



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series I: General Correspondence, 1914-1969, undated.

Sub-series A: Alphabetical, 1914-1965, undated.

Reel
10

Box
3

Folder
199

American Zionist Emergency Council, Shapiro, Harry, 1945.

November 27, 1945

Mr. Loy W. Henderson, Director
Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Henderson:

In connection with our conversation of November 23rd, I have the honor to forward to you the enclosed copy of a message which we have received from Palestine, dealing with the British part in the recent disorders in Tripoli.

I would be very much obliged if you will submit this material to the Secretary of State and will take any other measures which you may deem appropriate under the circumstances.

As of possible interest in this regard, I also enclose for your information and for that of the Secretary of State a copy of a news item from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 26th dealing with the attitude of British authorities toward the Jews in Belsen-Bergen. A third item which will also be of interest to you is a news story carried by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 11th and pointing to the part played by government officials in Palestine in inciting the local Arab population to armed action against the Jews.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BA:ow
3 Encls.

Dr. Silver

November 28, 1945

Mr. Harry Shapiro, Executive Director
American Zionist Emergency Council
342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, New York

Dear Shapiro:

1. I want to inform you about an hour's talk which I had with Loy Henderson of the Department of State on Friday, November 23rd. He asked me why we take so negative an attitude on the Anglo-American Commission. I explained our reasons, analyzing the purpose of the British Government as illustrated in Bevin's statement and telling about our past experience with British commissions. He said that on the American side at least there undoubtedly is every intention to play fair. I replied that the attitude of the administration with reference to the pending resolution in the Senate makes us doubt whether this is the case. Had the administration so desired, it could have obtained from Great Britain the admission of 100,000 Jews in exchange for American agreement to the Commission; it could have insisted on making the terms of reference of the Commission more favorable, and it certainly would have welcomed a Congressional resolution at this time, which would strengthen the hands of the administration and of the American members of the Commission in dealing with the matter. Since the administration chose to do neither of the first two things and is now trying to prevent the passage of the resolution, we have no choice but to take it for granted that the American Government, too, is using the Commission either to stall for time or as an instrumentality to justify an unfavorable policy. He said that he would transmit this point of view to the Secretary of State.

2. Henderson took up the request for 100,000 certificates. He said that in his opinion it would make no sense to admit so large a number of Jews unless it is decided that further Jewish immigration should be permitted to the point where Jews should make a majority and establish a Jewish State. Otherwise, the admission of so large a number

Mr. Harry Shapiro,
Executive Director

November 28, 1945

would only complicate the situation in Palestine and possibly expose those Jews to further persecution. This would be unfair, he said, to the people concerned who might otherwise take root in various countries in Europe. He further said that he had made his point of view clear to Secretary Byrnes some time ago.

I reminded him that the 100,000 candidates for immigration are already uprooted, and that they, and a great many other people, would gladly take their chances on immigrating to Palestine, even without a decision on the country's future -- which he admitted -- but I agreed with him that the tension and irritation in Palestine will continue until a clear decision is reached in favor of a Jewish majority and the Jewish State.

3. I mentioned recent newspaper reports that Ibn Saud had threatened to cancel American oil concessions and explained why I believed this would be sheer nonsense. Henderson admitted that to his knowledge no such threats were ever made by the Saudi-Arabians and that he did not think that any such threat would ever be made by them. I told him that the worry over the security of American oil concessions is very great among newspaper people and others and asked whether he would mind repeating to newspaper men the statement which he had made to me. He said that he would have no objection to doing so and that I could refer to him any newspaper man who raised this issue. (I have every intention of doing so, and would suggest that you should do the same; perhaps even Roy Howard's attention should be drawn to this matter.)

4. I raised the question of the attitude of the British authorities in connection with the recent disorders in Tripoli. He said that the Department has already inquired about the matter, and read to me a longish cable received by the Department in reply to its inquiry, from the American Legation in Cairo. Another report is expected momentarily from the representative of the Office of Strategic Services in Tripoli. Henderson's personal opinion is that there was no deliberate machination on the part of the British, but that probably it was a case of incompetence of the officers on the spot. I said that if it is a case of gross incompetence, the guilty ones should be severely punished, but that we have received reports that there was deliberate evil intention. I reminded him of similar occurrences in Palestine at the beginning of the British occupation in 1920, and of the reports of incitement of Palestinian Arabs against the Jews by officials of the Palestine administration. We agreed that I would send him the gist of the report received from Palestine regarding the Tripoli affair, and that he will submit our material, together with the report of the Cairo Legation and of the O.S.S. to Secretary Byrnes.

