



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-763: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman Collection, 1930-2004.

Series H: United Jewish Appeal, 1945-1995.

Subseries 1: Sermons, Speeches and Writings, 1949-1982.

Box
22

Folder
32

"The Inner Meaning of the United Jewish Appeal." 1964.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

THE INNER MEANING OF THE UJA

In 1938, a few men, deeply stirred by the ominous events in Nazi Germany, concluded that only through a unified effort on the part of American Jewry could effective help be brought to the Jews in perils. And because this decision was necessary, wise and sound, it struck a responsive chord in the hearts of the people and the UJA came into being.

In the first quarter of a century of its life, the UJA has been many things. It has been the answer to a succession of challenges. At first there was the challenge of the Nazis who in defiance of all human values decreed: "All Jews must die." Through the UJA the Jews of America responded: "We shall save as many as can be rescued." Who prevailed? The answer is part of the saddest chapter in the history of the Jewish people and the bleakest chapter in the history of mankind. Millions of Jews perished because of the unbridled bestiality and depravity of the Nazis and because the world did pitifully little to help. But tens of thousands of Jews are alive today because UJA agencies brought food, medicine and clothing to Jews in the concentration camps, ghettos and in hiding, and because of the relentless effort on the part of these agencies to open avenues of escape to Jews consigned to death.

Then there was the challenge of the survivors who made their way into the displaced persons camps. UJA funds helped to restore their health and their will to live.

Then Israel was born and there was the challenge of the opportunity to solve the problem of the homelessness of the survivors of the Nazi holocaust and the insecurity of the Jews who found themselves in Moslem lands -- Yemen, Iraq, Egypt, Lybia. Not one Jew who wanted to go to Israel was left behind. These challenges have continued to the present day. Jews who broke out of Hungary in the 1956 uprising; Jews who were repatriated to Poland who could not pick up the threads of life in ghost communities; Jews whose position became untenable in the face of

events in the North African countries; and Jews from other parts of the world where life for them was burdensome, have been part of the steady march towards freedom in Israel and in other democratic lands. The fact that all these challenges have been met -- and met with such great compassion for those in need -- is of very essence the perennial start of the UJA.

The UJA has been a weapon.

UJA funds have helped to fight hunger and disease in North Africa, poverty in Iran, and old age and physical disabilities in Israel and in other parts of the world.

The UJA has been a beacon of hope.

There are many Jews who have needed help and whom the Jews of America wanted to help, who have been beyond reach. These Jews are sustained by the knowledge that American Jewry is interested in their plight and that when the day comes that American Jewry is free to help that help will be forthcoming.

The UJA has been a philanthropy in the highest Jewish tradition.

The UJA has been a philanthropy in the spirit of "tzedoko," the Hebrew word which incorporates the concepts of righteousness and justice. The hundreds of millions of dollars that the Jews of America have contributed to the UJA have been ^atax which the Jews have imposed upon themselves because their faith and their common fate had taught them that it was only just and righteous that they should share their material possessions with their fellow-Jews -- their brothers -- in need.

"Tzedoko" reaches the highest stage when it is given under conditions where the recipient and the donor are not known to each other. The size of the gifts that many men have given through the years to the UJA could have brought immortality for the donors if they were interested in having their names permanently identified with the object of their gifts. But the men and women who have contributed to the UJA have eschewed these honors and have found their reward in the knowledge that their monies, ~~provided~~ with funds provided by others, have gone to help their

fellow-man.

The UJA has been a solemn pact.

From its very beginnings the UJA has represented a solemn pledge on the part of the Jews of America, giving one to the other, that Jews in other parts of the world who are in need will remain of primary concern to them and that united, they will make every effort to meet these needs.

The UJA has been people.

The success of the UJA has not been the result of chance or accident. It has been the product of the examples set by men who have given staggering sums to the UJA and of the hard work done by countless men and women throughout the land. Year in and year out through the past quarter of a century the leaders have considered no assignment in behalf of the UJA too difficult. Some have worked indefatigably in their own communities. Others have travelled the length and breadth of the country making others share their own enthusiasm for the great cause in whose name and in whose behalf they spoke. They have all done this work cheerfully because they always carried before them the vision of the end results of their labor -- bringing to their fellow Jews in need the priceless gifts of human dignity and freedom -- the precious treasures of new hope and new life.

