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Letter from the Secretary General

Dear Participants,

I am honored to welcome you to the sixth session of the EcoTrain Model United Nations Conference which is to be held from December 13 to 15 in İzmir, İzmir University of Economics MUN Society and GO Academy Society have been working diligently to ensure that EcoTrain will be an enriching and rewarding MUN experience. An assortment of experienced MUN delegates and meritorious individuals well versed in the topics at hand will chair our committees.

My lovely friend Merve Noyan will be in the position of Deputy Secretary-General along with the rest of our Academic Team consisting of successful Under-Secretary-Generals and Academic Assistants. While I have full faith in our Academic Team helping you to improve your academic skills, our amazing Organization Team in the leadership of Gök hun Gümüş who is the Director-General, his advisor Seray Güderel and his Deputy Director-General Dennis Tuğberk Çiftçi ı will make you fill in the best environment to ensure surround you in the spirit of diplomacy.

In this edition of EcoTrain, will host 14 important committees with the context of significant issues of past, today and the future. EcoTrain is not only benefiting you on an academic level, but it will also set chances to meet new people and create unforgettable memories. Since every member of both teams is very dedicated, hardworking and endeavour to advance your achievements in this conference, you honorable young diplomats of today, will have an unforgettable experience.

In case of any inquiries, do not hesitate to contact us. We would be glad to help with your questions. On behalf of the EcoTrain Secretariat and staff, thank you for your time and consideration.

We look forward to seeing you this upcoming December; of course, for feeling the Aegean Difference!

Best Regards,

Doğa ÇAKAR
Secretary-General of EcoTrain 2019
Letter from the Under-Secretary-General

Dear Delegates of the Historical United Nations Trusteeship Council,

It is a tremendous pleasure to welcome you to the sixth session of the EcoTrain Model United Nations Conference. I am Zeynep Öykü Kalkan, a graduate student in Political Science program at Sabancı University and it is my utmost honor to serve as the Under-Secretary General responsible for the Historical United Nations Trusteeship Council. I graduated from Yeditepe University with a degree in Political Science and International Relations along with Translation and Interpreting. During my undergraduate education, I attended several MUN conferences and served as a member of the Executive Board in Yeditepe Model United Nations Club. I have recently started participating in MUN conferences again. Over all those years and throughout numerous MUN experiences, I have somehow managed not to attend a single conference in İzmir. This will be my first EcoTrain and I can confidently say that I am as excited as you are! This year, the participants of Historical United Nations Trusteeship Council will revisit the year of 1948 and simulate the United States Proposal for Temporary Trusteeship for Palestine. This study guide is designed as an introductory source for the topic; therefore, it is highly advised that the delegates do additional research on the topic and on the policies of the countries they represent in the conference.

I would like to express my gratitude to my dear friend and our Advisor Onuralp Acar for convincing me to be a part of MUN conferences again, for his long-standing and profoundly appreciated friendship, support and guidance. I would also like to thank another dear friend and our Secretary General Doğa Çakar for giving me this opportunity to be a part of EcoTrain Model United Nations Conference with nothing less than a historical committee. Lastly, I would like to thank Deputy-Secretary General Merve Noyan for being the best roommate ever, for taking me to wild shopping trips and for taking my photographs when I dress up as a witch. Yes, I do that from time to time.

I, once again, welcome you to EcoTrain and Historical United Nations Trusteeship Council. I am looking forward to seeing you all. Please do not hesitate to contact me via zeynepoyku@sabanciuniv.edu for any kind of questions related to the study guide or the proceedings of the committee.

Best Regards,

Zeynep Öykü Kalkan

Under-Secretary-General
I. Introduction to The Committee: The United Nations Trusteeship Council

When United Nations were established on September 24, 1945, nearly a third of the world’s population lived in territories without a functioning government. These territories that are not able to govern themselves included colonies, territories that once belonged to countries that lost the Second World War but have become separate from those countries because of the war, or territories under mandate. The mandate system was created after the World War I ended in 1918, by the newly-formed League of Nations, predecessor to the United Nations. It was the President of United States Woodrow Wilson who introduced the international supervision of colonial territories in 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference, which lead to the creation of the mandate system. The Mandate System was an attempt to stop the cycle of war and fighting over conquered land by allocating the land of the collapsed Ottoman Empire and the colonies of Germany. Under the Mandate System, the League of Nations granted authorization to a member nation to govern a former colony. The territory was then called a mandated territory or mandate.

With the establishment of the United Nations, United Nations Charter created an International Trusteeship System which categorized the territories that are not able to govern themselves including the mandated territories as trust territories. The International Trusteeship
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System aimed to support the territories over time to govern themselves or to be independent while taking into account the needs and wishes of people in each trust territory by encouraging their progress in terms of politics, economy, society and education\textsuperscript{7}. Along with setting up an International Trusteeship System, the United Nations Charter also established the Trusteeship Council in 1945 as one of the six main organs of the United Nations and assigned it the task of supervising, administrating and supporting the transition of trust territories placed under the Trusteeship System to independence and self-governance while promoting the advancement of the inhabitants of these territories.\textsuperscript{8} Even though the trusteeship system, like the mandate system, was established on the premise that colonial territories taken from countries defeated in war should not be annexed by the victorious powers but should be administered by a trust country under international supervision until their future status was determined, unlike the mandate system, the trusteeship system invited petitions from trust territories on their independence and required periodic international missions to the territories\textsuperscript{9}.