Accordingly, I sent him yesterday a letter with enclosures, a copy of which is enclosed.

Mr. Harry Shapiro,
Executive Director

November 28, 1945

5. I complained of British propaganda dealing with the military situation in Palestine. The points I made to him are along the lines of the memorandum on this subject enclosed herewith. He agreed with the reasonableness of our point of view and stated that to his knowledge Britain has never suggested that American troops be sent to Palestine. I asked whether I might refer to him newspaper men who are under the impression that this was done and refused by the American Government, and he agreed to my doing so.

At the point where I told him of my talk with some Englishmen in which I asked point blank whether they really want America to share the responsibility for Palestine, fully knowing that this means sharing with the United States authority over the country, he became very interested. It was obvious that the British attempt to have America share the moral responsibility for bad policies but reserving to Britain every ounce of effective control, is well-known and resented by people in the Department of State. By facial expression and otherwise, Henderson also indicated animated satisfaction at the point where I mentioned that the British, after kicking De Gaulle out of Syria had hoped to obtain military and political control over that territory, but were gypped by the Arabs, with the discreet assistance of the American Government.

6. At the end of our talk, Henderson said that he had told Mr. Duce, the vice-president of the Arabian-American Oil Company, of my desire to see him, and that Duce had stated his readiness to meet with me. (You will find in one of my earlier reports that I had mentioned to Henderson my desire to get in touch with some of the American oil people interested in the Middle East.)

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BA:cw
Encls.

Dr. Silver

November 29, 1945

Mr. Harry Shapiro, Executive Director
American Zionist Emergency Council
342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, New York

Dear Shapiro:

had
The following is a report on the visit of Dr. Goldstein and I in the Department of Interior this afternoon:

We saw the Under Secretary, Mr. Fortas, at 2:15 and told him of the harm which the oil argument is doing us in Washington. We said that we are trying to combat the argument as follows: "Ibn Saud and the other Arab rulers are mortally afraid of any Russian influence in their countries, since that would radically change the social structure of their countries and deprive them of their traditional power and way of life. Therefore, any hints that they may be thrown into the arms of the Russians are empty bluffs.

Neither would they like an increase of British influence: Britain is poorer than the United States and can't pay so much; it is also too weak to protect them effectively against Russia; finally, Britain likes to dominate countries under its influence with respect to political and military affairs to an extent unpalatable to the Arabs. It is to the United States that the Arabs are looking, since we are the richest, the strongest, and are interfering least with international affairs. Therefore, whatever the Palestine policy of our government, Ibn Saud and the other Arab rulers will continue to cling to American friendship."

We added that this argument, however plausible, is not sufficiently convincing when advanced by us. The only person in the government who would be accepted as a sufficient authority on oil matters to destroy the oil bogey in the minds of the President and the Secretary of State, perhaps also in the minds of various Senators and newspaper men, is Secretary Ickes.

The Executive Director

November 29, 1945

Mr. Fortas agreed that the argument is logical and that it would be right for us to ask the Secretary to explain the situation to the President and the Secretary of State.

Dr. Goldstein asked whether, in the opinion of Mr. Fortas, it is this government or Ibn Saud who is holding the trumps. Mr. Fortas replied that our position is much stronger, that Russia is as yet a potential factor in the situation, that there is some competition between the United States and Great Britain, but that fundamentally Ibn Saud, of course, prefers us to the British. He added that even the oil companies hardly believe that strong American backing of Zionism would result in a permanent endangering of American oil interests. They think, though, and with some justification, that there may be some temporary trouble, such as some sabotage of the oil lines or some motions which might indicate that the Arabs would like to cancel some concessions. The question is whether the fear of such minor and temporary damage should be allowed to stand in the way of an American policy motivated by important humanitarian considerations. Even if there is one chance out of a hundred of such a temporary damage, this suffices to induce the oil companies to oppose Zionism.

Mr. Fortas also thought that the question should be ventilated publicly, so that the whispering campaign based on the oil argument should be proven by public discussions as devoid of a real foundation.

He thought that at a later time, but not today, the Secretary might be asked to make a public speech in which he would express his conviction as to the baselessness of the oil argument. He advised us to consult him before approaching the Secretary in this manner.

We saw the Secretary at 3:00, and stayed with him for half an hour. We repeated the point made to Mr. Fortas, but the Secretary said that he does not believe that either Mr. Truman or Mr. Byrnes are moved by any considerations of American oil interests. At least they have never mentioned the matter to him and he thinks that if this had been the basis of their hesitation, they would have asked what he had to say about it.

