEMBLY.**

November 26, 1947

**1.8. RECORDING OF S. K. TSARAPKIN, THE CHARGE D.C. CHARGE D.C. IN
THE UNITED STATES, WITH E. EPSTEIN, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE IN WASHINGTON.**

January 26, 1948

**1.9. REFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE USSR
FOREIGN MINISTRY "THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE AFTER THE UN
DECISION ON THE PARTITION OF THE COUNTRY".**

April 13, 1948

1.10. PROTOCOL RECORDING OF THE SPEECH OF THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR TO THE UN A. A. GROMYKO AT THE MEETING OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

April 20, 1948

1.11. TELEGRAM OF ISRAELI FOREIGN MINISTER M. SHERTOK TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR V. M. MOLOTOV.

May 15, 1948

1.12. TELEGRAM OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR V.M. MOLOTOV TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF ISRAEL M. SCHERTOK.

May 18, 1948

1.13. EXCHANGE OF TELEGRAMS BETWEEN ISRAELI FOREIGN MINISTER M. SHERTOK AND SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTER V. M. MOLOTOV.

May 24, 1948,

May 25, 1948

**REFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE USSR FOREIGN
MINISTRY "PALESTINIAN PROBLEM"**

March 5, 1947

Our position on the Palestinian issue should probably be based, if the issue is referred by Britain to the United Nations, on the following grounds:

1. The British mandate for Palestine must be abolished because it makes it impossible to resolve the Palestinian question in a fundamental way and constantly poses a threat to security in the Middle East.
2. British troops should be withdrawn from Palestine in order to create a normal situation there.
3. The United Nations must prepare the conditions for a united, independent and democratic Palestine that ensures equal national and democratic rights for the peoples who inhabit it.
4. The Jewish question in Western Europe could not be resolved through immigration to Palestine, since only the complete destruction of all the roots of fascism and the democratization of Western Europe could give the Jewish masses normal living conditions.

Deputy Head of the Middle East Division

M. Maximov Attache of the Middle East Department of S. Nemchinov

**NOTE OF THE HEAD OF THE MIDDLE EAST DIVISION OF THE FOREIGN
MINISTRY OF THE USSR I. V. SAMYLOVSKIY DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER OF
THE USSR J.A. MALIK**

March 14, 1947

Soy.

At the same time, I submit a reference on the Palestinian issue.

In connection with The Appeal of Trygve Lee to T. Gromyko regarding the opinion of the Soviet government on the creation of a special United Nations committee to discuss the Palestinian problem, on March 6, 1947, Gromyko was sent under the signature of T.M. Molotov telegram instructing to give consent to Trygve Lee on the creation of the committee mentioned.

Our position on the Palestinian issue in the report note addressed to T. Vyshinsky A.Y. was as follows:

1. The British mandate for Palestine should be abolished because it was an obstacle to resolving the question of Palestine.
2. British troops should be withdrawn from Palestine in order to create a normal situation there.
3. The United Nations must draft a statute of a single independent democratic Palestine, with equal national and democratic rights for the peoples who inhabit it.

I. Samylovsky

**CONSIDERATIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST DIVISION OF THE USSR FOREIGN
MINISTRY ON THE POSITION OF THE USSR ON THE PALESTINIAN ISSUE
April 12, 1947**

Secretly

Possible position of the USSR when discussing the Palestinian issue at the United Nations

The USSR's position on the question of Palestine can be summarized in the form of the following provisions:

1. The British mandate for Palestine must be abolished.
2. British troops must be withdrawn from Palestine.
3. The United Nations must draft a statute of a single independent democratic Palestine, with equal national and democratic rights for the peoples who inhabit it.
4. The Jewish question in Western Europe could not be resolved by immigration only to Palestine, since only the complete destruction of all the roots of fascism and the democratization of Western Europe could give the Jewish masses normal living conditions.

I.

The British mandate for Palestine must be abolished because it is an insurmountable and fundamental obstacle to the fundamental resolution of the Palestinian question. The British Government, having adopted a mandate for Palestine in 1922, committed itself to promoting the development of that state towards local government and local autonomy. By virtue of the mandate, the United Kingdom has obtained all rights under the law and governance of Palestine, including control over external relations and the judicial system. The mandate enshrined for England the right to keep its troops in Palestine. The unfettered ruler of the country is the English High Commissioner, who owns the fullness of the legislative and executive power. And yet, Britain, which has ruled Palestine for almost a quarter of a century, with all the broad powers, the vast state and military apparatus as a mandate-holder has failed in its task and has failed to establish order in the country, to prevent almost continuous bloodshed posing a threat to security in the Middle East.

II.

British troops should be withdrawn from Palestine in order to create a normal situation there. The urgent withdrawal of British troops from Palestine must be carried out in order to create a provision there that would prepare the conditions for the organization of Palestinian self-rule, since the presence of British troops in Palestine creates anxiety and disarray not only in Palestine itself, but also in neighbouring countries. Palestine, which is one of the main bases of British troops at the Near East, is included by Britain as part of the overall plan of British military activities in this part of the world, aimed at creating a military-strategic foothold, which is not only not a necessity at present, but also threatens complications for the countries of the Middle East.

III.

The demands of the progressive social circles of Palestine for a united independent and democratic Palestine that ensures equal national and democratic rights for all the peoples inhabiting it must be supported.

The United Nations must prepare the conditions for the establishment of an independent democratic Palestinian State within a certain period of time and work with the people of Palestine on the statute of that State. At the same time, the United Nations must be the guarantor of the conditions it has developed to establish an independent and democratic Palestinian State.

The independent and democratic State of Palestine is included in the United Nations. Attempts to resolve the Jewish issue in the states of Western Europe only at the expense of Jewish immigration to Palestine are doomed to failure, as only the complete destruction of all the roots of fascism and the complete democratization of the countries of Western Europe will be able to give the Jewish masses normal living conditions in any country.

V.

Any attempt to obtain individual custody of Palestine from the United Nations cannot be accepted. There is no doubt that Britain, which claims to retain its mandate for Palestine or for guardianship, will pursue the same policy in Palestine as it did during the mandate period.

It is more appropriate to discuss the establishment of collective custody of the United Nations over Palestine, although it should be taken into account that the population of that country (both Arabs and Jews) is mature enough to gain full independence and that both Arabs and Jews are in principle negative for guardianship, demanding full independence and the establishment of a Jewish (Jewish demand) or An Arab (Arab) State.

M. Maximov

REFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY ON THE PALESTINIAN ISSUE April 15, 1947

Secretly

(To the forthcoming discussion of the Palestinian issue at the United Nations)

Position of the United States

The last official U.S. position was formulated in Truman's statement of October 3, 1946, Truman stated that U.S. public opinion would support the proposal for a viable Jewish state that controls its own immigration and economic policies in the relevant area of Palestine, not the whole of Palestine, and the immediate entry into Palestine of 100,000 Jewish immigrants, as proposed by the Jewish Agency. The U.S. government could support such a decision.

The U.S. interest in Palestine is mainly due to the following circumstances:

1. The seizure by the United States trusts of the richest oil resources of the Middle East and the desire of the United States to establish the hegemony of American

capital in the Middle East markets. An American oil pipeline will pass through Palestine and American oil refineries will be built here.

2. The U.S. desire to establish its air and sea bases in the Middle East and, in particular, Palestine in order to establish American world domination.

Under Truman, the United States strongly supported the Zionists and, seeking to establish its economic and military domination over the countries of the Middle East, focused on the establishment of a Zionist state in Palestine. Influential circles of American Zionists support this policy Truman. Part of the U.S. position depends on the presence of 2 million Jewish voters in the United States and American Zionist capitalists.

The United States considers that Palestine is for them an extremely important strategic and economic springboard on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea. Hence the exceptionally strong support of the Zionists in their quest to establish a Zionist state in Palestine, even to the detriment of the U.S. relationship with the Arab countries.

ENGLAND'S POSITION

Britain's last position on the Palestinian issue was reflected at the London Conference in January 1947.

The British Government has proposed to Arab delegates and the Jewish Agency a plan to establish two autonomous cantons in Palestine: Jewish and Arab, which must submit to the central triple-A government (Arab-Jewish-English).

Arabs must guarantee the rights of the Jewish minority living on their territory in their canton. The Jewish canton should make the same commitment to the Arab minority. New 100,000 Jewish immigrants must be admitted to the Jewish canton.

The Triple Government would exist in Palestine for four years, after which a bi-national constituent assembly would be established in Palestine, which would develop the constitution of a Palestinian state. The Palestinian State will be placed in custody for a five-year term. Relations between the UK and the Palestinian state will be governed by a treaty.

This position was rejected by both Jews and Arabs. Britain referred the matter to the United Nations, believing that Britain itself, as a mandate-holder, could not solve the problem of the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine (as the Zionists and the United States insist) or the Arab state (as the Arabs insist).

Bevin's statement of 25 February 1947 on this issue states that the British government "as a mandate-holder is not authorized to make such a decision."

For England, Palestine acts as a strategic springboard to ensure the freedom of maritime and air communications to India. In Palestine, the English oil pipeline that supplies Iraqi oil is coming to an end.

If in the first period of the administration of Palestine the British relied mainly on the Zionists, patronizing Jewish immigration and attracting Jewish capital to Palestine, in 1925 England decided to bet on the Arabs. At the same time, England tried to play the role of arbiter between the two struggling parties in Palestine.

Britain's decision to refer the question of Palestine to the United Nations appears to have been the result of the following reasons:

1. It is inability for England to propose a plan that has been adopted by the Arab and Jewish parties while at the same time retaining All England's position in Palestine.
2. It is impossible for Britain to bear the heavy financial burden in Palestine of maintaining a significant armed force and state apparatus there.