The Trusteeship council originally consisted of states administering trust territories, permanent members of the Security Council territories (China, France, USA, UK, and Russian Federation) that did not administer trust, and other members elected by the General Assembly\textsuperscript{10}. Originally, the council met once each year. Each member had one vote, and decisions were taken by a simple majority of those present\textsuperscript{11}. The Trusteeship Council suspended its operations on 1 November 1994, a month after the independence of Palau, the last remaining United Nations trust territory\textsuperscript{12}. By a resolution adopted on 25 May 1994, the Council amended its rules of procedure to drop the obligation to meet annually and agreed to meet as occasion

\textsuperscript{7} "Charter of The United Nations" 2019
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required -- by its decision or the decision of its President, or at the request of a majority of its members or the General Assembly or the Security Council.13

There were 11 trust territories placed under the administration of the Trusteeship Council14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Administered By</th>
<th>Formed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Togoland under British administration</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Formed Ghana in 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Formed Somalia in 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togoland under French administration</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Became independent as Togo in 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroons under French administration</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Became independent as Cameroon in 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroons under British administration</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Following a plebiscite, the northern part of the Trust Territory joined Nigeria and the southern part joined Cameroon in 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Became independent in 1961 (In 1964, Tanganyika and Zanzibar, which had become independent in 1963, united as a single State under the name of the United Republic of Tanzania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruanda-Urundi</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Became two independent and sovereign States of Rwanda and Burundi in 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Samoa</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Became independent as Western Samoa in 1962 (In 1997, it changed its name to Samoa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>Became independent in 1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 “Trusteeship Council” 2019
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II. Introduction to the Historical Committee Procedure

A Historical Committee is a committee that takes place in the past. Generally, a historical committee is a simulation of a committee or event that did actually happen in the past. In our case, in 1948, United States did propose a temporary Trusteeship for Palestine and we are simply going to simulate the event. The delegates in this committee will have to pretend they are taking a step into the past as they are going to represent their countries as if the year is in fact 1948. The difference is, you as the delegates can create something new, make new decisions on the topic and set the world off on a completely different path. You are not, therefore, bound to the historical events that happened after this proposal was presented to the Trusteeship Council in 1948.

We will apply the standard Rules of Procedure in the committee, and the committee proceedings will follow the same procedure as those of other committees. The discussions during the committee will focus on evaluating the United States Proposal for Temporary United Nations Trusteeship for Palestine. The delegates are expected to discuss the proposal thoroughly and decide whether to accept or reject the proposal. The delegates of the Historical UN Trusteeship Council are not expected to produce a resolution as other committees do. Instead, the committee will explain their reasons and justifications to either reject or accept the proposal in a standard resolution format.

III. Historical Background

| New Guinea       | Australia          | United with the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua, also administered by Australia, to become the independent State of Papua New Guinea in 1975 |
A. Palestine

Scholars believe the name “Palestine” originally comes from the word “Philistia,” which refers to the name given by Greek writers to the land of the Philistines who occupied part of the region in the 12th century B.C.\(^\text{15}\) Until 1948, Palestine typically referred to the geographic region located between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River, comprising parts of modern-day Israel and the Palestinian territories of the Gaza Strip (along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea) and the West Bank (the area west of the Jordan River).\(^\text{16}\) It is the region bounded on the east by the Jordan River, on the north by the border between modern Israel and Lebanon, on the west by the Mediterranean Sea (including the coast of Gaza), and on the south by the Negev, with its southernmost extension reaching the Gulf of Aqaba.\(^\text{17}\)

The social geography of Palestine as a region, especially the area west of the Jordan River, has been greatly affected by the dramatic political changes and wars that have brought this small region to the attention of the world.\(^\text{18}\) Throughout the centuries, however, the majority of the population in Palestine composed of two distinct and significant groups: Jews and Arabs with the latter divided into Christians, Muslims and Druze.\(^\text{19}\) Throughout this study guide, there are numerous references to Zionists. Zionism is a Jewish nationalist movement that has had the goal of creating and supporting a Jewish national state in Palestine, the ancient homeland of the Jews.\(^\text{20}\) Though Zionism originated in eastern and central Europe in the latter part of the 19th century, it is in many ways a continuation of the ancient attachment of the Jews and of the

\(^{15}\) Faris et al. 2019 and "Palestine" 2019
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Jewish religion to the historical region of Palestine, where one of the hills of ancient Jerusalem was called Zion\textsuperscript{21}. Zionists, therefore, are Jews who support Zionism.

Both the geographic area designated by the name and the political status of it have changed over the course of centuries\textsuperscript{22}. The region (or at least a part of it) is also known as the Holy Land and is held sacred among Jews, Christians, and Muslims.\textsuperscript{23} Since the 20th century Palestine has been the object of conflicting claims of Jewish and Arab national movements, and the conflict has led to prolonged violence and, in several instances, open warfare.\textsuperscript{24}

Throughout history, Palestine has been ruled by numerous groups, including the Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Fatimids, Seljuk

\textsuperscript{21} "Zionism | Definition, History, Examples, & Facts" 2019 \\
\textsuperscript{22} Faris et al. 2019 \\
\textsuperscript{23} Faris et al. 2019 \\
\textsuperscript{24} Faris et al. 2019
Turks, Crusaders, Egyptians, and Mamelukes. From about 1517 to 1917, the Ottoman Empire ruled much of the region. When World War I ended in 1918 and Ottoman Empire was defeated along with other countries in the Central Powers, the British took control of Palestine.