There is, indeed, good cause to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the UJA and to draw inspiration from what the UJA has achieved, for the work that still lies ahead. That work must be done and to the extent that it lies within the power of American Jewry, it will be done.

Twenty-five years ago, Congress was concerned about the sinister propoganda complex manipulated ~~complex manipulated~~ by Hitler's Germany and the Nazi Bund in this country. As a consequence, it passed a law requiring the non-diplomatic representatives of foreign governments and foreign principals to register with the Department of Justice. The purpose was to keep track of their expenditures and to ensure that foreign-financed propoganda was labelled, so that the American people would know its source. Has the law worked?

Many of our largest law firms and most prominent public officials have accepted substantial retainers and have registered under that law over the years. Of course, there is nothing wrong with being a foreign agent. But, like the word "lobbying," the phrase "foreign agent" has a dubious connotation in many minds. Foreign agents are fair game for isolationists who continue to warn us against any kind of entanglement with forces that are not "100% American." Furthermore, the term "foreign agent" has become associated with subversion. This was due, in part, to the fact that enforcement of the law was directed primarily at Nazi, and

later, at Communist activities. The Department of Justice was not equipped by manpower and money to go much beyond that.

Since World War II, many new countries have proclaimed their independence. Lacking experienced diplomatic personnel, some have retained American economists, lawyers and publicists to guide them through the maze of official Washington and to help them win favorable attention from our communications media.

At first, few of these experts worked on Capitol Hill. But, in recent years, as many of the new governments sought U.S. economic aid, agents were employed to lobby their cause before Congressional committees. Some were hired on a contingent fee basis and were paid impressive sums. Their pressures on the Hill mounted as foreign aid appropriations contracted, and they incurred the wrath of leading Senators who thought their programs did not always serve our own national interest.

In the summer of 1962, rival lobbies fought for large shares of the U.S. sugar allocation which formerly went to Cuba. Their activities made headlines. In another conflict, Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, clashed with a lobbyist who

represented Philippine claimants for war damages. The Arkansas Senator had preferred payment to the Philippine government rather than to individual claimants, but Congress overruled him.

Fulbright requested and gained authority to launch an investigation into the activities of foreign agents. The purpose was to determine how the law needed to be changed to deal with the increasing pressures on U.S. policies and public opinion.

This is the background of the recent inquiry.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations worked for a year and a half. It held private and public hearings and published the transcripts. And it has recommended changes in the law.

While Israel has employed agents, such as lawyers, economic consultants, etc. from time to time, it has not used public relations counsel to influence Congress or the Administration in Washington. It has not hired any lobbyists. Lobbying helpful to Israel has been carried on by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), which is

registered with Congress under the domestic lobbying law. AIPAC has never been required to register with the Department of Justice because it is not a foreign agent. It is an American committee, controlled and financed by Americans. Accordingly, neither the Government of Israel nor the American Israel Public Affairs Committee was under investigation.

The Senate Committee did delve into the expenditures of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. (American Section). The Agency is registered with the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act because it represents the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem), ^{IT IS} the American arm [?] of the World Zionist Organization.

Probably all readers of the Jewish Frontier know that the Jewish Agency was originally created as a quasi-official body under the League of Nations mandate. It was to represent and mobilize the Jewish people in creating the national Jewish homeland. ~~And~~ ^{Its} efforts on the diplomatic and political scene culminated in the historic struggle for statehood at the United Nations in 1947 and 1948. Inside Jewish Palestine, it helped to resettle incoming refugees and to develop the country's land and economy.

After the Government of Israel was established, the Jewish Agency suspended political action. But it retained responsibility for the care, transport, housing, employment and resettlement of the Jewish refugees as well as for education and the preservation of the Jewish cultural heritage.

Prior to 1960, the American Section of the Jewish Agency received the funds raised by the United Israel Appeal in this country and transmitted them to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). Some revenues remained here and were spent to inform the American public of the work done in Israel and to carry on various educational activities. These included assistance to the Zionist organizations, the promotion of religious education, the study of Hebrew and the Bible, the publication of books and pamphlets, and cooperation with American youth groups in the establishment of summer camps, seminars and study and travel groups to Israel.

*

There was a change in 1960. Officials of the Internal Revenue Department wanted to ensure that U.S. funds sent overseas for philanthropic

purposes were disbursed under the control of Americans. Accordingly, in 1960, American Jews established a new committee - the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. It allocates the monies that are received from the United Jewish Appeal for resettlement and rehabilitation. It makes the decisions and then transmits these funds to the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, which disburses them. The new Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. is an American committee. It is not a foreign agent. It is not required to register with the Department of Justice.