3. Increasing pressure from the United States and the planned unified Anglo-Saxon plan to capture the resources of the Middle East (oil, airbases, military supply and training of local armies, etc.).

By transferring the question of Palestine to the United Nations, Britain continues to consider itself a mandate-taker Power and, therefore, no radical solution to the question of Palestine without its consent is not yet possible. By shifting responsibility on the question of Palestine to the United Nations, Britain is trying to buy time and is reserving its position on the peoples of Palestine.

POSITION OF THE ARAB STATES

The proposals of the Arab delegations on the Palestinian issue were outlined in a memorandum handed down on 21 November 1946 by the head of the Syrian delegation to the members of the United Nations. The proposals consisted of a number of items, the main ones of which were:

1. The appointment of the Palestinian High Commissioner as an interim Government of Palestine, with the transfer of the entire executive and legislative power to it, but with the preservation of the High Commissioner's veto over the transitional period.
2. Elections of the Palestinian Constituent Assembly.
3. The adoption of a democratic Palestinian constitution, which could not be vetoed by the High Commissioner and which provided for the election of a legislative body.
4. Ending Jewish immigration.
5. The termination of the mandate after the appointment of the head of the Palestinian state, but no later than December 31, 1948.
6. Conclusion of an alliance agreement with England.

Arab progressive organizations, such as the Arab League for National Liberation, are fighting for the independence of Palestine and the abolition of the mandate, for the withdrawal of British troops from the country, for the democratization of the country. The League stands for Arab-Jewish unity in the struggle against imperialism and Zionism.

IV. POSITION of the Zionists

In a resolution adopted in December 1946, the Basel Congress of Zionists demanded:

- (a) The transformation of Palestine into a Jewish "community of nations" into a Jewish hotbed;
- b) the transfer of control over all Jewish immigration to Palestine to the Jewish Agency.

Congress rejected the plan to divide Palestine into Arab, Jewish and English zones. The Zionist organizations in Palestine are unapologetic about the Arabs. Only two organizations, the League of Arab-Jewish Cooperation and Rapprochement and the Palestinian Communist Party, are advocating the establishment of a binational Jewish-Arab State in Palestine on the basis of full equality of Jews and Arabs, for the full independence of Palestine and for the establishment of a truly democratic Palestinian constitution.

V. POSSIBLE POSITION OF THE USSR WHEN DISCUSSING THE PALESTINIAN ISSUE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The USSR's position on the question of Palestine can be summarized in the form of the following provisions:

1. The British mandate for Palestine must be abolished.

The British mandate for Palestine must be abolished because it is an insurmountable and fundamental obstacle to the fundamental resolution of the Palestinian question. The British Government, having adopted a mandate for Palestine in 1922, committed itself to promoting the development of that state towards local government and local autonomy. By virtue of the mandate, the United Kingdom has obtained all rights under the law and governance of Palestine, including control over external relations and the judicial system. The mandate enshrined for England the right to keep its troops in Palestine. The unfettered ruler of the country is the English High Commissioner, who owns the fullness of the legislative and executive power. And yet Britain, which has ruled Palestine for almost a quarter of a century, with all the broad powers, the vast state and military apparatus as a mandate-holder state has failed in its task and has failed to establish order in the country, to prevent almost continuous bloodshed posing a threat to security in the Middle East.

2. British troops must be withdrawn from Palestine.

British troops should be withdrawn from Palestine in order to create a normal situation there. The urgent withdrawal of British troops from Palestine must be carried out in order to create a provision there that would prepare the conditions for the organization of Palestinian self-rule, since the presence of British troops in Palestine creates anxiety and disarray not only in Palestine itself, but also in neighbouring countries. Palestine, one of the main bases of British troops in the Middle East, is included by Britain as part of the overall plan of British military activities in this part of the world aimed at establishing a military-strategic foothold, which is not only not a necessity at present, but also threatens complications for the countries of the Middle East.

3. The United Nations must draft a statute of a single independent democratic Palestine, with equal national and democratic rights for the peoples who inhabit it.

The demands of the progressive social circles of Palestine for a united independent and democratic Palestine that ensures equal national and democratic rights for all the peoples inhabiting it must be supported.

The United Nations must prepare the conditions for the establishment of an independent democratic Palestinian State within a certain period of time and work with the people of Palestine on the statute of that State. At the same time, the United Nations must be the guarantor of the conditions it has developed to establish an independent and democratic Palestinian State.

The independent and democratic State of Palestine is included in the United Nations.

4. The Jewish question in Western Europe could not be resolved by immigration only to Palestine, since only the complete destruction of all the roots of fascism and the democratization of Western Europe could give the Jewish masses normal living conditions.

Attempts to resolve the Jewish issue in the states of Western Europe only at the expense of Jewish immigration to Palestine are doomed to failure, as only the complete destruction of all the roots of fascism and the complete democratization of the countries of Western Europe will be able to give the Jewish masses normal living conditions in any country.

Any attempt to obtain individual custody of Palestine from the United Nations cannot be accepted. There is no doubt that Britain, which claims to retain its mandate for

Palestine or for guardianship, will pursue the same policy in Palestine as it did during the mandate period.

It is more appropriate to discuss the establishment of the United Nations over Palestine, although in this case it should be taken into account that the population of that country (both Arabs and Jews) is mature enough to gain full independence and establish a Jewish (Jewish demand) or an Arab (Arab demand) State.

M. Maximov

**A. A. GROMYKO, THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR TO THE UN, AT THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE
May 14, 1947**

The debate, both in the plenary sessions of the General Assembly and in the Political Committee, showed that the question of Palestine had become a pressing political issue. This view seems to be shared by all the delegations that participated in the discussion. This view is already confirmed by the fact that this issue is the subject of discussion at the United Nations.

The fact that the question of Palestine has been the subject of debate in the General Assembly not only shows, however, its poignancy, but also imposes on the United Nations responsibility for its decision. This obliges us to study it carefully and comprehensively, and we must be guided by the principles and objectives of our Organization and the interests of maintaining peace and international security. The discussion also showed that it seemed difficult to make any definite, much less definitive, substantive solution at this special session of the Assembly. The discussion at this session, therefore, can only be considered the first stage of the consideration of the question of Palestine. In the general view of delegations, the General Assembly will have to decide on the substance of the issue at the regular session at the end of 1947.

Nevertheless, the discussion showed that delegations from a number of countries found it useful to exchange views on some important aspects of the question of Palestine already at this session. Discussion, albeit incomplete, of some important aspects of the issue is useful. First, it allows delegations to become more familiar with the facts relating to the question of Palestine, and especially the situation in that country at present, and secondly, such a discussion, which is even preliminary, makes it easier for us to determine the functions and direction of the commission's work, which we are going to set up to prepare substantive proposals for the next session of the General Assembly.

In discussing the question of Palestine, at least tentatively, and in discussing the tasks and functions of the commission mentioned above, it is impossible not to note, first of all, the important fact that the mandated system of governance of Palestine established in 1922 has not paid off. She couldn't pass the exam. The correctness of such a conclusion can hardly be disputed by anyone. There is no doubt that the objectives set in the mandate have not been achieved. The solemn declarations that accompanied the establishment of a mandated system of governance for Palestine remained declarations that had not been implemented.

The conclusion that the mandated system of governance of Palestine has not paid off is borne out by the whole history of the governance of Palestine on the basis of

this system, not to mention that it is confirmed by the current situation in that country. In this regard, it is useful to recall that as far back as 1937, Lord Peel's English commission, after examining the situation in Palestine, declared that "the exercise of the mandate is not possible". This conclusion was reached at the time by the Permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, which also pointed out the "impossibility" of the implementation of the Palestinian mandate. The commission we are about to establish should be familiar with the historical facts pertaining to this issue.

There are many other facts pertaining to the history of mandated governance of Palestine, which confirm the bankruptcy of this system of governance. However, there is hardly any need to elaborate on these facts. Suffice it to point to, for example, the Arab uprising that erupted in 1936 and lasted virtually several years. There is also ample evidence of the situation in Palestine and the conclusion reached above. Everyone knows the bloody events that took place in Palestine. Such events are becoming more frequent. They are therefore increasingly attracting the attention of the peoples of the world, and above all the United Nations. It was as a result of the bankruptcy of the mandated system of governance of Palestine, which had led to the extreme deterioration of the situation and to the bloody events in Palestine that the matter had come to the consideration of the General Assembly. The fact that the British Government itself has referred the matter to the General Assembly is very revealing. This cannot (but mn) be seen as a recognition of the impossibility of continuing the situation in Palestine. The Commission should also take a close look at the current situation in Palestine.

It is known that the British Government has repeatedly pointed out at various times, even before the issue was referred to the General Assembly, that the mandated system of governance of Palestine had failed and that a solution to the question of how to deal with Palestine should be found by the United Nations. For example, Mr. Bevin stated in the House of Commons on 18 February 1947 the following: "We intend to present to the United Nations a historical report on how the British Government has exercised its custody of Palestine for twenty-five years. We will explain that the mandate has not been implemented in practice and that the commitments made to the two communities in Palestine have proved irreconcilable." This statement by the British Foreign Secretary expressly and openly states the reality of the mandated administration of Palestine. It is a recognition that the Administration has failed to address the issue of the relationship between Arabs and Jews, a major and sensitive issue, and has failed to achieve the objectives of the mandate.

The existing form of government, as Mr. Bevin had confirmed, had proved unacceptable to the Arab or Jewish population of Palestine. Both Arabs and Jews are protesting against it. It has not enjoyed or enjoyed the support of the peoples of Palestine, and without such support it can only lead to further difficulties and complications.