**B. World War I and Aftermath**

At the war’s end, however, the future of Palestine remained vague and problematic. Great Britain, which had set up a military administration in Palestine after capturing Jerusalem, was faced with the problem of having to secure international sanction for the continued occupation of the country in a manner consistent with its ambiguous, seemingly conflicting wartime commitments. In April 1920, a peace conference was held in San Remo, Italy to decide the future of the former territories of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. The conference approved the final framework of the Treaty of Sèvres, a peace treaty with Turkey which was later signed at Sèvres, on Aug. 10, 1920. In this peace conference which was attended by the prime ministers of Great Britain, France, and Italy, and representatives of Japan, Greece, and Belgium, Palestine was placed under the British mandate by the Supreme Court of the League of Nations. Negotiations between Great Britain and the United States with regard to the Palestine mandate were successfully concluded in May 1922, and approved by the Council of the League of Nations in July 1922.
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In July 1922 the Council of the League of Nations approved the mandate instrument for Palestine which significantly stressed the Jewish historical connection with Palestine\textsuperscript{34}. Article 2 of the document made the mandatory power responsible for placing the country under such “political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home...and the development of self-governing institutions.”\textsuperscript{35} Article 4 allowed for the establishment of a Jewish Agency to advise and cooperate with the Palestine administration in matters affecting the Jewish national home\textsuperscript{36}. Article 6 required that the Palestine administration, “while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced,” under suitable conditions should facilitate Jewish immigration and close settlement of Jews on the land\textsuperscript{37}. Although Transjordan—i.e., the lands east of the Jordan River—constituted three-fourths of the British mandate of Palestine, it was, despite protests from the Zionists, excluded from the clauses covering the establishment of a Jewish national home\textsuperscript{38}. On September 29, 1923, the mandate officially came into force\textsuperscript{39}.

\textbf{C. British Mandate}

Palestine was a distinct political entity for the first time in centuries\textsuperscript{40}. This created problems and challenges for Palestinian Arabs and Zionists alike\textsuperscript{41}. Both communities realized that by the end of the mandate period the region’s future would be determined by size of population and ownership of land\textsuperscript{42}. Thus, the central issues throughout the mandate period were Jewish immigration and land purchases, with the Jews attempting to increase both and the

\begin{footnotesize}
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Arabs seeking to slow down or halt both. Conflict over these issues often escalated into violence over the years, and the British were forced to take action.

Throughout the British mandate, there was little political cooperation between Arabs and Jews in Palestine. In 1923 the British high commissioner tried to win Arab cooperation by first offering a legislative council that would reflect the Arab majority and then of an Arab agency. Both offers were rejected by the Arabs as falling far short of their national demands. Nor did the Arabs wish to legitimize a situation they rejected in principle. The years 1923–29 were relatively quiet; Arab passivity was partly due to the drop in Jewish immigration in 1926–28. Nevertheless, the Jewish national home continued to consolidate itself in terms of urban, agricultural, social, cultural, and industrial development. Large amounts of land were purchased from Arab owners, who often were absentee landlords. In August 1929 negotiations were concluded for the formation of an enlarged Jewish Agency to include non-Zionist Jewish sympathizers throughout the world.

From the early 1930s onward, developments in Europe once again began to impose themselves more forcefully on Palestine. The Nazi accession to power in Germany in 1933 and the widespread persecution of Jews throughout central and eastern Europe gave a great incentive to Jewish immigration, which jumped to 30,000 in 1933, 42,000 in 1934, and
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61,000 in 1935\textsuperscript{54}. By 1936 the Jewish population of Palestine had reached almost 400,000, or one-third of the total\textsuperscript{55}. This new wave of immigration provoked major acts of violence against Jews and the British in 1933 and 1935\textsuperscript{56}. The Arab population of Palestine also grew rapidly, largely by natural increase, although some Arabs were attracted from outside the region by the capital infusion brought by middle-class Jewish immigrants and British public works\textsuperscript{57}. Most of the Arabs (nearly nine-tenths) continued to be employed in agriculture despite deteriorating economic conditions\textsuperscript{58}. By the mid-1930s, however, many landless Arabs had joined the expanding Arab proletariat working in the construction trades on the edge of rapidly growing urban centers\textsuperscript{59}. This was the beginning of a shift in the foundations of Palestinian economic and social life that was to have profound immediate and long-term effects\textsuperscript{60}.