Meanwhile, the American Section, the "foreign agent," has continued its educational functions in this country. It no longer receives funds from the UJA but uses money sent from Jerusalem. It operates departments for youth, economic development, press and publications. It has cooperated with the Israel Office of Information. It has assisted Israel students and granted aid to Middle East studies at universities. It conducts an institute for adult education. It houses the Zionist Archives and library. As the arm of the World Zionist executive, the American Section has assisted American Zionist organizations in

distributing publications and raising funds.

For a time, much of this activity was carried on under the supervision of the American Zionist Council, an organization of the representatives of nine American Zionist bodies. The Jewish Agency, American Section, transmitted funds to the American Zionist Council to maintain its information and education program. Beginning in 1960, the Council raised part of its budget by its own appeal in the communities.

These activities were never in question by the Senate Committee. But the procedure for the transmission of funds came under challenge.

For years, the Agency had reported the total of its "grants and subventions" and its "payments to affiliates," as the law required. It did not list the recipients by name. The Department of Justice had never requested such a breakdown. But late in 1962, the Department of Justice requested the American Section to furnish a list of all recipients of its funds. The Section complied and its elaborated statement showed regular payments to the American Zionist Council.

At once, the question was raised - should the Council register as

the agent of the Jewish Agency, American Section, under the foreign agent registration law. In that event, the Council's publications would have to be labelled as material emanating from a foreign principal.

Since the American Zionist Council has been, in fact, an independent body, with its own governing committee, mapping its own program, it had never regarded itself as an "agent" of the Agency. But the Department of Justice ruled that registration was required.

There are many international organizations with American divisions. But the American Zionist movement is an American movement and it would seem incongruous to have it function as an agent of an international body. Therefore, American Zionist leaders felt that registration of the Council might give rise to misunderstanding and provide ammunition for the movement's detractors.

Accordingly, the Council notified Washington that it would no longer accept any funds from the Jewish Agency. The Agency resumed responsibility for some of the functions that it had previously delegated to the Council. Others were maintained by the Council. But the Council

curtailed its staff and closed its regional offices.

This drastic retrenchment of the AZC's activities is the one serious casualty suffered by the Zionist movement during this period. The Council was using its funds for education, youth organizations, summer seminars and tours for educators and youth and for a general information program. The problem facing Zionist leaders has been how to maintain these important activities and to raise the modest budget required for their continuation.

Now, all this happened in January of this year. The question arises, why did the Senate Committee open its inquiry into the Jewish Agency in March?

The amended statement filed by the Jewish Agency had given the Department of Justice a complete picture of its most recent activities. Nevertheless, the Senate Committee sent a team of three investigators into the Agency's offices to go into past accounts, records, minutes and files for the past half-dozen years. Since all the facts were already available to the Department of Justice - why? A number of the

Senate Committee explained that an organization like the Jewish Agency with large funds at its disposal might be spending substantial sums for lobbying.

Gottlieb Hamner, who directed the affairs of the Agency until 1960, and Isadore Hamlin, his assistant who succeeded him, were summoned to a closed session in Washington on May 23, at which they were questioned about the accounts. Subsequently, the Committee decided to publish the 215-page transcript of the testimony and to question Hamlin further in a public hearing, (89 pages were).

These hearings showed that between 1955 and 1962, the Jewish Agency turned over \$5,100,000 to the American Zionist Council. But the inquiry failed to show that any of this money was used for lobbying on Capitol Hill. There were no contributions to political parties or candidates for office. There were no free rides to the Near East for Congressmen. Washington was not deluged with pamphlets.

The truth is that American Zionists anticipated the inquiry by a dozen years.

Prior to 1948, as too many have now forgotten, it was the American Zionist Emergency Council which spearheaded the drive to win American public opinion to support the creation of a Jewish state. After Israel was created, the Council took the "Emergency" out of its name. It scaled down its activities. ~~It might have suspended entirely~~ if the UN armistice agreements had been superseded by peace treaties. But, as long as the Arabs continued their war against Israel - and their defamation of Israel's friends - the AZC, as the public relations arm of the Zionist movement, had work to do.