Referring to the attitude of the Arab and Jewish population towards the mandated system of governance of Palestine, the British Foreign Secretary stated in his address to the House of Commons on 26 February 1917 (1947 mn) :

"The administration in Palestine faced the most difficult task. It did not enjoy the support of the people, it was criticized on both sides."

The Commission we are about to establish cannot but take into account the conclusions drawn by the British Government itself regarding the results of the mandated governance of Palestine.

It is not only the British Government that has come to this conclusion. In fact, the so-called Anglo-American Committee for the Inquiry on Palestine, which studied the issue in 1946, came to the same conclusion.

“Palestine is an armed camp. We found signs of this immediately after we crossed the border. Every day more and more the presence of a tense atmosphere was found here. Many buildings are surrounded by barbed wire hedges and other defensive fortifications. We ourselves were heavily guarded by armed police; often we were accompanied by armoured vehicles... There are well-built police barracks all over the country.”

This is how the Anglo-American committee describes the situation in Palestine. His characterization of the situation was further evidence of what the mandated administration of Palestine had led to. The transformation of Palestine into an “armed camp,” as the committee notes, is a fact that speaks for itself. In such circumstances, it is impossible to speak seriously about the protection of the interests of the Palestinian population, the improvement of the material conditions of its existence, the rise of its cultural level.

The same committee points to the following very interesting facts: the total number of full-time employees in the police and prison administration in 1945 reached 15,000. This figure is very revealing. She explains to us where the considerable resources that weigh on the population go. Under other circumstances, these funds could be used for the economic and cultural development of the country, for the benefit of its peoples.

Here’s another fact. In 1944/45, \$18 million, 400,000 was spent on maintaining “order and law.” During the same fiscal year, only \$2 million was spent on health care and \$2 million in 800,000 dollars on education.

In citing these figures, the committee comes to the following noteworthy conclusion: “So, even from a budgetary point of view, Palestine has become a kind of paramilitary and police state.”

The committee’s report above is of considerable interest in terms of the characterization of the situation in Palestine and raises serious questions about how to rectify the situation and find a solution to the question of Palestine that is in the interests of its peoples as well as the common interests of the United Nations. The commission’s task should be to help the United Nations achieve this solution by examining the actual situation on the ground in Palestine.

Should it be surprising that, given the situation in Palestine, both Jews and Arabs are demanding the elimination of the mandate? That’s where they’re all about. There is no disagreement between them on this issue. And with this the United Nations cannot but be reckoned with when considering the future of Palestine.

When discussing the task of the commission on the preparation of proposals for Palestine, our attention cannot but be focused on another important aspect of this issue. As is well known, the aspirations of a large part of the Jewish people are connected with the question of Palestine and its future state structure. This provision hardly needs proof. It is not surprising, therefore, that this aspect is given much attention to this aspect in both the General Assembly and the Political Committee meeting. Interest in it is understandable and quite justified.

The Jewish people suffered exceptional calamities and suffering in the last war. These calamities and sufferings, without exaggeration, are indescribable. They are difficult to express in a series of dry figures about the sacrifices made by the Jewish people from the fascist occupiers. In the territories where the Nazis dominated, the Jews were subjected to almost complete physical extermination. The total number of

Jewish people killed by fascist executioners is approximately 6 million. Only about one and a half million Jews in Western Europe survived the war.

But these figures, giving an idea of the sacrifices suffered by the Jewish people from the fascist aggressors, do not give an idea of the plight of large masses of the Jewish population after the war.

A huge number of surviving Jewish population of Europe was deprived of homeland, shelter and means of subsistence. Hundreds of thousands of Jews roam different countries of Europe in search of livelihoods, in search of refuge. Most of them are in camps for displaced persons and all continue to suffer great hardship. These deprivations are highlighted, in particular, by a representative of a Jewish organization, whom we heard in the Political Committee.

It is permissible to ask: can the United Nations, given such a plight of hundreds of thousands of surviving Jewish populations, not show interest in the situation of these people, separated from their homeland and their hearths? The United Nations cannot and should not be indifferent to this situation, for it would be incompatible with the high principles enshrined in its Charter, the principles of human rights, regardless of race, religious beliefs and gender. It's time not in words, but in practice to help these people. The urgent needs of the people who had suffered greatly as a result of the war waged by Hitler's Germany must be taken care of. This is the duty of the United Nations.

Drawing attention to the need to take care of the needs of the Jewish population, who had been homeless and without their livelihoods, the Soviet delegation considered it necessary to draw the general Assembly's attention to the following important circumstances. The experience of the past, especially during the Second World War, showed that no state in Western Europe was able to provide adequate assistance to the Jewish people in protecting their rights and their very existence from the abuses of the Nazis and their allies. It's a hard fact. But, unfortunately, like all facts, it must be recognized.

The fact that no Western European state was able to protect the basic rights of the Jewish people and protect them from the attacks of fascist executioners explains the desire of the Jews to create their own state. It would be unfair not to ignore this and deny the right of the Jewish people to pursue such an aspiration. The denial of this right for the Jewish people cannot be justified, especially given all that they experienced during the Second World War. Therefore, studying this aspect of the issue and preparing relevant proposals should be an important task for the commission.

I am now approaching the issue that is central to the discussion of the objectives and powers of the commission that we intend to establish: the future of Palestine. It is known that there are many different kinds of projects regarding the future of the Palestinian order and the solution of the Jewish people in connection with the problem of Palestine. In particular, some proposals have been prepared on this issue by the Anglo-American committee I have mentioned. **Among the best-known projects on the future of The Palestinian order, the following are:**

- 1. The formation of a single Arab-Jewish state with equal rights for Arabs and Jews.**
- 2. The division of Palestine into two separate states, Arab and Jewish.**
- 3. The establishment of an Arab state from Palestine without due regard for the rights of the Jewish population.**
- 4. The establishment of a Jewish State from Palestine without due regard for the rights of the Arab population.**

Each of these four main plans, in turn, has different options for settling relations between Arabs and Jews and addressing some other issues. I'm not going to analyse all these projects in detail right now. The Soviet Union will set out in more detail its position on different plans when concrete proposals are prepared and considered, and especially when decisions on the future of Palestine are taken. At this time, I will limit myself to some observations on the merits of the proposed drafts in terms of defining the commission's objectives in this area as well.

In analysing different kinds of projects on the future of Palestine, it is necessary, **first of all, to take into account the specifics of this issue**. It must be taken into account the indisputable fact that the Palestinian population consists of two peoples, Arabs and Jews. Each of them has historical roots in Palestine. Palestine has become the birthplace of both of these peoples, each of which has a prominent place in the economy and cultural life of the country.

The historical past, as well as the current conditions in Palestine, cannot justify any unilateral resolution of the Palestinian question, both in favour of the establishment of an independent Arab State, without regard to the legitimate rights of the Jewish people, and in favour of the establishment of an independent Jewish State, while ignoring the legitimate rights of the Arab population. Both such extreme solutions would not have brought a just solution to this complex issue, since, above all, they would not have ensured the settlement of relations between Arabs and Jews, which is the most important task.

It can only be found to have a just solution if the legitimate interests of both peoples are sufficiently taken into account. All this gives the Soviet delegation reason to conclude that the legitimate interests of the Jewish, as well as the Arab, peoples of Palestine can be protected properly only by the establishment of an independent two-pronged democratic Arab-Jewish state. Such a State should be based on equal rights for the Jewish and Arab populations, which could lay the groundwork for cooperation between the two peoples in their common interest and for the benefit of both of them. It is known that such a plan to decide the future of Palestine has a course in Palestine itself.

Modern history knows not only racial and religious discrimination, which, unfortunately, still takes place in some countries. It also gives us examples of peaceful cooperation between different nationalities within a single State, a collaboration in which each nationality has unlimited opportunities to invest their work and show talent within a single State and in the common interest of the entire nation. Is it not clear that it is useful to take into account the experience of such friendly coexistence and the fraternal community of different nationalities within a single State in dealing with the question of Palestine?

The solution of the question of Palestine by establishing a single Arab-Jewish State with equal rights for Jews and Arabs can thus be seen as one of the possible and most noteworthy ways of dealing with this complex problem. Such a solution to the future of Palestine could provide a healthy basis for the peaceful existence and cooperation of the Arab and Jewish people of Palestine for the benefit of both these peoples and for the benefit of the entire Palestinian population, for peace and security in the Middle East.

If this option were not feasible because of the broken relations between Jews and Arabs - and the commission's opinion on this issue would be very important to know - then the second option, as well as the first one, was to be divided into two independent States, Jewish and Arab. I repeat, such a solution to the question of Palestine would be justified only if it turned out that the relations

between the Jewish population and the Arab population of Palestine were indeed so bad that they could not be established that it was impossible to ensure the peaceful coexistence of Arabs and Jews.

Both of these possible options for resolving the future of Palestine, of course, should be explored by the commission. Its task should be to have a comprehensive and thorough discussion of the drafts on the structure of Palestine in order to present at the next regular session of the General Assembly thoughtful and motivated proposals that would help the United Nations to find a just solution to this issue, in the interests of the peoples of Palestine, the interests of the United Nations and our common interests in promoting peace and international security.

These are the considerations that the Soviet delegation felt was necessary to express at this early stage of the consideration of the question of Palestine.

United Nations. Official report of the First Special Session of the General Assembly, **Volume 1. Plenary sessions of the General Assembly. Transcript for April 28-May 15, 1947. New York, 1947. S. 83-87.**

**NOTE OF THE HEAD OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE FOREIGN
MINISTRY OF THE USSR I. N. BAKULIN TO THE FIRST DEPUTY FOREIGN
MINISTER OF THE USSR A. Y. VYSHINSKY
July 30, 1947**

Secretly

1. Background

Palestine was part of the Ottoman Empire before the First World War.