In November 1935 the Arab political parties collectively demanded that Jewish immigration cease, land transfer be prohibited, and democratic institutions be established\textsuperscript{61}. A boycott of Zionist and British goods was proclaimed\textsuperscript{62}. In December the British administration offered to set up a legislative council of 28 members, in which the Arabs (both Muslim and Christian) would have a majority\textsuperscript{63}. The British would retain control through their selection of nonelected members. Although Arabs would not be represented in the council in proportion to their numbers, Arab leaders favored the proposal, but the Zionists criticized it bitterly as an attempt to freeze the national home through a constitutional Arab stranglehold\textsuperscript{64}.
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In any event, London rejected the proposal\textsuperscript{65}. This, together with the example of rising nationalism in neighboring Egypt and Syria, increasing unemployment in Palestine, and a poor citrus harvest, triggered an Arab rebellion that had been kept in store for so long.\textsuperscript{66}

D. The Arab Revolt

The Arab Revolt of 1936–39 was the first sustained violent uprising of Palestinian Arabs in more than a century\textsuperscript{67}. Thousands of Arabs from all classes were mobilized, and nationalistic sentiment was fanned in the Arabic press, schools, and literary circles. The British, taken aback by the extent and intensity of the revolt, shipped more than 20,000 troops into Palestine, and by 1939 the Zionists had armed more than 15,000 Jews in their own nationalist movement\textsuperscript{68}. At that point the Arab political parties formed an Arab Higher Committee presided over by the mufti of Jerusalem, Amīn al-Ḥusaynī\textsuperscript{69}. Arab Higher Committee called for a general strike, nonpayment of taxes, and the closing of municipal governments (although government employees were allowed to stay at work) and demanded an end to Jewish immigration, a ban on land sales to Jews, and national independence\textsuperscript{70}. Simultaneously with the strike, Arab rebels, joined by volunteers from neighboring Arab countries, took to the hills, attacking Jewish settlements and British installations in the northern part of the country\textsuperscript{71}.

The first mention of a partition proposed as a result of this Arab Revolt. A royal commission of inquiry supervised by Lord Robert Peel, which was sent to the region by the
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British government to investigate the volatile situation, reported in July 1937 that the revolt was caused by Arab desire for independence and fear of the Jewish national home. The Peel Commission declared the mandate unfunctional and Britain’s obligations to Arabs and Jews mutually incompatible. Following this declaration, the commission recommended that the region be partitioned. Zionist attitude toward partition, though ambivalent, was overall one of cautious acceptance. This was also the first time a British official body explicitly spoke of a Jewish state. The commission not only allotted to this state an area that was immensely larger than the existing Jewish landholdings, but recommended the forcible transfer of the Arab population from the proposed Jewish state. The Zionists, however, still needed mandatory protection for their further development and left the door open for an undivided Palestine. The Arabs were horrified by the idea of dismembering the region and particularly by the suggestion that they be forcibly transferred from the areas they had been living to Transjordan. As a result, the momentum of the revolt increased during 1937 and 1938.

As a result of the increased violence, the British were forced to declare martial law in Palestine in September 1937. The Arab Higher Committee was dissolved, and many officials of the Supreme Muslim Council and other organizations were arrested. The mufti fled to Lebanon and then Iraq, never to return to an undivided Palestine. Although the Arab Revolt continued well into 1939, high casualty rates and firm British measures gradually eroded its
strength. Other than the birth of a national identity, the revolt was generally unsuccessful. The general strike, which was called off in October 1939, had encouraged Zionist self-reliance, and the Arabs of Palestine were unable to recover from their sustained effort of defying the British administration.

However, the prospect of war in Europe alarmed the British government and caused it to reassess its policy in Palestine. If Britain went to war, it could not afford to face Arab hostility in Palestine and in neighboring countries. The Woodhead Commission, under Sir John Woodhead, was set up to examine the practicality of partition. In November 1938 it recommended against the Peel Commission’s plan—largely on the ground that the number of Arabs in the proposed Jewish state would be almost equal to the number of Jews—and put forward alternative proposals drastically reducing the area of the Jewish state and limiting the sovereignty of the proposed states. This was unacceptable to both Arabs and Jews though. Seeking to find a solution acceptable to both parties, the British announced the impracticability of partition and called for a roundtable conference in London.

Though no agreement was reached at this conference in London, the British government issued a White Paper, which essentially yielded to Arab demands. It stated that the Jewish national home should be established within an independent Palestinian state. During the next five years 75,000 Jews would be allowed into the country; thereafter Jewish immigration would
be subject to Arab “acquiescence” or consent. Land transfer to Jews would be allowed only in certain areas in Palestine, and an independent Palestinian state would be considered within 10 years. The Arabs, although in favor of the new policy, rejected the White Paper, largely because they mistrusted the British government and opposed a provision contained in the paper for extending the mandate beyond the 10-year period. The Zionists were shocked and enraged by the paper, which they considered a death blow to their program and to Jews who desperately sought refuge in Palestine from the growing persecution they were enduring in Europe. The 1939 White Paper, therefore, marked the end of the Anglo-Zionist entente.

It is also important to note that, by that time, progress toward a Jewish national home had, however, been remarkable. Majority of the Jewish population was urban with increasing number of rural Zionist colonies. Jewish landholdings had risen from about 148,500 to 383,500 acres since 1918 (about 60,100 to 155,200 hectares) and constituted roughly one-seventh of the cultivatable land, and the Jewish population had grown from 83,790 to some 467,000, or nearly one-third of a total population of about 1,528,000. Tel Aviv had developed into an all-Jewish city of 150,000 inhabitants, and hundreds of millions of dollars of Jewish capital had been introduced into the region. The Jewish literacy rate was high, schools were expanding, and the Hebrew language had become widespread.
E. World War II