In 1950, American Jews, meeting at a large inter-organization conference in Washington, approved a four-point program to help finance Israel's development and thus enable Israel to absorb the hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees who were pouring through her gates and overtaxing her economy.

- It was decided 1) to expand the UJA, 2) to launch Israel bonds, 3) to stimulate private investments and 4) to request our Government

to include Israel in the U.S. foreign aid program. Up to that time, the only aid granted to Israel had been a \$100 million Export-Import Bank loan, with conventional interest rates (most of which has since been repaid).

Talk of a grant to Israel evoked swift opposition from oil lobbyists and from ex-U.S. diplomats. Some officials pointed out that the Arabs did not ask for economic aid and would resent any aid to Israel as confirmation that the United States was biased in Israel's favor. It was clear that an effort would have to be made to persuade Congress that a grant to Israel was justified and in harmony with U.S. interest.

American Zionists then decided to reactivate the one-room Washington office of the American Zionist Council. (I left my post as Director of Information for the Israel UN delegation for this purpose.) This decision was reached after a thorough discussion as to whether this work should be done on behalf of the Israel embassy or by the American Zionist Council. We came to the conclusion that foreign embassies and their agents should not lobby for legislation. Foreign

diplomats talk to the Department of State, not to Congressmen. Thus, from the very beginning, we rejected the practice which Senator Fulbright criticized so strongly in 1962.

We registered as a lobby with Congress, under the domestic lobbying law. And we announced our support not only for aid to Israel but for aid to the Arab peoples, for the Arab refugees as well as for the Jewish refugees, and for our foreign aid bill as a whole. We urged this program, not as a foreign agent, but - we have always believed - in the best interests of U.S. policy. All too few American organizations have been willing to lobby for the foreign aid program.

In 1954, we anticipated another problem - the use of tax-exempt funds for lobbying.

Zionist leaders decided that the AZC should no longer be involved in lobbying or any other political action. Instead, they created a separate committee, which would be financed with non-tax-exempt funds contributed by individuals. Thus, in March 1954, the American Zionist

Public Affairs Committee was born. It was later renamed the American Israel Public Affairs Committee because much of its support has been derived from non-Zionists as well as from Zionists.

The AZC closed its Washington office on March 1, 1954, a year before the 1955-1962 period reviewed by the Fulbright committee. (In subsequent years, up until 1960, the AZC did spend nominal sums in Washington for services and documents, including some fees for speaking engagements to myself. Like many other organizations, it bought subscriptions for the Near East Report, which I publish and edit in Washington. But it made no grants or subsidies to the AIPAC or the HER and did not contribute any funds to underwrite lobbying activities.)

Much of the testimony adduced by Senator Fulbright during the hearings had to do with the identification of the organizations and publications which had received funds, either directly or through the AZC, from the Jewish Agency. It was his thesis that the Jewish Agency had used the AZC as a "conduit" and that in this way the recipient of funds had been spared registration with the Department of Justice.

The implication was that the Jewish Agency was a central overall body directing public relations and political work through subsidiary and satellite instruments.

But those who are familiar with the facts of Jewish organizational life know that this is a distortion. Throughout this entire period, the Agency was preoccupied with the problem of absorption and settlement. It was never actively concerned with the program of the AZC or its affiliated or allied organizations. Nor was it interested or engaged in the work of non-affiliated organizations. Thus, the Agency had nothing at all to do with the work or the program of the AIPAC or with the editorial content of the HER. The AIPAC has fixed its own policies in ^{annual} ~~position~~

^{Statements} ~~papers~~ adopted at national policy conferences in Washington. The Committee is headed by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein of Rochester, New York. It has an executive committee of 30 and a national committee of 179.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency, the Synagogue Council, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, the Council for Middle Eastern Affairs and others were named as recipients of funds.

either from the Jewish Agency directly or from the American Zionist Council. It should be emphasized that there was not a line in the testimony to suggest that there was anything questionable about the activities of these bodies. Nevertheless, those who were named in the testimony were subjected to considerable publicity - some of it distorted - as if the inquiry had revealed facts which had hitherto been concealed.