He thinks that American policy on Palestine is mainly the result of the general tendency of his administration to work closely with the British. He, Ickes, spoke to the President about Palestine as recently as last Monday. He has spoken to him several times before and hopes to discuss it again. We mentioned that the oil argument is also genuinely feared by some Senators and inquired whether the Secretary could explain the true situation to them. The Secretary said that he would be freer after the Anglo-American Oil Commission has been ratified by the Senate. After this is done, our government will be freer anyhow in the Middle East, since our and English oil interests in the area will have been established

The Executive Director

November 29, 1945

on a clear basis. But the treaty is being held up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Dr. Goldstein mentioned the rumors that Ibn Saud is asking for an advance on royalties and asked whether this could not be made use of to overcome his opposition. Mr. Ickes replied that there we might have a lead, but that it is the Department of State which would be dealing with that matter.

Some other matters were discussed (politics, characterization, etc.), and Dr. Goldstein will inform you about them orally.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BA:ow



Dr. Silver

December 5, 1945

Mr. Harry Shapiro, Executive Director
American Zionist Emergency Council
342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, New York

Dear Shapiro:

I had a lengthy conversation yesterday morning with Mr. Raymond L. Zwemer, Chief of the Division of Cultural Cooperation in the Department of State. I had met him at the conference which Ben-Horin and I had with Mr. Benton, the Assistant Secretary of State. Zwemer is the son of the most outstanding American missionary in Arabia, has grown up in the Middle East, is undoubtedly familiar with all the people who are at the center of anti-Zionist activities in Washington, and, perhaps, participates in these activities. It was for the purpose of making him out that I arranged yesterday's appointment.

I began by discussing with him a matter which falls within the jurisdiction of his Division: the question of exchange of students between the Hebrew University and various American colleges. As you know, such exchanges are made by the United States with various countries. Private institutions such as the Institute for International Education under Dr. Dugan in New York, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, have been traditionally organizing these exchanges. In recent years, the Department of State has become interested in the matter and is now actively encouraging these exchange activities, to some extent even participating in the financial outlay. I told Zwemer that archeologists, students of Semitics, and theologians in this country might be interested in studying at the Hebrew University, and that students of agriculture and engineering from Palestine might very usefully study at American colleges. I added that we, American Zionists, do not see why Palestinian Jewish students who want to perfect themselves in English should all go off to London, Oxford, or Cambridge, and that we think it most desirable that some of them go to American universities.

The Executive Director

December 5, 1945

He liked the idea very much and added that he hoped that such students would not all go to Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, but that they would go to the smaller American colleges where they would be in much closer social and personal contact with American students. (Incidentally, I find that idea very sound and endorse it heartily.)

He suggested that the University of Jerusalem address a letter to this general effect to his Division and write another letter of the same kind to the Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education, Social Security Agency, Washington, D. C. He assured me that he will give this matter his favorable consideration. "In the beginning, there may be no more than two or three students exchanged, but in time, the number may grow. This is what happens in other cases", were his words. I am going to suggest to Elishu Epstein that he immediately refer this matter to the Hebrew University, since I consider it very essential that American students get their impressions of the Middle East not only through Beyruth and Arab channels, but also through contact with our people. I also think that if some Jewish students from Palestine, selected not only for their scholarship abilities but also for their personality and persuasiveness, would begin to appear at places such as Cornell, Dartmouth, Princeton, Williams, Amhurst, and some of the larger universities, they could make important friends for our cause in years to come.

I then told Zwemer of the difficulty which we have been finding in various government agencies and in the universities, in the very center of the anti-Zionist opposition where there are people who were associated with the Arabs either as missionaries or as educators. He first tried to give me the usual arguments: dispossessing Arabs, Christian feeling, absorptive capacity, and so on. We analyzed these arguments and he had to admit that they are not really sound, and that at the root of the opposition of the educators and missionaries is the fact that they worked among the Arabs, have come to like them, and are looking for arguments that would be helpful to them. I asked him what the remedy would be, and he suggested that the exchange-student proposition might prove a long range remedy. We then discussed the reasons why we don't have much time and must press for an immediate solution.