With the outbreak of the World War II in September 1939, Zionist and British policies came into direct conflict\textsuperscript{104}. Throughout the war Zionists sought with growing urgency to increase Jewish immigration to Palestine, while the British sought to prevent such immigration, regarding it as illegal and a threat to the stability of a region essential to the war effort\textsuperscript{105}. Despite British efforts to halt the progress, the Jewish community in Palestine was vastly strengthened during the war years\textsuperscript{106}. Its moderate wing supported the British; in September 1944 a Jewish brigade was formed—a total of 27,000 Jews having enlisted in the British forces—and attached to the British 8th Army\textsuperscript{107}. Jewish industry in general was given immense momentum by the war, and a Jewish munitions industry developed to manufacture antitank mines for the British forces\textsuperscript{108}. Another important development was the gained support of the American Zionists\textsuperscript{109}. In May 1942, at a Zionist conference held at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, Zionists gained support for a program demanding unrestricted immigration, a Jewish army, and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth\textsuperscript{110}. Meanwhile, the Arabs of Palestine remained largely quiescent throughout the war especially due to the aftereffects of the Arab Revolt which ruined Arab merchants and importers as well as the traditional social institutions\textsuperscript{111}.
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The Allied discovery of the Nazi extermination camps at the end of World War II and the undecided future of the Holocaust survivors led to an increasing number of pro-Zionist statements from the U.S. politicians. In August 1945 U.S. President Harry S. Truman requested that British Prime Minister Clement Attlee facilitate the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish Holocaust survivors into Palestine, and in December the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives asked for unrestricted Jewish immigration to the limit of the economic absorptive capacity of Palestine. Truman’s request signaled the U.S. entry into the arena of powers determining the future of Palestine. The question of Palestine, now linked with the fate of Holocaust survivors, became once again the focus of international attention.

As the war came to an end, the neighboring Arab countries began to take a more direct interest in Palestine as well. In October 1944 Arab heads of state met in Alexandria, Egypt, and issued a statement, the Alexandria Protocol, setting out the Arab position. They made clear that, although they regretted the bitter fate inflicted upon European Jewry by European dictatorships, the issue of European Jewish survivors ought not to be confused with Zionism. Solving the problem of European Jewry, they asserted, should not be achieved by inflicting injustice on Palestinian Arabs. The covenant of the League of Arab States, or Arab League, formed in March 1945, contained an annex emphasizing the Arab character of Palestine. The Arab League appointed an Arab Higher Executive for Palestine (the Arab Higher Committee), which included a broad spectrum of Palestinian leaders, to speak for the Palestinian Arabs. In December 1945 the league declared a boycott of Zionist goods.
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F. The Early Post-War Period

The major issue between 1945 and 1948 was, as it had been throughout the British mandate, Jewish immigration to Palestine. Zionists were determined to remove all restrictions to Jewish immigration and to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. The Arabs were determined that no more Jews should arrive and that Palestine should achieve independence as an Arab state. The primary goal of British policy following World War II was to secure British strategic interests in the Middle East and Asia. Because the cooperation of the Arab states was considered essential to this goal, British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin opposed Jewish immigration and the foundation of an independent Jewish state in Palestine. The U.S. State Department basically supported the British position, but Truman was determined to ensure that Jews displaced by the war were permitted to enter Palestine. The issue was resolved in 1948 when the British mandate collapsed under the pressure of force and diplomacy.

In November 1945, in an effort to secure American co-responsibility for a Palestinian policy, British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin announced the formation of an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. Pending the report of the committee, Jewish immigration would continue at the rate of 1,500 persons per month above the 75,000-limit set by the 1939 White
A plan of provincial autonomy for Arabs and Jews was worked out in an Anglo-American conference in 1946 and became the basis for discussions in London between Great Britain and the representatives of Arabs and Zionists. In the meantime, Zionist pressure in Palestine was intensified by the unauthorized immigration of refugees on a hitherto unprecedented scale and by closely coordinated attacks by Zionist underground forces. Jewish immigration was impelled by the burning memories of the Holocaust, the chaotic postwar conditions in Europe, and the growing possibility of attaining a Jewish state where the victims of persecution could guarantee their own safety. On the Arab side, a meeting of the Arab states took place in June 1946 at Blūdān, Syria, at which secret resolutions were adopted threatening British and American interests in the Middle East if Arab rights were disregarded.

While Zionists pressed ahead with immigration and attacks on the government, and Arab states mobilized in response, British resolve to remain in the Middle East was collapsing. World War II had left Britain victorious but exhausted. After the war it lacked the funds and political will to maintain control of colonial possessions that were agitating, with increasing violence, for independence. When a conference called in London in February 1947 failed to resolve the impasse, Great Britain, already negotiating its withdrawal from India and eager to decrease its costly military presence in Palestine (of the more than 280,000 troops stationed there during the war, more than 80,000 still remained), referred the Palestine question to the United Nations (UN).