And the hearings were exploited by adversary interests as an "expose" of the use of funds for "questionable" activities. It has been alleged that philanthropic funds have been misused for political and propaganda purposes. This foray in vilification is led by the American Council for Judaism, which has labored to make the revelations conform to its own nightmarish image of the Zionist movement. Thus, in a letter sent to many newspapers, Dr. Leonard R. Sussman, executive director of the American Council for Judaism, wrote: "The sworn testimony showed that at least \$5 million sent abroad for philanthropy was returned for political use of the World Zionist Organization in the United States. This is the same organization as the Jewish Agency for Israel, which is registered as a foreign agent with the Justice Department."

There is no truth in that statement. For years, this anti-Zionist body had been demanding a government investigation of Zion and its friends. It would have been delighted to function as an amicus curiae, aiding the prosecutor, if it could. Doubtless, it was breathing on the necks of the Senate Committee investigators, in a vain effort to fit the evidence to its own prejudicial preconception - that philanthropic funds were used for political purposes, and this unbeknownst to the innocent contributors - and that some central authority (a foreign principal called the World Zionist Organization) was mysteriously directing a network which sought to compromise the freedom and loyalty of American Jews.

For some weeks prior to the inquiry, the American Council for Judaism kept tipping newspapers, ^{in buses} press-agentry, to win space and headlines for the story. Newspapers who called our office for information about the AIC confided that the American Council for Judaism had stimulated the call. The Council sent out sensational comment on the inquiry, which it labelled as "fact sheets." It scored a coup when Senator Fulbright accepted its invitation to appear at its annual convention. Presumably,

the invitation was extended by constituents in Little Rock, where the ACJ has some members.

Of course Senator Fulbright is free to speak on any platform he chooses. But his appearance before the ACJ appeared inappropriate and untimely, since his critics could argue that it prejudiced his inquiry into the Jewish Agency. That was apparent from ACJ publicity, which billed his appearance as a significant affirmation that the U.S. government was accepting its line. The Senator was not happy about this exploitation. But he decided to make the address, for he came to regard it as an issue of free speech.

It is reported that one friend advised him to refrain from any remarks about the Arabs, the Israelis, the Zionists, the Near East, or even the Far East. In fact, Fulbright went very far indeed in search of a subject. He talked about space; a non-Zionist area which probably held little interest for the ACJ's publicity department.

Several newspaper columnists, presumably inspired by the ACJ, put out articles that the Senate Committee was studying the issue of

tax exemption, enjoyed by Zionist and pro-Israel organizations. Yet this was patently untrue. The Senate Committee was concerned with the foreign agents registration law and the need for amendment. It gave publicity to its study of the Jewish Agency because it was argued that the record illustrated the need for an amendment to the law, to extend it to organizations, individuals and publications which might receive funds from an agent through a conduit. The Committee was not entering into any discussion of tax exemption.

Nevertheless, the published transcript, containing excerpts from minutes, reports and memoranda, will be used and misused by Israel's foes in their propagandic barrage. The Arabs, too, will cite the testimony to deceive themselves, as they have for so long, about the nature of the "Zionist lobby."

Ever since Israel was established, fifteen years ago, Arab leadership has attributed Israel's success in 1948 to the pressures of a "Zionist lobby," which, Arabs are convinced, dominates our nation's press and politics. Irradentist Arabs are persuaded that Israel was conjured

into being by the incantations of a small minority of the American people.

Some day, Arabs dream, the American people will revolt and break the propaganda chains. Publishers will resist bullying by large Jewish advertisers. Radio, television and motion pictures will shake off the tyranny of Jewish stockholders. Political leaders will cease to be intimidated by the Jewish vote and will serve America's true interests. When that day comes, America will abandon Israel. And vindicated Arabs, from Habbus, Gaza and Amman, will restore the rights of the Palestine Arabs, to the applause of the international community.

Of course there is a pro-Israeli lobby. But there is no huge resemblance between it and the grotesque Arab image. Arabs have never been willing to accept the truth that the American people as a whole favored the creation of Israel. President Truman once modestly disclaimed special credit for his swift recognition of Israel. He merely did what the American people wanted him to do, he explained. Thus, the task of the pro-Israeli lobby is to clarify issues and to serve as a two-way

listening post between Congressman and constituent.

Arabs have slandered the integrity of American congressmen and political leaders by implying that they sold out America's interests for personal political gain. No press in the world is as free and independent of pressure as the American press. Arab propaganda has been counterproductive because it insulted the audience it courted.