The value of this conversation lies in the fact that here is the first time I got one of the circle whose opposition to us is most intense to analyze the attitude of the people of this circle and to admit that this attitude is biased rather than objective. I intend to invite him soon to lunch or dinner together with Elishu Epstein, whose knowledge of Arab conditions would make him very valuable in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

BA:ow

Benjamin Akzin

Dr Silver

December 7, 1945

Mr. Loy W. Henderson, Director
Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Henderson:

May I take the liberty of reminding you of my letters of September 26 and October 9, 1945, dealing with the reported threats of aggressive violence against the Jews of Palestine by King Ibn Saud. When we discussed the matter orally some time ago, you were good enough to inform me that the question had been referred by you to the appropriate Division in the Department of State with a view to ascertaining what, if any, action on the part of the Government of the United States would appear appropriate in the circumstances. Since a considerable time has elapsed, and we are naturally concerned lest Ibn Saud and other Arab rulers be left under the impression that such threats of violence are a matter of indifference to the Government of the United States, I would be very much obliged if you could possibly inform me whether any action has been taken to prevent such an impression from gaining ground.

At the same time, I would like to recall to your attention my letter of November 27, 1945, enclosing a copy of a message which we had received from Palestine and dealing with British responsibility for the recent disorders in Tripoli, and some other related matters. I would be very grateful if it were possible for you to let me know whether these documents have been submitted to the Secretary of State and whether you believe it possible to take some appropriate action on the basis of these reports.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BAtaw

Dr. Silver

December 7, 1945

Mr. Loy W. Henderson, Director
Office of Near Eastern & African Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Henderson:

I have been instructed by the American Zionist Emergency Council to bring to your attention the enclosed photostat copy of a letter which appeared in a recent issue of the newspaper "PM" in New York, with a request to ascertain the facts of the situation.

You will undoubtedly realize the concern with which the Jewish citizens in the United States would view the situation described in the attached letter, if it were found to be essentially correct.

I would be very grateful, therefore, if you would deem it possible to inform me as to the state of affairs and as to the attitude of the United States Government with reference to the reported agreement of the United States authorities not to employ Jews in the construction of the base in Saudi-Arabia.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BA:ew
Encl.

SAUDI-ARABIA BASE

Dear Editor:

A few weeks ago I read in PM that the U. S. A. is building a military and commercial base in Saudi-Arabia at a cost of \$4,000,000.

Said base will eventually be given to Saudi-Arabia as a present.

You failed to point out an interesting point in connection with this base that is now revealed in a soldier's letter. Saudi-Arabia made the condition that no Jew may be employed by U. S. authorities in the construction of the base. And the U. S. military authorities acceded to this demand.

The U. S. A. once abrogated diplomatic relations with Russia, always considered a first-class power, for discrimination against its representative, who happened to be a Jew. Now, the U. S. A. bows to an insignificant feudal king who lives out of subsidies of Great Britain and sale of oil to both Britain and the U. S. A.

Philadelphia

Maj J. Benamy

December 21, 1945

Mr. Harry Shapiro, Executive Director
American Zionist Emergency Council
342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, New York

Dear Shapiro:

1. Mr. George Warren, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of displaced persons (whom I know rather well from my work in the War Refugee Board), phoned me this afternoon to tell me that the memorandum on the European aspect of the Palestine problem, which I had given to Mr. Leverich of the Central European Division, has been read by the people in the European Divisions and has rather impressed them. These Divisions forwarded the memorandum to him. It is the feeling of the European Divisions, which he shares, that now that a Joint Commission has been appointed to go into the problem, it would not be appropriate for the European Divisions to make any recommendations to the Secretary of State on this problem, but that they should leave it to the Joint Commission to formulate its findings first. He added that the memorandum, or something of that nature, would seem most appropriate for inclusion in the material which we might wish to submit to the Joint Commission.

I replied that we have not yet made a decision as to whether we should present any testimony before the Commission. I explained that we view with suspicion this entire procedure, since the British government is clearly unfriendly and is proposing the Commission not to find facts but to find excuses. I added that the British personnel of the Commission seems to have been picked with an eye to their seconding the policy which has been decided upon in advance by Mr. Bevin; that the American members of the Commission are undoubtedly fair people who don't know enough about the matter, but that they will easily be awayed by their British colleagues, and especially by the staff members, who will be picked out for them by the Middle East Divisions of the Department of State. I drew his attention to the fact that the Middle East Divisions are consistently taking a pro-Arab view on the Palestine question

The Executive Director

December 21, 1945

and especially to the fact that the American University at Beirut is the chief center of Arab-Nazi propaganda and that any man who would be put on the staff of the Commission who was connected with the Beirut University must be considered extremely hostile. He said that he did not know that latter fact.