G. The Partition Plan
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Following Britain's announcement in February 1947 of its intention to terminate its Mandate government in Palestine and referring the Palestine issue to the United Nations, the UN General Assembly appointed a special committee - the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) – with the adoption of resolution A/RES/106 (S-1) on 15 May 1947, to make recommendations on the land's future government.\textsuperscript{138} UNSCOP consisted of the representatives of 11 nations: Australia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, India, Iran, Netherlands, Peru, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{139} UNSCOP was given the widest powers to ascertain and record facts, and to investigate all questions and issues relevant to the problem of Palestine with the goal of conducting investigations in Palestine and wherever it may deem useful, receiving and examining written or oral testimony, whichever it may consider appropriate in each case, from the mandatory Power, from representatives of the population of Palestine, from Governments and from such organizations and individuals as it may deem necessary to prepare a report to the General Assembly and submit such proposals as it may consider appropriate for the solution of the problem of Palestine.\textsuperscript{140}

According to the statement of the United Nations Press Officer who was with the Special Committee on Palestine throughout its work, it has taken exactly two and a half months (15 June to 1 September) for UNSCOP to carry its task to completion.\textsuperscript{141} This entailed a 2200 mile 15 day tour of Palestine, a five day trip to the Lebanon and Syria, a one day visit to the King of Transjordan in Amman, a 2700 mile 7 day tour of DP camps in Germany and Austria, the holding of 13 public hearings in the course of which 37 persons representing 6 Arab states and 17 Jewish organizations gave evidence, and the holding of 4 private hearings.\textsuperscript{142} A total of 39
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private meetings were held by the Committee; its 4 sub-committees and its 3 working groups held additional formal and informal private meetings. In Palestine, about 200 correspondents belonging to 20 different nationalities were accredited to UNSCOP.

After visiting Palestine and conducting public and private hearings, UNSCOP issued a report on August 31, 1947 which recommends the establishment of two separate states, Jewish and Arab, to be joined by economic union, with the Jerusalem-Bethlehem region as an enclave under international administration. With this resolution, United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) called for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states, with the city of Jerusalem as a corpus separatum (Latin for “separate entity”) to be governed by a special international regime. Resolution 181 also called for the formation of the UN Palestine Commission with the task of selecting and overseeing provisional councils of government for the Jewish and Arab states by April 1, 1948—and set the date for the termination of the mandate no later than August 1, 1948.

It was argued that this decision was made possible partly because of an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on partition and partly because pressure was exerted on some small countries by Zionist sympathizers in the United States. All the Islamic Asian countries voted against partition. The resolution- which was considered by the Jewish community in Palestine to be a legal basis for the establishment of Israel, was accepted by the Jewish side while the Arabs rejected it and proposed a query the International Court of Justice on the competence of the General Assembly to partition a country against the wishes of
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the majority of its inhabitants\textsuperscript{150}. The query was rejected on the grounds that in 1946 there were 1,269,000 Arabs and 678,000 Jews in Palestine.\textsuperscript{151}

H. Civil War in Palestine

The Zionists welcomed the partition proposal both because it recognized a Jewish state and because it allotted slightly more than half of (west-of-Jordan) Palestine to it\textsuperscript{152}. As in 1937, the Arabs fiercely opposed partition both in principle and because nearly half of the population of the Jewish state would be Arab\textsuperscript{153}. Soon after the UN resolution, fighting broke out in
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Palestine\textsuperscript{154}. The Zionists mobilized their forces and redoubled their efforts to bring in immigrants\textsuperscript{155}. In December 1947 the Arab League pledged its support to the Palestinian Arabs and organized a force of 3,000 volunteers\textsuperscript{156}. Civil war spread, and external intervention increased as the disintegration of the British administration progressed\textsuperscript{157}.

Alarmed by the continued fighting, the United States expressed its opposition to forcibly implementing a partition in early March 1948\textsuperscript{158}. A March 12 report by the UN Palestine Commission stated that the establishment of provisional councils of government able to fulfill their functions would be impossible by April 1\textsuperscript{159}. Arab resistance to the partition in principle precluded the establishment of an Arab council, and, although steps had been taken toward the selection of the Jewish council, the commission reported that the latter council would be unable to carry out its functions as intended by the resolution\textsuperscript{160}. Hampering efforts altogether was Great Britain’s refusal in any case to share with the commission the administration of Palestine during the transitional period\textsuperscript{161}. On March 19 the United States called for the UN Palestine Commission to suspend its efforts\textsuperscript{162}.

IV. United States Proposal for Temporary United Nations Trusteeship for Palestine

During December 1947 and the early months of 1948, there was heavy fighting in Palestine as the Arabs attempted to prevent by force the creation of the two States proposed by the United Nations Partition Plan\textsuperscript{163}. The efforts of the UN Palestine Commission to implement the Resolution 181 were frustrated by lack of cooperation on the part of the British
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Administration in Palestine and of support on the part of the other Great Powers\textsuperscript{164}. On 19 March 1948, the United States suddenly abandoned its endorsement of the Partition Plan and called for a special session of the General Assembly to place Palestine under a United Nations trusteeship until such time as an Arab-Jewish compromise could be reached.\textsuperscript{165} After vigorously supporting the partition plan, this proposal represented a major policy shift in response to the then continuing Civil War in Mandatory Palestine. Following is the relevant part of the statement made by the United States Representative at the United Nations Ambassador Warren R. Austin before the Security Council on March 19, 1948\textsuperscript{166}:

\textit{\"The Security Council now has before it clear evidence that the Jews and Arabs of Palestine and the Mandatory Power cannot agree to implement the General Assembly plan of partition through peaceful means. The announced determination of the Mandatory Power to terminate the Mandate on 15 May 1948, if carried out by the United Kingdom, would result, in the light of information now available, in chaos, heavy fighting and much loss of life in Palestine. The United Nations cannot permit such a result. The loss of life in the Holy Land must be brought to an immediate end. The maintenance of international peace is at stake.}

\textit{The United States fully subscribes to the conclusion reached by the four permanent members that the Security Council should make it clear to the parties and Governments concerned that the Security Council is determined not to permit the situation in Palestine to threaten international peace and, further, that the Security Council should take further action by all means available to it to bring about the immediate cessation of violence and the restoration of peace and order in Palestine.}
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Under the Charter, the Security Council has both an inescapable responsibility and full authority to take the steps necessary to bring about a cease-fire in Palestine, and a halt to the incursions being made into that country. The powers of Articles 39, 40, 41, and 42 are very great, and the Security Council should not hesitate to use them—all of them—if necessary, to bring about peace.