In 1915, the British government, in order to encourage the Arabs to oppose Turkey, promised in secret negotiations with the sheriff of Mecca Hussein to form after the end of the war an independent Arab state, which was to enter and Palestine.

In May 1916, a treaty was concluded between England and France (Sykes-Picot), under which Palestine at the end of the war was transferred to international administration, the definition of forms of which was in the joint competence of Russia, England and France, and the Palestinian ports of Haifa and Acre were granted to England.

On November 2, 1917, the British government, wanting to secure the support of the influential Jewish bourgeoisie of Europe and the United States in the consolidation of Palestine occupied by English forces for England at that time, published a declaration by Lord Balfour, in which England was obliged to "treat favourably to the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

In 1920, England achieved the transfer of Palestine under the English mandate, approved by the League of Nations on June 24, 1922.

By virtue of the mandate, England received "all rights under the law and governance" of Palestine, including control over external relations, the judicial system and the "holy places". The mandate gave England the right to keep its troops in Palestine. All legislative and executive power in the country was concentrated in the hands of the British High Commissioner, which operates the so-called "Palestinian government" made up of British officials.

The "constitution" of 1922 was supposed to create a "legislative council" in Palestine, but due to the boycott of Arab elections, this event was never held by the British.

The main pillar of British colonial rule in Palestine were the Zionists. On the basis of the mandate, the Jewish Agency was established, a body to assist the Palestinian Government in matters related to the organization of the Jewish National Hearth, in which the Zionists played a major role.

Thus was created on the initiative of the British Jewish National Council (Waad Leumi), officially recognized as a self-government body, whose competence was to collect taxes among Jews for the maintenance of schools and community needs. A Assembly of Deputies was also established. The illegal Jewish army of Haganah (Defence) was created under the Zionist organization, numbering up to 80,000 people, which was used by the British to suppress the Arab national movement. Montgomery's instruction (published in Palestine and Middle East 8. IX. 46) in connection with the preparation of British troops for action against Arab rebels in 1938 explicitly referred to the creation of mixed groups of soldiers and "proven locals" in Palestine. As "verified locals" the instruction recommended the Jews-Zionists.

The economic infiltration of the Zionist capital undermined the foundations of the Arabs of Palestine, and the political privileges granted to the Zionists were detrimental to their national rights and aspirations.

The seizure of Arab lands by the Zionists provoked strong protests from the Arabs. The struggle between Arabs and Jews in Palestine was used by the British. Thus, in particular, with the help of the Jews were suppressed strong anti-English speeches of the Arabs in 1929, 1936, 1939.

The Arab uprising in Palestine, raised in 1935, forced England to negotiate with the Arabs on constitutional reforms in Palestine. However, the British intention to introduce a constitution for the people of Palestine was not approved by the Zionists. In April 1936, a new Arab uprising broke out, far surpassing all previous anti-English protests of the Arabs. It was supported by Arabs of other countries and Muslims of India.

The unrest lasted 3 years. With the outbreak of the Second World War, the Arab unrest in Palestine would have been an extremely dangerous threat to English domination, forcing the British to reconsider their policy towards the Arabs of Palestine.

As early as 1937, the English royal commission of Lord Peel, which examined the situation in Palestine, came to the conclusion that the mandate "survived" and could not provide England with lasting power over Palestine. The commission's proposed plan to divide Palestine into three parts- English, Jewish and Arabic—was rejected by the Arabs. Under the pressure of the continuing anti-English Arab movement, the British were forced to work out a new course, formulated in the White Paper of 1939. With the White Paper, England refused the exclusive support of the Zionists and tried to cooperate with the top of the Arab national movement, promising to stop Jewish immigration to Palestine by 1944 and to begin negotiations on the independence of Palestine in 1949.

The White Paper of 1939 stirred up strong discontent among the Zionists, which, starting in the spring of 1944, took the form of open armed acts against the British. This struggle took a particularly active form after the end of the Second World War, when the United States provided significant support to the Zionists in the fight against the British.

In August 1945, Truman demanded the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe to Palestine. The British refused to meet this demand. In this regard, in November 1945, a mixed Anglo-American commission was formed, tasked with

examining both the Palestinian and Jewish question in Europe and making proposals to the governments of the United States and England.

On April 30, 1946, the commission published its report.

The Commission recommended allowing 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine. Referring to the situation in Palestine, the Commission recognized that the country "represented an armed camp" and that unrest continued in Palestine, despite the siege and the presence of a huge British army. The report highlighted the irreconcilable animosity between Arabs and Jews living in Palestine.

The Commission recommended that the English mandate for Palestine be retained until custody was established under the United Nations agreement.

The recommendations of the Anglo-American commission caused discontent with both the Zionists and the Arabs.

On July 8, 1946, negotiations between experts from the British and U.S.

governments began in London to develop a concrete plan to solve the Palestinian problem based on a report by the Anglo-American Commission. The experts, citing animosity between Jews and Arabs, recommended the formation of a federation in Palestine of four regions, of which two would be governed by the central government (English) and two would constitute "autonomous" provinces: Arab and Jewish. All major government functions would remain with the central government.

The federation's plan was in the best interests of England, but could not satisfy the Americans, and Truman, under the pretext of having to "revise the whole issue anew", recalled American experts from London.

During this period, the activities of Jewish terrorist organizations increased markedly.

British authorities in Palestine responded with mass repression against Jews.

Following the failure of the Anglo-American experts' meeting, the Arab countries, according to the decision of the Arab League session in Bludan, invited England to start negotiations on a solution to the Palestinian problem. The British accepted the Arab proposal, and on September 10, 1946, a special conference on Palestine was convened in London with the participation of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan and Saudi Arabia.

Jews and Palestinian Arabs refused to participate in the conference.

The Arabs, rejecting the English plan of the federation, put forward their plan, the essence of which boils down to the following.

At the end of 1948, it was envisaged to establish a single independent Palestinian state with a predominantly Arab population, where the rest of the nationalities, including Jews, would be given full rights. Under the plan, an interim Palestinian government consisting of seven Arab and three Jewish ministers should be established immediately. The Provisional Government would prepare elections for the Constituent Assembly. Once a democratic constitution had been adopted by the Constituent Assembly, elections to the Legislature would have been held. Based on the Jewish population in Palestine, Jews would be allocated approximately a third of the seats in the Palestinian Parliament.

After the appointment of the first head of state, the English mandate would cease.

The Jews rejected both the English federal plan and the Arab proposals to establish an Arab independent state in Palestine and demanded the free immigration of Jews to Palestine, the transfer of control over immigration into the hands of the Jewish Agency and the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine.

The United States, judging by Truman Attlee's telegram on the termination of the conference, supported the Jewish Agency's proposal and suggested that Britain allow 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine.

The British government, under the pretext of the need to study the Arab plan of the state of Palestine, postponed the conference first until December 16, 1946, and then until January 27, 1947.

On the eve of the resumption of the London Conference on the Palestinian Issue in Basel, the 27th World Jewish Congress was held, which supported the demands of Jews for free immigration and the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine.

The London Conference, which resumed on 27 January 1947, was attended by representatives of Palestinian Arabs, in addition to Arab representatives.

During the course of the conference, the British, having met resistance from Arab delegates to the federal plan they had put forward, proposed the creation of two autonomous cantons in Palestine: Jewish and Arab, which should be subordinated to the triple government (Arab-Jewish-English) with a place in Jerusalem.

The Arabs also rejected this offer of the British.

On 14 February 1947, Bevin stated that the British Government had decided to refer the question of Palestine to the United Nations after an agreement had not been reached.

2. UN Commission Review of the Issue

On 28 April this year, at the suggestion of the British Government, a special session of the UN General Assembly was convened, with the task of establishing and instructing a special commission to prepare for consideration at the next regular session of the Assembly of the report on Palestine.

From the procedural debate, it can be concluded that the United States and Britain have decided to join forces and prevent detailed discussion of the Palestinian issue on the merits, presumably in the expectation that during the work of the UN commission in Palestine they will be able to amicably agree among themselves on the future of Palestine and will try to reconcile their original positions on which they stood before the consideration of the Palestinian issue at the United Nations.

Both the representative of England and the U.S. representative at the General Assembly did not express new views of their Governments. The positions of England and the United States thus remained as they were before the Assembly (see reference 337-BV of 15.4.47 on the positions of the United States, England, Arabs and Zionists in the Palestinian issue).

Only indirectly, Marshall's letter, published in the American press on 6 May this year, in response to a question about whether the United States intended to take a stand on the issue of custody of Palestine, indicated that the issue would not arise until any steps were taken to include Palestine in the UN guardianship system. At the same time, Marshall stressed that under Article 77 of the UN Charter, the transfer of territories under the mandate of the League of Nations to the UN is a voluntary, not automatic, action.

According to the resolution adopted by the session, representatives of 11 states were appointed to the commission to draft a report on Palestine at the upcoming session of the UN General Assembly: Australia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, India, Iran, Holland, Peru, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

The dedicated commission, after reviewing the Palestinian problem, arrived in Palestine on 15 June to study the situation on the ground.

A) The position of the Arabs. The Arab Executive Committee in Palestine decided to boycott the UN commission and urged all Arabs not to give any testimony to the members of the commission.

Thus, the UN commission has the opportunity to read only the testimony of the Jewish part of the Palestinian population.

The attitude of Palestinian Arabs towards the UN-Commission can only be judged by the statements in the Arab press by the leaders of Palestinian Arabs and Arabs of other countries, which are reduced to the demand to end the British mandate for Palestine, grant it independence and suspend Jewish immigration.

The representatives of the Arab countries, according to the statement of the Syrian President Shukri al-Kuati, published in the newspaper "Oryan" on 21 July this year, fully share the opinion of Palestinian Arabs and will oppose the division of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

The only correct solution to the Palestinian issue, according to representatives of the Arab countries, outlined in the memorandum submitted on behalf of the Arab countries to the UN commission in Beirut on July 22 this year, is the formation of a free government in Palestine on the basis of proportional representation.