But it is a cynical distortion to suggest that the friends of Israel are the only lobbyists interested in our Near East policies. There has always been an active pro-Arab group in Washington. They opposed the establishment of Israel; they were responsible for the ignominious reversal on partition in 1948; they opposed aid to Israel in 1951; they have pressed the thesis that Israel was responsible for the war and that the initiative rests with her to make reparations to the Arabs as a prerequisite to peace.

There are thirteen Arab delegations. There is the Arab Information Center, the American Friends of the Middle East, and a covey of organizations which have carried on anti-Israel propaganda under

VIRTUOUS

~~question-begging~~ titles; the Institute of Arab-American Affairs; the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine; the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land; the Holy Land Christian Committee; the Holy Land Emergency Liaison Program; the Committee for Security and Justice in the Middle East; the Continuing Committee on Christian-Muslim Cooperation. As they interpret history, the Zionists are expansionist aggressors and the Arabs are to defend themselves and to restore the rights of the Palestine Arabs.

Accordingly, many have asked why the Senate Committee confined its inquiry into the activities of the Jewish Agency and why Fulbright did not investigate the Arab lobby.

It was a coincidence that Bushrod Board, an agent for the Yemani royalists, appeared before the Senate Committee, on June 21, to criticize the Department of State's Near East policy and to charge that our Government had put \$4 million into an anti-Israel organization over the years. The State Department entered a denial, but Board reaffirmed his statement later, elaborating on it and naming the organization in secret testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Why didn't the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations investigate AFNE? This organization is well known to Senator Fulbright. He has graced its functions as an honored guest. A picture of the Senator, flanked by two Arab diplomats, appears on AFNE's 1961 annual report. Presumably, Fulbright's answer would be that he was investigating foreign agents and not American organizations. ^{The Committee} It was not investigating the Zionist movement, the Government of Israel or the Arab-Israel controversy. The Committee did not investigate the AZC or the AIPAC. An inquiry into American organizations, either pro-Israel or pro-Arab, might have led to the inference that the Senate Committee regarded them as foreign agents in spirit. Such an inference would have immediately aroused suspicions and fears in a sensitive area - suspicions that Americans were dividing their loyalties. Such an inquiry, unless carefully defined and checked, could have ranged into some kind of McCarthyism. By confining its probe to the paid agents of foreign principals, the Committee dispersed fears that the probe might take an ugly detour.

Even so, Fulbright might still have investigated the Arab Information Center, the links of that organization with the hate groups and the lunatic fringe in this country, and the efforts of pro-Arab groups to smear American friends of Israel. Here is a prime example of the way in which a foreign principal may carry on antagonistic activities against a segment of the American people.

Some critics have suggested that the list of those investigated reveals an interesting pattern. It includes lobbies whose views and programs Fulbright has opposed, such as the Philippine war claimants, and it includes regimes whose lobbies or policies do not enjoy a sympathetic press. Thus, the list includes Formosa, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Republic of South Africa, Portugal (Angola).

Fulbright's past record made an inquiry into the Jewish Agency inevitable. He rebuked lobbying by Israel's friends in speeches on the Senate floor in April 1960. That was in a debate ^{the} ~~in a debate~~ in which Fulbright was overruled on the "Suez" amendment to the foreign aid bill.

In 1957, President Eisenhower appealed to Israel to withdraw from Gaza and Sinai. He promised that if, "unhappily," Egypt blocked Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal, "this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations." But in 1959, the UN and the U.S. proved impotent when Nasser barred the Danish Inge Toft and the Greek Astypaleas because they carried Israeli cargoes. Without insisting that Nasser keep the canal open to all nations, including its own stockholders, the World Bank loaned him \$56 million to widen and deepen the very waterway which the Egyptian dictator was using as a weapon against Israel.

Congressional protests were ignored because Congress has no jurisdiction over World Bank lending. But Congress does control foreign aid appropriations, and in 1960 the House wrote in an amendment putting Congress on record against aid to countries which carry on boycotts and blockades and deny freedom of navigation in international waterways.

There was no dissent in the House. But Fulbright was able to pigeon-hole it in the Senate Committee. Fearing that it would fail in

conference, some 30 Senators (including John F. Kennedy) sponsored what came to be known as the Douglas-Keating amendment on the floor of the Senate. It was identical with the House amendment. It was approved over Fulbright's opposition and later he was defeated when he offered amendments in an attempt to water it down.