In addition, my Government believes that a temporary trusteeship for Palestine should be established under the Trusteehip Council of the United Nations to maintain the peace and to afford the Jews and Arabs of Palestine, who must live together, further opportunity to reach an agreement regarding the future government of that country. Such a United Nations trusteeship would, of course, be without prejudice to the character of the eventual political settlement, which we hope can be achieved without long delay. In our opinion, the Security Council should recommend the establishment of such a trusteeship to the General Assembly and to the Mandatory Power. This would require an immediate special session of the General Assembly, which the Security Council might call under the terms of the Charter. Pending the convening of the special session of the General Assembly, we believe that the Security Council should instruct the Palestine Commission to suspend its efforts to implement the proposed partition plan.

I shall now read three propositions which are being submitted by the United States. I am not making any representation for any other one of the permanent members. The United States propositions are contained in a paper entitled “Additional conclusions and recommendations concerning Palestine”, which has been circulated to the members. It reads as follows:
“1. The plan proposed by the General Assembly is an integral plan which cannot succeed unless each of its parts can be carried out. There seems to be general agreement that the plan cannot now be implemented by peaceful means.

“2. We believe that further steps must be taken immediately not only to maintain the peace but also to afford a further opportunity to reach an agreement between the interested parties regarding the future government of Palestine. To this end we believe that a temporary trusteeship for Palestine should be established under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. Such a United Nations trusteeship would be without prejudice to the rights, claims or position of the parties concerned or to the character of the eventual political settlement, which we hope can be achieved without long delay. In our opinion, the Security Council should recommend the establishment of such a trusteeship to the General Assembly and to the Mandatory Power. This would require an immediate special session of the General Assembly, which the Security Council should request the Secretary-General to convocate under Article 20 of the Charter.

“3. Pending the meeting of the proposed special session of the General Assembly, we believe that the Security Council should instruct the Palestine Commission to suspend its efforts to implement the proposed partition plan.”

Draft resolutions which would give effect to the above suggestions will be circulated shortly for the consideration of the Security Council.”

167 Austin 1948
On March 20, the United States Secretary of State George Marshall confirmed the United States' view and on March 25 the United States President Truman gave a statement regarding the proposal:

A. Statement by President Truman Concerning United States Proposal for Temporary United Nations Trusteeship for Palestine on March 25, 1948

“"It is vital that the American people have a clear understanding of the position of the United States in the United Nations regarding Palestine.

This country vigorously supported the plan for partition with economic union recommended by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine and by the General Assembly. We have explored every possibility consistent with the basic principles of the Charter for giving effect to that solution. Unfortunately, it has become clear that the partition plan cannot be carried out at this time by peaceful means. We could not undertake to impose this solution on the people of Palestine by the use of American troops, both on Charter grounds and as a matter of national policy.

The United Kingdom has announced its firm intention to abandon its mandate in Palestine on May 15. Unless emergency action is taken, there will be no public authority in Palestine on that date capable of preserving law and order. Violence and bloodshed will descend upon the Holy Land. Large-scale fighting among the people of that country will be the inevitable result. Such fighting would infect the entire Middle East and could lead to consequences of the gravest sort involving the peace of this Nation and of the world.

These dangers are imminent. Responsible governments in the United Nations cannot face this prospect without acting promptly to prevent it. The United States has proposed to the Security Council a temporary United Nations trusteeship for Palestine to provide a government to keep the peace. Such trusteeship was proposed only after we had exhausted every effort to find a way to carry out partition by peaceful means. Trusteeship is not proposed as a substitute

for the partition plan but as an effort to fill the vacuum soon to be created by the termination of the mandate on May 15. The trusteeship does not prejudice the character of the final political settlement. It would establish the conditions of order which are essential to a peaceful solution.

If we are to avert tragedy in Palestine, an immediate truce must be reached between the Arabs and Jews of that country. I am instructing Ambassador Austin to urge upon the Security Council in the strongest terms that representatives of the Arabs and Jews be called at once to the council table to arrange such a truce.

The United States is prepared to lend every appropriate assistance to the United Nations in preventing bloodshed and in reaching a peaceful settlement. If the United Nations agrees to a temporary trusteeship, we must take our share of the necessary responsibility. Our regard for the United Nations, for the peace of the world, and for our own self-interest does not permit us to do less.

With such a truce and such a trusteeship, a peaceful settlement is yet possible; without them, open warfare is just over the horizon. American policy in this emergency period is based squarely upon the recognition of this inescapable fact.”