B) The position of the Jews. The Jewish Agency in its statements to the UN commission requires the organization in Palestine of a Jewish state with the right of unlimited admission to Palestine of Jews-immigrants from other countries.

Ben-Gurion, chairman of the executive committee of the Jewish Agency, proposed a plan to the UN Commission to establish a Jewish state for all of Palestine, to repeal the 1939 English White Paper and to promote the Jewish-Arab Alliance. Ben-Gurion stated that the Jewish Agency would be unapologetically applicable to any rulings concerning the formation of a bi-national state and the imposition of a mandate of England or the United Nations over Palestine.

3. Our positions

The attitude of the Soviet Union to the Palestinian question was outlined in the speech of T. Gromyko at the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on 14 May 1947.

On this basis, when discussing the Palestinian issue at the forthcoming Assembly, we must:

1. To seek the abolition of the mandated system of governance of Palestine as having failed to justify itself.
2. To seek the withdrawal of British troops from Palestine, since without this condition it is impossible to create an independent state in Palestine.
3. Support the idea of an independent, two-pronged, democratic Arab-Jewish state based on equal rights for the Jewish and Arab populations.
4. If it turns out in the discussion of the Palestinian question that relations between Arabs and Jews have deteriorated so much that their peaceful existence in a two-pronged democratic State cannot be supported, then support the creation of two independent States, Arab and Jewish.
5. If a proposal to resettle 100,000 Jews in Palestine is put to the Assembly for discussion, we should support this proposal.

The above proposals, which define our attitude to the Palestinian question, have been communicated by Gromyko.

The need for additional proposals and guidance may arise after a report has been submitted by the UN committee investigating the situation in Palestine.

Head of the Middle East Division

I. Bakulin

**A. A. GROMYKO, THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR TO THE UN, AT THE PLENARY SESSION OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.
November 26, 1947**

The Soviet Union, as it is known, has no direct material or other interests in Palestine. He is interested in the question of Palestine as a member of the United Nations and as a great Power, which, along with other great Powers, has a special responsibility to maintain international peace. This determines the position taken by the Government of the Soviet Union on the question of Palestine. The position of the Soviet Union has already been expressed quite fully at the special session of the General Assembly in early 1947, as well as during the debate at this session of the Assembly. Therefore, I will not repeat what was previously said by the representatives of the USSR during the discussion on the future of Palestine. It was therefore only natural that each delegation felt obliged not only to take a stand by voting in favour of a proposal, but also to set out the motives behind it.

The Soviet Government, when discussing the future of Palestine at the special session of the General Assembly, pointed out the two most appropriate options for dealing with the issue. The first option is the creation of a single democratic Arab-Jewish state with equal rights for Arabs and Jews. If this option proves unrealistic if Arabs and Jews claim that they will not be able to live together because of the spoiled relations between them, the Soviet Government, through its delegation to the Assembly, has pointed to the second option: the division of Palestine into two independent democracies, the Arab and the Jewish ones.

The Special Session of the Assembly, as you know, has established a Special Commission that has carefully examined the question of Palestine in terms of finding the most acceptable solution to this issue. After the end of the commission's work, we were pleased to note that the proposal of this commission, or rather the majority of it, coincides with one of the two options named by the Soviet Union delegation at the special session. I am referring to the option of dividing Palestine into two separate democratic states, the Arab and the Jewish.

The delegation of the Soviet Union, therefore, could not but support this option, recommended by the Special Commission. It is now known that not only did the Special Commission considering the future of Palestine accept the option of partition, but that the overwhelming majority of other delegations represented in the General Assembly agreed to the proposal. The vast majority of The United Nations member countries have reached the same conclusion that the Soviet Government has reached as a result of a comprehensive examination of how the future of Palestine should be resolved.

The question arises as to why the vast majority of delegations represented in the General Assembly have settled on this option rather than on any other option. This can only be explained by the fact that all other options for resolving the question of Palestine have proved to be unrealistic and impractical. I also refer to the option of establishing an independent, unified Arab-Jewish state with equal rights for Arabs

and Jews. Experience with the question of Palestine, including the experience of the Special Commission, had shown that Jews and Arabs in Palestine did not want or could not live together. This was followed by a logical conclusion: if these two peoples inhabiting Palestine, both of whom have deep historical roots in that country, cannot live together within a single State, there is no choice but to form instead of one two States, Arab and Jewish. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, no other feasible option could be invented.

Opponents of the partition of Palestine into two independent democracies usually point out that this decision is aimed at Arabs, against the Arab population of Palestine and against the Arab States in general. This is particularly pointed out by Arab delegations for understandable reasons. The Soviet delegation could not share that view. The proposal to divide Palestine into two independent States, as well as the decision of the Ad Nos Commission established at this session, which endorsed the proposal, which is the subject of our discussion, is not directed against the Arabs. This decision is not directed against any of the two main peoples inhabiting Palestine.

On the contrary, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, this decision is in the fundamental national interests of both peoples, the interests of both the Jewish and Arab people.

Arab representatives point out that the partition of Palestine is a historical injustice. But this view cannot be accepted, if only because the Jewish people have been associated with Palestine for a long historical period of time. Moreover, we cannot lose sight of this, and the Soviet delegation has already pointed out this at the special session of the General Assembly, we cannot lose sight of the situation in which the Jewish people found themselves as a result of the last world war. I will not repeat what the Soviet delegation said in this regard at the special session of the Assembly. However, it is worth recalling now that as a result of the war imposed by Hitler's Germany, Jews as a people suffered more than any other people. You know that there is not a single state in Western Europe that could properly protect the interests of the Jewish people from the arbitrariness and violence of the Nazis. Referring to the proposal for the partition of Palestine, representatives of some countries mentioned the Soviet Union and tried to cast a shadow over the foreign policy of the Soviet government. In particular, the representative of Lebanon has twice exercised in this regard. I have already pointed out that the proposal to divide Palestine into two independent States and the position taken by the Soviet Union in this matter are not directed against the Arabs, which we strongly believe that this solution is in the fundamental national interest not only of Jews but also of Arabs. The peoples of the Soviet Union were sympathetic and sympathetic to the national aspirations of the peoples of the Arab East. The Soviet Union is sympathetic and sympathetic to the attempts of these peoples to free themselves from the last shackles of colonial dependence. Therefore, we do not equate the clumsy statements of some representatives of the Arab states about the foreign policy of the USSR in relation to the question of the future of Palestine with the vital national interests of the Arabs. We distinguish between these kinds of statements, apparently under the impression of minute-long sentiments, and the fundamental interests of the Arab people. The Soviet delegation is confident that the Arabs and Arab countries will look towards Moscow more than once, waiting for the Soviet Union to help fight for its legitimate interests, trying to free themselves from the remnants of foreign dependence.

The Soviet delegation believes that the decision to partition Palestine is in full compliance with the high principles and objectives of the United Nations as well. It is in line with the principle of national self-determination of peoples. The policy of the USSR in the field of national question, pursued since the creation of the Soviet state, is the policy of the commonwealth and self-determination of peoples. All the peoples of the Soviet Union are a united and united family that has endured the ordeal of the war against the strongest and most dangerous enemy that peace-loving peoples have ever faced.

The solution of the question of Palestine by dividing it into two independent States would be of great historical importance, as such a decision would meet the legitimate demands of the Jewish people, whose hundreds of thousands of representatives, as you know, are still homeless, without their own pockets, who have found only temporary shelter in special camps in the territories of some Western European States. I'm not going to talk about the conditions these people live in. These conditions are quite well known. They were said enough by delegates who share the view of the USSR delegation on this issue and support the plan of partition of Palestine into two states.

The Assembly is working hard to find the most just and feasible and at the same time the most radical solution to the question of the future of Palestine. It is based on some indisputable facts that have raised the question of Palestine in the United Nations. What are these facts? Fact one: the mandate system has not paid off. I will say more: the mandate system has gone bankrupt. We have also heard statements from the British representatives that the mandate system of governance of Palestine has not paid off. Such statements were made at the special session as well as at this session of the Assembly. It was because the mandate system went bankrupt that the British Government turned to the United Nations for help. It asked the Assembly to take a decision and thereby take control of the question of the future of Palestine. The second fact. The British Government, in contacting the United Nations, stated that it could not take responsibility for all the actions that would have to be taken in Palestine in response to a possible General Assembly decision. In doing so, the British Government has recognized that the General Assembly can, by virtue of its rights and powers, under the Charter, take responsibility for resolving the question of the future of Palestine.

The Soviet delegation, however, considers it useful to draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that the British Assembly still does not feel the support we would be entitled to expect. On the one hand, the British Government has asked the Assembly for assistance in deciding the future of Palestine. On the other hand, the British Government has made so many reservations during the discussion of this issue at the special session, as well as at this session of the Assembly, that it begs the question whether the United Kingdom really wants the question of Palestine to be resolved through the United Nations.

At the special session of the Assembly, the Representative of the United Kingdom, on the one hand, stated that the United Kingdom was prepared to implement United Nations decisions, provided that it was not only the United Kingdom that was responsible for the events to be held.

In making such a statement, the British delegation made it clear to other States that it was prepared to work with the United Nations on the issue.

On the other hand, at the same special session, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government was prepared to implement the relevant decisions of the General Assembly only if Arabs and Jews agreed to a solution. It is

clear to everyone that the first and second statements contradict one another. While the first statement indicates the UK's willingness to cooperate with the United Nations on this issue, the second statement shows that the British Government may not be in the Assembly's decision.