That defeat rankled. He blamed a lobby - an implied criticism of his colleagues. He said that the principal reason why the amendment was offered "was not because of the overall good of the United States but because of the existence of a pressure group in the United States which seeks to inject the Arab-Israel dispute into domestic politics." He said that in recent years "we have seen the rise of organizations dedicated apparently not to America but to foreign states and groups."

Within hours, word spread through Washington - helped, no doubt, by wishful thinkers - that Fulbright planned to investigate the "Israeli lobby."

The investigation didn't come off at that time. One of Fulbright's leading Democratic colleagues observed three months later, "Senator

Fulbright is a very rational man. But he went overboard on that one."

But Fulbright continues to "go overboard" on this issue. In 1961, he reprimanded the Administration when it offered mild language in a statement of policy reiterating the principles affirmed in the Douglas-Katting amendment. And ever since 1959, Fulbright has stubbornly fought the Morse-Javits amendment which opposes granting aid to nations which discriminate against Americans on the ground of race or religion.

A few weeks ago, he again disclosed that he had not changed his mind on the "activities of special pressure groups." He recently mailed out reprints of his 1960 speeches, along with a letter in which he reiterated his opposition to amendments which put conditions on U.S. aid.

I have already emphasized the point that, contrary to ACJ propaganda, the inquiry was not aimed at the UJA or its tax exemption. The Senate inquiry was careful to stress that its purpose was not to embarrass the UJA. Senator Fulbright went out of his way to speak highly of the good works of the UJA and the Jewish Agency overseas. He said, in opening the hearings on August 1: "There can be little but respect for an

organization which over the past fifteen years has resettled 1,150,000 refugees in Israel - indeed American Jews have shown their support for the Agency through contributions of over \$1 billion, and the U.S. Government itself has over the past fifteen years supplied another \$870 million in grants and loans to Israel for similar purposes."

Thus, the inquiry had to do with how the expenditure of funds in this country related to the foreign agents registration law. Nothing in the testimony justified the American Council for Judaism insinuation that philanthropic funds were misused.

Nor did the exposure give credence to the myths circulated by the anti-Semites. There was no evidence of a central authority, extending arms in many directions, issuing instructions and doling out large appropriations to far-flung agents. There were no Elders of Zion.

The testimony does not show precisely how much of the money spent by the AZC over this period actually came from UJA sources and how much came from other organizations and sources. But if one assumed, for the sake of argument, that every penny of the \$5 million that the AZC received between 1955 and 1962 came from the UJA, this would still be a

only percent of the which the UJA raised in the same period. Moreover, the amount that the AZC then spent for services, documents and subscriptions in Washington during this period is a miniscule fraction of the \$5 million. During the same period, AFME raised \$ and the American Council for Judaism \$. Both organizations, incidentally, are tax-exempt.

But arithmetic and percentages aside - is there any real doubt that the work done in the AZC was in the overall interest of UJA? Apart from the fact that Zionists always helped UJA with their own contribution in money and ~~manpower~~ volunteer services, there is not the slightest doubt that UJA interests were served by the existence of an organization which was building a favorable climate of opinion, which was seeking to clarify controversial issues for editors, the clergy and professors, which was arranging for study tours for Americans in Israel, holding seminars on college campuses. Of course, the UJA is concerned with expanding the interest of American Jews in Israel. There will always be a need for education among Jewish youth, if American Jews are to preserve the voluntary commitment in the cause of Israel's survival.

It has served the UJA to have defenders in Washington. The UJA has been attacked on Capitol Hill. There was the Flanders episode in 1958, when the Vermont Senator made ten speeches and offered a resolution challenging the UJA's tax exemption. Many Senators took the floor to answer Flanders' accusations. Texts of their speeches were

printed and widely circulated.

It is artificial to draw a distinction between New York and Washington. The UJA was raising funds for the resettlement of Jewish refugees in Israel. In this same period, we were lobbying for American aid to Israel to serve the same objective. Regrettably, lobbying has become a hate word. But every American knows that lobbying is a fundamental right and that its infringement touches on a main nerve in the democratic system.

Yet we shall always be lectured on the need for a pious separation between philanthropy and political action. And there will be some who will give money for relief and rehabilitation in Israel but who will not spare a non-deductible dime for political action. But long ago, many UJA leaders recognized the importance of AIPAC in Washington and supplemented their UJA contributions with non-deductible contributions to the Committee. They were appreciative of the splendid partnership between the private philanthropy of the American Jew and the generosity of the American government.