B. President Harry S. Truman

Harry S. Truman, (1884-1972) was the 33rd president of the United States from the Democratic Party (1945–53), who led his country through the final stages of World War II and through the early years of the Cold War, vigorously opposing Soviet expansionism in Europe and sending U.S. forces to turn back a communist invasion of South Korea169. Serving as vice-president of Roosevelt, Truman was sworn in as president on the same day as President Roosevelt died suddenly of a cerebral hemorrhage on April 12, 1945, which was just weeks away from Truman’s 61st birthday170. Roosevelt, who apparently did not realize how ill he was, made little effort to inform Truman about the administration’s programs and plans, nor did he prepare Truman for dealing with the heavy responsibilities that were about to devolve upon
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him\textsuperscript{171}. Although he had no foreign policy experience, and his term as the vice-president lasted only 82 days during which time he met with the president only twice, Truman was believed to be a capable administrator of large bureaucracies and a skilled politician who knew how to use the press to his purposes due to his military and political background as a U.S Senator in Missouri.\textsuperscript{172}

One of the first things that Truman did as the 33\textsuperscript{rd} President of the United States was to make final arrangements for the San Francisco meeting to draft a charter for the United Nations\textsuperscript{173}. Both United Nations (UN) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) were established under Truman administration. He oversaw the ending of the Second World War during his first two months in office\textsuperscript{174}. He participated in a conference at Potsdam, Germany in July 1945 for a meeting with Allied leaders to discuss the fate of postwar Germany\textsuperscript{175}. While in Potsdam Truman received word of the successful test of an atomic bomb at Los Alamos, New Mexico, and it was from Potsdam that Truman sent an ultimatum to Japan to surrender or face “utter devastation.”\textsuperscript{176} When Japan did not surrender and his advisers estimated that up to 500,000 Americans might be killed in an invasion of Japan, Truman authorized the dropping of atomic bombs on the cities of Hiroshima (August 6) and Nagasaki (August 9), killing more than 100,000 men, women, and children\textsuperscript{177}. This remains perhaps the most controversial decision ever taken by a U.S. president, one that scholars continue to debate today.\textsuperscript{178} Japan surrendered on August 14, and the Pacific war ended officially on September 2, 1945.\textsuperscript{179}
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Almost immediately after the end of World War II, Truman faced the threat of Soviet expansionism in eastern Europe. While the United States and the Soviet Union struggled to reach a balance of power during the Cold War that followed World War II; in 1947, the Great Britain announced that it could no longer afford to aid Mediterranean countries which the West feared were in danger of falling under Soviet influence such as Turkey and Greece. On March 1947, Truman declared to the world that by the pronouncement of the Truman Doctrine the United States would oppose communist aggression everywhere through economic, political and military assistance to all democratic nations under communist threat. President Truman especially called for economic aid to Greece and Turkey to help those countries resist communist takeover. The Truman Doctrine, therefore, was an American foreign policy whose stated purpose was to counter Soviet geopolitical expansion during the Cold War. The Truman Doctrine effectively reoriented U.S. foreign policy, away from its usual stance of withdrawal from regional conflicts not directly involving the United States, to one of possible intervention in faraway conflicts.

Similar to the Truman Doctrine, the motivation behind the Marshall Plan was the fear of the United States that the poverty, unemployment, and dislocation of the post-World War II period were reinforcing the appeal of communist parties to voters in western Europe. Therefore, when the Secretary of State George C. Marshall advanced the idea of a European self-help program to be financed by the United States, U.S Congress authorized the establishment of the program to rehabilitate the economies of 17 western and southern European countries within a year. During his second term, when the Chinese communists
finally won their long civil war in 1949, and the Soviet Union successfully tested a nuclear bomb, ending the nuclear monopoly enjoyed by the United States since 1945, Truman led the United States into a collective security agreement with noncommunist European nations, therefore forming the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—to resist Soviet expansionism.\footnote{Steinberg 2019} Following the establishment of NATO, Truman authorized development of the hydrogen bomb in order to maintain an arms lead over the Soviets in 1950.\footnote{Steinberg 2019} By the end of the decade, the wartime alliance linking the United States and Soviet Union had been completely severed, and the two nations had embarked on an arms race of potentially world-destroying dimensions.\footnote{Steinberg 2019}

V. Suggestions for Further Research

This study guide is prepared to give you a brief introduction to the agenda item. Additional research on the topic is, therefore, strongly advised. You will not find the policy of the countries you are representing in this study guide so the first thing you should do is to research the foreign policy of the country you represent in the conference during and post Second World War period. Which countries were allies with the country you represent? Where did your country stand regarding the Palestine partition plan and trusteeship proposal? It might also be beneficial to do more research on the historical events prior to the temporary trusteeship proposal. While you do your research, try to investigate the historical events of the country you represent as well as considering the situation in Palestine and neighboring countries at the time. Checking out online encyclopedias and history cites as well as the foreign ministry websites of your countries might be beneficial. You can also find relevant documents from United Nations database. Following readings might provide a more detailed understanding of the topic. You do not have to read all of the provided materials but skimming through them might be a good idea. I briefly touched
upon the biography and presidency of President Truman so that you can familiarize yourselves with the man behind the proposal. In the following readings you can also find some articles that discuss the policy preferences of Truman regarding Palestine. I do, however, encourage you all to dig deeper. I did not include any materials regarding the policies of your countries, that is for you to find out 😊


  http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/middle_east/israel_and_the_palestinians/key_documents/1681322.stm.
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