I was particularly out-spoken in these remarks, because George Warren may have a lot to do with the appointment of the Commission staff and because I thought that a strong attack, emphasizing the partiality of the Middle East and Beirut people might induce him to become particularly cautious about following the advice of these groups.

2. I had a second conversation today with Mr. Zwemer, head of the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State. I wanted Eliahu Epstein to be present, but he could not make it.

It was a general and cordial conversation about the Middle East and other parts of the world. I asked him about a concrete way to proceed in connection with the exchange student program discussed at our first meeting, and he suggested that the approach be made along the lines of the draft enclosed herewith. This letter ought to be sent by the University of Jerusalem to the Department of State, and I am asking Eliahu Epstein to forward this draft to Jerusalem with a request for immediate action. Please see my report of December 5th for an explanation of the importance of this step.

I discussed with Zwemer the financial aspects involved. Zwemer explained that the simplest way of getting the program started would be for the Hebrew University to grant tuition scholarships (i.e., free tuition) to the students from America and for the American universities to grant free tuition to the students from Palestine. Each side would be responsible for the travel and maintenance costs of its students in the foreign country. After the Department of State gets additional funds from Congress, it may be feasible for the United States to contribute to either the travel or the maintenance costs of Palestinian students in America, but this is not yet certain. My advice would be not to postpone the exchange program until this additional concession is won, but to invite American students to Jerusalem and to get our people to appropriate American colleges on the basis of tuition scholarships only. The Hebrew University would merely sacrifice some tuition fees; the travel and maintenance costs of our students in America would probably be met in most

The Executive Director

December 21, 1945

cases by the families of those students; in particular cases, certain organizations in Palestine might wish to contribute something toward these expenses. The maintenance and travel costs of American students would not have to concern us at all. I strongly recommend that the heads of the Emergency Council urge the Hebrew University to write to the Department of State without the least delay.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BA:ow



Mr. Raymond L. Zwemer
Chief, Division of Cultural Cooperation
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Zwemer:

On behalf of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, I have the honor to suggest hereby an exchange of students between the Hebrew University and various colleges and universities in the United States.

It is believed that the Hebrew University in Jerusalem would afford welcome opportunities for graduate and undergraduate study for a number of students from the United States, particularly those specializing or majoring in theology, archeology, ancient history, and Semitic languages. On the other hand, we believe that a number of our students, both of the graduate and undergraduate level, would greatly profit by a year or two of study in the United States, where they could improve their knowledge in the fields of English language and literature, history, economics, engineering, chemistry, agriculture, and medicine. We feel that a period of stay in the United States would also make them, upon their return, good interpreters of the American people and American institutions in Palestine.

If the proposal meets with your approval, we would be ready to carry it out at the earliest possible moment. We would propose an exchange on the basis of tuition scholarships, with each party responsible for the travel and maintenance costs of the students proposed by them. We would suggest an exchange on the basis of from six to twelve students of the Hebrew University proceeding to the United States, and a corresponding number from the United States studying at the Hebrew University, each student being entitled to a scholarship of one to two years' duration.

I shall be grateful if you will give this matter your earliest attention, and am authorizing Mr. Elishu Epstein, a graduate of the Hebrew University, now residing at 2210 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C., to negotiate further in this matter with the Department of State and with any governmental and educational agencies in the United States, and to conclude, on behalf of the Hebrew University, any arrangements necessary for the carrying out of the above proposal.

I am, sir,

Yours very truly,

December 21, 1945

Captain A. Tulin
521 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Dear Captain Tulin:

Upon receipt of your telephone call this afternoon, asking me to see Leslie Rood and to obtain all possible information regarding the submission of evidence to the Joint Commission, I telephoned Mr. Rood. He said that letters are being mailed out today to the Jewish Agency, to the American Zionist Emergency Council, and to each of the four constituent organizations, outlining the procedures invited in connection with the submission of evidence. Should we desire any further clarification upon receipt of these letters, he will be glad to see me or anyone else. In the meantime, he would be glad to answer any questions over the telephone.

In reply to my various questions, Rood stated as follows:

The Joint Commission has at its disposal documents, books, pamphlets, and other written material. It is not necessary, therefore, to submit to the Commission any voluminous printed material. Ordinarily, references to published material will suffice. Of course, if it is felt that the Commission may not have a particular kind of material, there is no objection to submitting same.

There is no need to present evidence on oath or affidavit. Any statement or letter signed by an officer of a reputable organization will be acceptable.