Such reservations were made by the representative of the United Kingdom at this session as well. We heard today's statement from Mr. Cadogan on this matter. In a somewhat modified form, he repeated the idea that the United Kingdom would agree to implement the Assembly's decision, provided that Jews and Arabs were in agreement. But we all know that the Arabs and Jews did not agree among themselves. The discussion of this issue at this session shows that they cannot agree. Prospects for a possible agreement between Arabs and Jews are not visible. This is the view of not only the Soviet delegation, but also all delegations that have come to the conclusion that a decision on this issue is necessary at this session of the Assembly.

All of these reservations by the British delegation indicate that the British government has no real desire to cooperate fully with the United Nations on this issue to this day. At a time when the vast majority of delegations represented in the General Assembly were in favour of a solution now to the question of the future of Palestine, which is for a two-State division, the British Government states that it will only be considered when the Assembly decides when Jews and Arabs agree on each other. I repeat, to put forward such a condition is almost tantamount to a decision to bury the Assembly even before the Assembly decides to bury it. Is this the way the UK should act on this issue, especially now that after a long discussion it has become clear to all, including the UK, that the vast majority of states are behind the partition of Palestine?

If, at the first session, when the question of a possible solution to the future of Palestine first arose, it was at least possible to understand the reservations emanating from the British delegation, now that the overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations knew to make such reservations, it was to declare in advance that the United Kingdom did not consider itself bound by a possible general assembly decision.

The USSR delegation cannot share this view. We have the right to expect UK's cooperation in this matter. We are entitled to expect that, if the Assembly adopts the relevant recommendation, the United Kingdom will take up this recommendation, especially since the current order in Palestine is hated by both Jews and Arabs. You all know what the attitude of Jews to these orders expresses, in particular.

I also think it is necessary to note another fact.

From the outset of the discussion of this issue, a number of delegations, mainly Arab delegations, have tried to convince us that this issue is not within the purview of the United Nations. And, as might be expected, they could not provide any convincing arguments, except for general and unmotivated statements and declarations.

The General Assembly, as in the United Nations as a whole, not only has the right to consider this issue, but in the current situation in Palestine it must take action. In the view of the Soviet delegation, the Ad Nos Commission's plan to resolve the question of Palestine, which should be the practical implementation of its implementation activities, should be in full compliance with the Security Council, is fully in the interest of maintaining and strengthening international peace and in the interests of strengthening cooperation among States. That is why the Soviet delegation supports the recommendation to partition Palestine.

The Soviet delegation, unlike some other delegations, had taken a clear and clear line on the issue from the outset. She consistently draws that line. It is not going to manoeuvre or manipulate the voices, which, unfortunately, is taking place in the Assembly and in the debate on the Palestinian question.

The United Nations. Plenary sessions of the General Assembly. Stenographic Records September 16-November 24, 1947- Volume II. 351-352.

RECORDING OF S. K. TSARAPKIN, THE CHARGE D.C. CHARGE D.C. IN THE UNITED STATES, WITH E. EPSTEIN, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE IN WASHINGTON.

January 26, 1948

Secret

Epstein said that now there is absolutely indisputable data confirming the double play of the British in the question of Palestine. The British do not want to leave and are now taking all measures to create a situation in Palestine and throughout the Middle East that would lead to the failure of the UN decision. The main role in this regard in the Middle East is now played by three British - Brigadier Clayton, diplomat Sir Walter Smart and General Glabb. Brigadier Clayton is the main person in this three. During the First World War he was the chief assistant to the well-known agent Intel-Lygens Lawrence service. In fact, Clayton is the creator of the Arab League, a tool of British politics throughout the Middle East. Clayton is currently liaising with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in London and the Arab League. Sir Walter Smart has been in Cairo for many years as an oriental officer. He is a major expert in Arab affairs.

Finally, the third person is General Glabb (Glubb). Officially, he is in the service of King Abdullah of Transjordan. Glabb is fluent in Arabic and knows many dialects of the language. He is an expert on the Bedouin issue and has written a number of books on the subject. Now he is actually coordinating from the point of view of the military and political activities of the countries belonging to the Arab League.

To thwart the General Assembly's decisions on the partition of Palestine, the British use three kinds of armed groups in Palestine itself:

1) Mufti detachments, which are led by someone Hasan Selami. It is known that during the last war, when the Mufti himself was sitting at Hitler's in Germany, Hassan Selami was taken by the Germans to Palestine by plane and was parachuted near Jericho. During the landing he broke his leg, was captured by the British, but then was released and now enters Palestine, being one of the mufti's closest assistants. He leads armed groups of Palestinian Arabs; 2) armed groups of Muslims, numbering up to 5,000. 3) Anders.

The aforementioned three Britons - Clayton, Smart and Glabb—are inspired by the provocative actions of the Arab states, organizing attacks on Palestine from the outside, and, relying on the three groups listed, is carrying out subversive work against the UN decision inside Palestine.

In order to deflect any accusations and to preserve its alibi, the British Government occasionally sends diplomatic representations to the Arab capitals. For example, the British recently addressed the Syrian government, as well as the government of their puppet Abdallah, King of Transjordan, in connection with the invasion of Palestine by their troops. Epstein told me that last Wednesday, January 21, Schertok and he

visited the State Department twice and had conversations with Handerson and Lovett. They asked the State Department the following three questions:

.....

S. Tsarapkin

REFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT OF THE USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY "THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE AFTER THE UN DECISION ON THE PARTITION OF THE COUNTRY".

April 13, 1948

The United Nations General Assembly, after more than six months of research into the Palestinian problem, adopted a democratic decision on 29 November 1947 to establish two independent States in Palestine, Arab and Jewish. This decision, reflecting the desire of the Jewish and Arab peoples to build their lives within the framework of nation-states, has been praised in democratic circles around the world.

Jewry

The news of the establishment of a Jewish state caused the jubilation of Jews throughout Palestine on 30 November, with demonstrators thanking the United Nations, the Soviet Union and other countries that supported the partition of Palestine. Arab resistance to the UN decision and widespread clashes between Arabs and Jews made it necessary to prepare Jews to protect the future of the Jewish state. The Jewish Agency and The Jewish National Council announced on 9 December the mobilization of the first conscription group (17-25 years) for security service and use in the Jewish semi-legal military organization Haganah. Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency, stated on January 1, 1948, that the Jews "have stood up for not only themselves and not only the UN, but also the borders of the Jewish state. We have the right to demand that the UN provide us with moral and material support... These are the ancestral torments of the Jewish state, and we will accept them with faith and selfless devotion."

The growing resistance of the Arabs to the partition was dictated by the urgency of the creation of the Jewish militia. Schertok, the head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, insisted at a press conference in New York on January 12, 1948, that "the Jews of Palestine need a well-armed and motorized militia of 15-20,000 people." The events that followed forced the Jewish Agency to demand the creation of a militia of 30-35 thousand people, including aviation units. This militia was to be established on the base of Hagana, which already has some weapons and most of the soldiers of which received military training in the British army during the Second World War. Jewish organizations launched a worldwide campaign to raise funds for Palestine and purchase weapons, but these efforts were met with a ban on the export of military materials from the United States (confiscation of large quantities of explosives in New York) and a thorough blockade of Palestinian shores by the British navy. Jews, fearing the possibility of a failure of the UN decision on Palestine because of the resistance of the Arabs, agreed and demanded the sending of the UN armed forces to carry out the partition of the country.

Beginning in January 1948, Jews began to establish an interim government of the Jewish state. The U.S. refusal to support the General Assembly's decision led to the Jewish Agency and the National Council's decision at a joint meeting on March 23 in Tel Aviv to declare the Jewish state on May 16 (the day after the end of the English mandate for Palestine). At the end of March, a Jewish military office was formed in Tel Aviv, which included Ben-Gurion. Most of the seats in the projected government are given to the Mapai Labour Party and the right-wing bourgeois parties, which are closely linked to reactionary circles in the United States.

The Jewish Agency rejects the U.S. offer of guardianship even for a short period of time, as "guardianship would inevitably bring with it the deprivation of Jews' right to national independence. This would give Palestine the power of a foreign military regime." Meyerson, head of the Political Division of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, said that "we will never accept any other solution than the establishment of a Jewish state." Jewish terrorist organizations strongly opposed the "treason of the United States to the cause of the Jews." "If U.S. troops are sent to Palestine to carry out guardianship, we will join them in a fierce struggle and treat the Americans as they treated the British invaders" (Irgun Tswai Lami, March 24). "American imperialism is no different from British. We will continue to fight for the Jewish state and against all imperialist claims even if we are forced to fight alone. But if we look closely at the current situation, we are almost certain that we will not be left alone in our struggle" (Stern Group, March 22).

Although the Jewish Agency continues to insist in its official statements on the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, there are indications that some Jewish groups are concerned and are making attempts to leave Palestine, so that the Jewish Agency has been forced to prevent Jews from leaving the country. The rector of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and influential politician Dr. Magnes in late March 1948 called on Jews to accept the guardianship of the UN and the creation of a bi-national state.

Immigration

Despite the mandate-holder's refusal to provide, according to the UN decision, a port for Jewish immigration by 1 February, several steamships managed to land illegal immigrants on the Palestinian shore. On the night of December 4, 1947, a ship carrying 182 immigrants broke the blockade and disembarked its passengers near Tel Aviv, and the UN ship landed 700 people north of Haifa on 1 January 1. The British Government issues 1,500 permits a month to Jewish immigrants held on the island of Cyprus, where all Palestinian-eligible vessels with immigrants are sent, in particular, at the end of 1947 two steamers were sent there, carrying 15,000 Jews from the Black Sea ports.

The British, having imposed a blockade on Palestinian shores, deprived the Jews of the opportunity to receive more or less significant amounts of aid from abroad. Britain and the United States fear an influx of immigrants from Eastern Europe.