And they have good memories. Back in the 1940s there was an unrealistic effort to departmentalize our thinking into logic-tight compartments. In those days, humanitarians said they favored opening Palestine's doors to Jewish immigration and they joined in demanding the abrogation of the White Paper. But they weren't sure that there should be a Jewish commonwealth. Zionists countered with the argument that the Jewish state preceded immigration, both in logic and in time - that Palestine's doors would not be opened unless Jews held the key.

By 1948, most people had accepted that reality. Today, there is little difference between Zionists and non-Zionists. Virtually all realize that it is dangerous to bring refugees to Israel unless Israel has the economic capacity to grow and the strength to defend its people. We are bringing Jews to Israel to live - not to be killed in a renewal of war. American Jews know that it will take a long time to win an Arab-Israeli peace. Until that day comes, there is work in Washington to strengthen Israel's frontiers.

Now that all the accounts have been examined, and the testimony published, it is necessary to enter a general disclaimer.

Obviously, there is a vast difference between a hired lobby and an army enlisted by conviction. It would be bizarre for veteran Zionists to regard themselves as "agents" of Israel. They treasure the recollection that they had a small part in the struggle for Israel's creation. Their commitment to Israel does not correspond to the relation of agent and principal. There is partnership. It is a relationship which is not easily analyzed by accountants, however perceptive, or by Senators, however inquisitive. The transcript, in its existing form, might well be entitled "A Bookkeeper's View of the Jewish Problem." The testimony did not touch on the fundamental motivation - Israel's struggle for peace and survival.

This sentiment was expressed in a letter which I wrote to Senator Fulbright and which he was kind enough to include in the transcript of the hearings: "Our generation witnessed the destruction of six million Jews at the hands of Nazi barbarians. Experience has taught us not to be

complacent about threats against Jews anywhere in the world. We take them seriously. We see a parallel between the threats against the Jews of Europe in the 1930s and the threats against the Jews of Israel in the 1960s. We try to do all that we can to warn of the danger and to ensure that the two million Jews of Israel will not suffer the fate that befell the six million Jews of Europe. In this struggle, we act as agents of our conscience.

"It is in this spirit and for that purpose that this Committee continues its efforts to keep Congress and the Administration apprised of our hopes and fears. It is our responsibility to combat misleading Arab propaganda, which is widely disseminated in Washington in a never-ending campaign to discredit and defeat American friends of Israel and to undermine American support for Israel. And, in a positive way, we strive for a firm U.S. policy which will help all the peoples of the Near East to develop and prosper, which will foster a climate of cooperation, which will strengthen democratic institutions, which will guarantee stability and which, eventually, will bring about a peace settlement." And, I

wrote, "No one, of course, would deny any American organization the right to lobby on issues of foreign policy as well as domestic policy."

I wish that we could be absolutely sure of that. For I am afraid that some Senators do. They will question whether the ordinary citizen is able to make the right decision from the standpoint of America's best interest, and whether he should intrude into an area where he cannot have all the facts. This is an ancient debate. The ~~career diplomat is skeptical.~~ ^{And} a people's lobby is always vulnerable to the ~~charges~~ ^{Career diplomat's criticism} that the people, unwittingly, complicate international relationships and jeopardize our security. Diplomacy is best conducted quietly by experts insulated from criticism and challenge. So it is said.

Some of our Senators have freely criticized our Near East policy when they thought it was wrong. Fortunately, there are very few who would deny us the same privilege or who would share the defeatist fear that our criticism might make it difficult for our Government to reach an understanding with the Arab states.

The topical issue is the continuing controversy over our aid to Egypt, which arms for the day of Israel's destruction. More and more Congressmen have come to doubt that Nasser can be trusted - not ~~merely~~ because of his threats to destroy Israel - but because of the Yemen expedition. The Administration rationalizes American pursuit of Egypt on the ground that we must give Egypt an alternative to the Soviet Union. Otherwise, it is said, we will lose the Middle East to Moscow. In the 1930s we were always admonished that we might lose the Middle East to Berlin.

Manifestly, Israel's friends have work to do in Washington. We doubt whether any one will be intimidated by propaganda which questions ~~his~~ motives. There is nothing "foreign" about the "pro-Israel lobby. It is an American lobby, serving the highest purposes of U.S. policy - the peace and development of the Near East.