In the interest of brevity, it would be advisable if various organizations having the same point of view would combine to give their evidence in common; this would seem to apply particularly to the constituent organizations of the American Zionist Emergency Council. (This statement was made by Mr. Rood on his own initiative, without being prompted by any question on my part.)

Captain A. Tulin

December 21, 1945

The hearings in Washington are intended to be very brief. The Commission does not contemplate having the interested parties produce witnesses or engage in any cross-examination. Spokesmen for the interested parties will be permitted to state orally their point of view, supplementing the written statements of the same parties. The procedure would be somewhat similar to that in the Supreme Court of the United States.

All twelve members of the Commission will participate in its meetings. After a brief period of hearings in Washington, there will be other brief hearings in London. It is only upon the arrival of the British Commission members in Washington that a detailed procedure will be established for the subsequent operations of the Commission. It is impossible to tell now, therefore, whether, for its work on the continent of Europe and in Palestine the Commission will act as a whole or split into sub-committees.

There were three questions which I asked him on which he was slightly stumped:

I asked him whether under its terms of reference, the Commission would be able to go into the record of the Palestine administration, which, I said, might appear reasonable in view of the inclusion of "political conditions" in the terms of reference. He said that this might appear reasonable, but that it will be for the Commission to interpret its own terms of reference.

I further asked whether the British government or officials of the Palestine administration will also be bound by the same rather strict rules of evidence which he outlined to me or whether they would be given more opportunity to go into the subject by producing numerous witnesses. He did not know.

Finally, I asked whether the Commission interprets the taking of testimony and the consultation with representative Jews and Arabs as one procedure or as two distinct procedures; in the latter case, what does the Commission propose to do in order to afford the Jewish Agency for Palestine opportunity for such consultation which would be distinct from the taking of evidence. He did not know.

In conclusion, as well as several times in the course of the talk, I emphasized that we had serious misgivings about the entire procedure of a Joint Commission of Inquiry at this time, and that, therefore, we had not yet decided whether we should present any testimony at all. The more I emphasized this point, the more warmly he expressed his hope that we will see our way to submit testimony and that he will have an opportunity to talk to me soon.

Sincerely yours,

HA:ow

Benjamin Akzin

Dr. Silver

December 21, 1945

Mr. Harry Shapiro, Executive Director
American Zionist Emergency Council
342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, New York

Dear Shapiro:

1. I had lunch ^{yesterday} ~~today~~ with Paul Edwards, an official of UNRRA who has recently returned from a prolonged stay in Palestine. Miss Pierce of this office was also present. Mr. Edwards had been in touch with Mrs. Yarden of the American Palestine Committee, and she conceived the idea that it might be helpful for me to meet him. I have already expressed my gratitude to Mrs. Yarden for her cooperative attitude.

Edwards was in charge of the displaced persons' camp in Palestine, in which Greeks and Yugoslavs were housed. At every step, his attempts to better the lot of these persons and to treat them on a decent basis were frustrated by the attitude of the British officials, who exhibited the worst features of old-fashioned colonialism. Incidentally, Edwards found a lot of evidence of vicious anti-Semitism which inspires the ranks of British officialdom in Palestine. Mr. Edwards has no objection whatsoever to telling what he saw to various people whom he knows and whom he might meet. He will try to see within the next few days Mr. Crump, the newly appointed member of the Joint Commission, with whom he has some close friends in common. He will also try to tell his story to Senators Gurney and Magnuson, whom he happens to know. If he has an opportunity, he will also relate his experiences to newspaper people. Mr. Edwards is rather interested in the possibilities of placing an article giving his experiences of Palestine. I would be grateful if Manson, Frank, or Ben-Horin could advise me of the best ways to interest a wide-spreading magazine (or perhaps a group of newspapers -- perhaps Hearst?) in such an article.

At a later time, if and when Edwards leaves the UNRRA, he would undoubtedly be interested in lecturing. I think what he has to tell would be of interest not merely to the APC audiences, but even to Zionist audiences. He told me that he has already done some informal speaking before church groups and other organizations in this country, whom he told of his experiences of British policy in Palestine. I will be in touch with Mrs. Shepard

The Executive Director

December 21, 1945

within a few weeks with the suggestion that Mr. Edwards be invited to deliver a first lecture under our auspices. I would prefer, however, to await the results of his talks in Washington with the persons named above.

2. I also had yesterday a useful conversation with Gould Lincoln, well-known newspaper columnist. He will cover the United Nations Conference in London, and I hope that our conversation will bear fruit in his dispatches.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin Akzin

BA:cw