Arabs

The main Arab feudal-bourgeois organizations, the Supreme Arab Committee and the Arab Bureau, inspired by the British, opposed the establishment of a Jewish state and the partition of Palestine. The United Nations decision on the Palestinian

issue provoked strong reactions in Arab circles and was marked by a three-day protest strike led by the Supreme Arab Committee.

Armed protests against Jews took place with renewed vigour in December 1947 and continue to this day. Traitors and quislings from all over the world began to flock to Palestine and took part in the struggle on the side of the Arabs, among them Anders Scum, Bosnian Muslims from the camps of displaced persons in Germany, German prisoners of war who had fled the camps in Egypt, "volunteers" from Francoist Spain. The Arab League countries, following the decisions of the League Council, send armed groups of Arabs to Palestine. The first unit entered Palestine from Syria on January 9, 1948. It consisted of Syrian, Iraqi and Lebanese volunteers who, having attacked two Jewish settlements, were forced to retreat back to Syria. This speech was timed to coincide with the start of the work of the UN Palestinian Commission. From January to March 1948, numerous Arab groups crossed the Palestinian border, travelling in vehicles and armed with mortars and automatic rifles. For example, on 30 January, 800 heavily armed Arabs in 50 trucks crossed the Palestinian-Transjordan border. The Arab armed forces are located mainly in the mountains of Samaria with headquarters in the city of Nablus, where the commander of the Arab Volunteer Army, Fawzi Kauk-chi, is currently stationed. The number of Arab troops was estimated at the beginning of March at 6,000 people, and according to Arab sources - almost 15,000 people. (According to the Jewish Agency, there are 2,500 Syrians, 2,500 Iraqis and several hundred Egyptians and Lebanese in Palestine.) Arab police officers, along with weapons, leave their posts and join the Arab militias.

The Arabs receive weapons from the Arab countries supplied by England. In March 1948, a mission of the Palestinian Supreme Arab Committee arrived in London to purchase weapons worth 500,000 pounds, and it is expected to receive 10,000 machine guns, etc., which will be sent to Palestine through neighbouring Arab countries. In France, guns and tanks are purchased and will be handed over to Palestinian Arabs through the Levant.

The Trans-Jordanian Arab Legion, which is held and under the command of the British, takes part in the battles against the Jews. Legion soldiers guarded one of the bridges across the Jordan River and unhindered allowed a 700-Arab unit into Palestine. The Arab Legion is the force within Palestine through which Abdallah intends to take over the country after the end of the British mandate on 15 May. The head of the Supreme Arab Committee is a former Mufti of Palestine, who moved to Damascus in March to make direct contact with Arab groups in Palestine.

Although the Arabs see the change in the U.S. position on the Palestinian issue as their "moral victory", the Mufti opposed the guardianship of Palestine and reiterated the Arab resolve to fight to the end. A March 26 report by the Arab Information Bureau stated that "Arabs will only agree to establish guardianship after the plan for the partition of Palestine is finally rejected."

Only the left-wing National Liberation League opposes the bloody clashes between Arabs and Jews in Palestine.

Clashes between Arabs and Jews

Armed struggle between Jews and Arabs erupted throughout Palestine. During the first 15 days of December 1947, each side had 100 killed and several hundred wounded. On the border of the Arab city of Jaffa and the Jewish - Tel Aviv for four months there are continuous street battles, sniper gunfights and mutual raids. Traffic

on the roads can take place only if there is strong armed protection. Jewish convoys of vehicles between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv are under attack and looting. The Arabs are carrying out a systematic offensive against Jewish settlements scattered in the southern Negev desert, destroying irrigation pipes without which it is impossible to exist in this waterless area.

The scale and brutality of the bloody struggles is growing from day to day. Jewish terrorists committed an irresponsible act on 30 December 1947 by throwing a bomb at a crowd of Arabs standing at the entrance to the Anglo-Iraqi oil refinery in Haifa. Six Arabs were killed and 40 wounded. Further carnage by the Arabs, during which 41 Jews were killed, took place in front of the guards of the factory run by the Arab Legion and British officers.

In Jerusalem, where the population is mixed, Arab-Jewish clashes have reached extreme tensions. The Hebrew University, Hadassah Hospital, the editorial office of the Jewish newspaper Palestine Post, the home of the former Mufti of Palestine, which he handed over to Arab organisations, the Semiramis Hotel (the meeting place of the Najada military organization) and a number of other buildings were blown up. For several months they have been under siege of 1,800 Jews in the old city of Jerusalem. This quarter, where Jewish "holy places" are concentrated, is surrounded by Arabs and food deliveries to the besieged can only be made on British armoured vehicles. The unrest in Palestine led to the development of banditry and looting, and attacks on banks and railways increased.

The U.S. peacekeeping statement had the opposite effect: the fighting was all flaring up, Arabs were using guns and machine guns, and during the clash in late March, the Jewish armed forces even had several planes.

According to official data of the British administration, in Palestine in the four months to April 1, 1948 killed almost 2,000 people, including 800 Jews.

The Arabs have recently moved to systematic and systematic operations against Jewish colonies scattered throughout the country. The colonies in the south of the country, in the Negev, and in the north, in the Galilee, are cut off from the main Jewish population of the coastal strip, and the defense of them, and even more so, the implementation of communication between them is almost impossible task for the semi-legal Jewish militia. In addition, Jews are deprived of assistance from outside, bear great losses killed and wounded, which will adversely affect the resistance of this small (only 640,000 people) community.

English

The "neutral" position of the British in the Palestinian question cannot hide their aspirations, provoking internecine struggle of Jews and Arabs, to disrupt the UN decisions on the partition of Palestine and to remain in Palestine in the form of a third force, one or together with the United States, or to hand over to Palestine to the transjordan king, who will preserve it for Great Britain. Therefore, the British police and army are either inactive or secretly assisting the Arabs in their fight against the Jews. The Jewish newspaper Dawar wrote in January 1948 that "the British want to organize chaos of this kind, so that by May 15 the country will be concentrated large Arab gangs, that at its borders everything was ready for an open invasion and that those who defend the UN decision were deprived of weapons and the ability to defend themselves."

The National Liberation League newspaper Al-Ittihad reported cases in which the British sought to set Arabs against Jews; this message the British administration banned reprinting, and the newspaper was closed on January 19.

British soldiers sell weapons and ammunition to Arab units, cases of "missing" armoured vehicles have increased - all this is done against the background of soothing statements of the British administration about the desire to preserve peace and order in the country. In fact, opening the borders of Palestine with neighbouring Arab countries (since the protection of several bridges in Jordan, through which the Arabs move in trucks, would not be an impossible task for the hundred thousand British army), England strictly protects the sea coast, preventing Jews from getting help.

The evacuation of British troops from Palestine has hardly yet begun, although it has already been 4 months after the UN decision on the gradual withdrawal of the mandate-holder powers. It was not until 7 March that the first batch of 2,000 soldiers was sent.

The British, who hold all the values of the Palestinian people, demand \$74 million from Palestinian funds to pay pensions to British officials and take the gold reserves of Palestine to London. In November 1947, the British administration opened bidding for state lands in Haifa.

The U.S. refusal to support the UN decision made the British speeches more frank. For example, officials of the British administration in Palestine proposed to the British Ministry of Colonies to divide Jerusalem on a religious basis and to put the head of the city of the English governor, and the security police officers to recruit from the British police.

Economic life in Palestine

Armed clashes have paralyzed many aspects of economic life in Palestine. Railroads and road transport are disorganized and transportation costs have increased significantly. There has been a significant increase in the prices of food and livestock feed, partly because of delivery difficulties. Palestine, unless vigorous action is taken, will come to a stand in a few months in the face of impending famine. Already, the Jews of Jerusalem receive 200 grams. bread a day. The industry has suffered to a much lesser extent.

Findings

1. The situation of Jews in Palestine is deteriorating day by day because of the inability to receive human assistance and weapons and the heavy losses that cannot be compensated because of the small Jewish population in Palestine.
2. Arabs are encouraged by the help of Arab countries and England and the U.S. retreat from support for the UN decision. They have launched a systematic offensive against Jewish settlements, attempting to expand their areas of domination and capturing the city of Jerusalem.
3. The British administration assists the Arabs and prevents the organization of the defence of the Jews.

BVO attache

A. Semioshkin

PROTOCOL RECORDING OF THE SPEECH OF THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR TO THE UN A. A. GROMYKO AT THE MEETING OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

April 20, 1948

A. A. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shares the fears of a number of delegations that the partition plan has not been implemented, that the Palestinian issue is being discussed for the third time by the General Assembly, and that one of the States is putting forward a proposal that nullifies the general Assembly's decision, is not in the interests of the Palestinian people and is not conducive to the maintenance of international peace. According to the General Assembly's partition plan, the Palestinian Commission had to take some measures to establish a Jewish and Arab State in Palestine. The commission was to receive instructions and assistance from the Security Council. The Security Council, however, has not only failed to take the necessary steps to implement this decision of the General Assembly, but, on the contrary, has made the implementation of the plan more difficult.

Mr. Gromyko attributed the inaction of the Security Council mainly to the position taken by the United States, which was trying to change the General Assembly's decision. While the United States initially used all its influence to adopt a partition plan, it suddenly changed its line on the issue. This change of position was clear as early as 9 December 1947 at the first meeting at which the Security Council was to discuss measures to implement the General Assembly's decision. Beginning on 29 November 1947, when the partition plan was adopted, the United States prepared its own plan, which was formally presented to the Security Council on 19 March 1948 and which provided for the establishment of United Nations custody over Palestine. At the end of the last session of the Assembly, public opinion, even in the United States, found that the latter's position on the Palestinian issue was in fact aimed at derailing the General Assembly resolution. No one believed in the official rebuttal of the United States. Everyone understood that the United States was preparing a deadly blow to the decision to divide and was hatching some new plans for Palestine. We are being persuaded that the new plan is better than the old one, although in reality the opposite is true. It is argued that the partition plan cannot be implemented peacefully. This argument would be worthy of attention only if the Security Council had taken any practical steps to carry out this decision, but it has not been done.

The inaction of the Security Council in recent months has been the result of a position taken by the United States, the United Kingdom and some other States. The Security Council has been trampled on the ground without achieving any useful results. The decision he made on 5 March 1948 (document S/691) was merely a simple appeal to the permanent members of the Security Council to make their recommendations to the Palestinian Commission. The resolution also called on all Governments and peoples to do everything possible to put an end to the unrest in Palestine. The decision, however, did not help the Palestinian Commission, and it did not have the necessary instructions for the implementation of the partition plan. The appeal to Governments and peoples to end the unrest in Palestine was without

consequences, as those to whom it had been addressed knew that they could expect total impunity in their actions.

The meetings of the permanent members of the Security Council have revealed that not only does the United States be unwilling to discuss how the General Assembly's decision could be implemented, but it wants that decision to be reconsidered. From the outset, the representative of the United States had offered to consult with Jews and Arabs as if there was no solution to Palestine, after which he tried to prove that the decision was supposedly impossible to implement peacefully. He did not, however, mention that The Security Council has not exhausted the capacity at its disposal to hold a general Assembly decision.

The last resolution adopted by the Armistice Council (document S/723) is not being implemented by those who, from the outset, have decided to fight against the General Assembly's decision of 29 November 1947.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recalls that, after a comprehensive study of the issue and after discussing all the other proposed solutions, the United Nations has concluded that the two-State partition of Palestine represents the most just solution. It is most just because it is in the national interest of both peoples of Palestine, it will resolve relations between these peoples once and for all and that will ensure the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Gromyko pointed out that the struggle between the two peoples had intensified during the mandate of the United Kingdom. A partition plan involving close economic cooperation between the two States could put an end to that struggle. The partition would mean the end of the semi-colonial order in Palestine and the recognition that the Jewish and Arab populations, in their political, economic and cultural development, had reached a level that allowed each of them to establish their own independent State. The section would also satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish people, who suffered so much during the existence of Hitler's regime.

When discussing the Palestinian question, everyone should be mindful of all these benefits of partition. It seems, however, that some States are not governed by the needs of Palestine, not by the common interests of the United Nations, but by the political, economic, military and military-strategic interests of one or two Powers. Those States are prepared to sacrifice the aspirations of the peoples of Palestine if it is not in the interests of the United States leadership. The change in the United States position on the Palestinian issue is dictated by its oil and military interests. Prominent influential circles, reflecting these interests, are trying to turn Palestine into its strategic and military base, and economically into the American semi-colony. The guardianship plan proposed by the United States is likely to exacerbate the struggle in Palestine, threaten peace and heighten anxiety in the Middle East. Moreover, the establishment of guardianship over Palestine does not correspond to the current cultural and political level of development of the Jewish and Arab population. This plan was incompatible with the right to self-determination of the peoples of Palestine, and it would effectively put that country in the position of colonial slavery, with all the deplorable consequences that ensued.

Finally, the United States plan puts the General Assembly in a false position: the Assembly, after a long study of the issue, adopted a partition plan with the active participation of the United States, and now the same plan is the subject of political machinations by America's ruling circles.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further accuses the Mandate Power of using all means available to it to prevent the General Assembly resolution from being implemented. The United Kingdom opposed the Palestinian

Commission's arrival in Palestine, leaving the latter unable to begin the preparatory work required to implement the partition decision. The Commission was not allowed to come to Palestine until 1 May, in other words, two weeks before the end of the mandate, and the United Kingdom refused to even guarantee the commission the safety of its stay during those two weeks. The Government of the United Kingdom has thus tried to make the Palestinian Commission a body that could discuss the issue but not take any practical measures to implement the General Assembly's decision. In doing so, the United Kingdom has jeopardized the entire plan of partition. It also ignored the part of the General Assembly resolution that said that a port for Jewish immigration had been opened in Palestine since 1 February 1948. All these facts, together with the report of the Palestinian Commission, prove that the United Kingdom is largely responsible for all the complications that have arisen over the question of the future of Palestine. Despite the best efforts of the United Kingdom to justify its actions in Palestine, it is clear that its purpose is to nullify the decision on partition and thus to condone those elements in the Middle East that wish to derail the plan of partition. The mandate-holder Power has not only failed to ensure basic order in Palestine, but has even opened the borders of that State to the armed gangs that have infiltrated Palestine in order to fight there against the Assembly's decision. The policies of the United Kingdom and the United States clearly have much in common. The behaviour of these two States on the Palestinian issue has dealt a serious blow to the credibility of the United Nations, which in fact has long been overlooked by the ruling circles of the United States. It is also clear that those States that have set out to derail the partition plan and impose on the United Nations a solution dictated by the selfish interests of the ruling circles of the United States are responsible.

The Soviet delegation would therefore vote against the United States proposal to establish a guardianship regime in Palestine.

The USSR delegation believed that the decision to partition Palestine was the right decision and that the United Nations should take effective measures to implement it.

United Nations. Official reports from the Second Special Session of the General Assembly. Volume 11. The main committees. Summary of meetings from April 16 to May 14, 1948. New York, 1948.

TELEGRAM OF ISRAELI FOREIGN MINISTER M. SHERTOK TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR V. M. MOLOTOV.

May 15, 1948

I am honoured to inform you and ask you to inform your Government that the National Council of the Jewish State, made up of members of selected representatives of Palestinian Jewish organizations, met yesterday, 14 May, after the end of the British Mandate, and on the basis of a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly of 29 November 1947, proclaimed the formation of an independent Jewish State in Palestine to be called the State of Israel. The Council stated that the State of Israel would be open to the immigration of Jews from all the countries in which they were scattered; will contribute to the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; will be based on the principles of freedom, justice and peace; will uphold the full social and political equality of all citizens, regardless of race, creed or gender; will guarantee full freedom of conscience, religion, education, culture and language; will protect the sanctity and

integrity of temples and holy sites of all religions and will devote himself to upholding the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. The Council also stated that the State of Israel would be ready to cooperate with the organs and representatives of the United Nations in implementing the Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 and would take steps to ensure the formation of an economic union for the whole of Palestine. The Council called on the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to return to the path of peace and to play their part in its development through full and equal citizenship and due representation in its administration, temporary and permanent. The Council also offered peace to all neighbouring States and their peoples and invited them to cooperate with the State of Israel for the common good for all. On behalf of the Provisional Government of Israel, I hereby ask for the official recognition of the State of Israel and its Provisional Government by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I express the hope that such recognition will soon follow, and I am sure that it will strengthen the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and its peoples, on the one hand, and the State of Israel and the Jewish people of Palestine, on the other hand, as well as serve the cause of peace and justice in international relations in general. I take this opportunity to express the deep gratitude and understanding of the Jewish people of Palestine, which are shared by Jews around the world, for the firm position taken by the SOVIET delegation to the United Nations in support of the establishment of an independent sovereign Jewish state in Palestine; for her consistent promotion of this idea, despite all the difficulties; for expressing her genuine sympathy for the suffering of the Jewish people in Europe at the hands of Nazi tormentors and for supporting the principle that the Jews of Palestine are a nation deserving of sovereignty and independence.

On behalf of the Provisional Government of Israel

Mote Schertok, Minister of Foreign Affairs

**TELEGRAM OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR V. M. MOLOTOV TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF ISRAEL M. SCHERTOK.
May 18, 1948**

I confirm receipt of your telegram dated May 16, in which you inform the Government of the USSR about the proclamation on the basis of the UN General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947 the establishment of an independent State of Israel in Palestine and request the recognition of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the State of Israel and its Provisional Government.

I hereby inform that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has decided to formally recognize the State of Israel and its Provisional Government. The Soviet Government hopes that the establishment by the Jewish people of their sovereign State will serve to promote peace and security in Palestine and the Middle East and expresses confidence in the successful development of friendly relations between the USSR and the State of Israel.

Foreign Minister of the USSR

V. Molotov

EXCHANGE OF TELEGRAMS BETWEEN ISRAELI FOREIGN MINISTER M. SHERTOK AND SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTER V. M. MOLOTOV.

May 24, 1948,

May 25, 1948

I. Telegram of Israeli Foreign Minister M. Shertok

May 24, 1948

I am honoured to express to you the deepest satisfaction with which my Government has taken note of the announcement of the official recognition of the State of Israel by the Government of the USSR, courtesy of your telegram of 18 May this year, the Government of the State of Israel fully shares the wishes so generously expressed by you, and once again reaffirms its firm hope, based on the events that led to the establishment of our Government, for that reason, that most friendly relations be established between the State of Israel and the Soviet Union. To that end, we ask you to inform us whether you agree to the State of Israel immediately establishing its mission in Moscow as an envoy or charge d'affaires and consul-general, and for a Soviet mission of the same rank to be established simultaneously in Tel Aviv. On behalf of the Provisional State Council of Israel

Mote Schertok, Minister of Foreign Affairs

2. Telegram of soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov

May 25, 1948

I confirm receipt of your telegram dated May 24, 1948, in which you ask the consent of the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that the State of Israel immediately establish its mission in Moscow and that at the same time the Soviet mission be established in Tel Aviv.

I am truly honoured to announce that the Soviet Government agrees to the establishment of a mission of the State of Israel in Moscow, headed by an envoy or charge d'affaires, including the performance of consular functions, and, in turn, is ready to establish a Soviet mission in Tel Aviv.

V. Molotov Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics