



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
200

American Zionist Emergency Council, State Department, 1945.

Text of Memorandum submitted by the
American Zionist Emergency Council to the
State Department on the occasion of the meeting of
Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise
with Secretary James F. Byrnes - October 23, 1945

1. The exchange of correspondence between President Roosevelt and King Ibn Saud which has now been made public and the statement by the Secretary of State of October 18 raise issues of fundamental importance in regard to the implementation of American policy on Palestine. Viewed in the light of the unequivocal and firmly established policy of the American Government and people as expressed in a long series of public and authoritative acts and pronouncements, that statement and correspondence, it is submitted, call for immediate clarification.

2. In March 1919 President Wilson, who was directly associated with the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, stated that:

"The Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."

Every President since that date has given his support to the Jewish National Home objective. Most recently, in statements issued by President Roosevelt on October 15, 1944 and March 16, 1945, that is to say, almost contemporaneously with his correspondence with King Ibn Saud, the late President expressed his support for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. In addition to these pronouncements by the heads of the Executive branch of the Government, the desires of the American people as to the policy to be pursued in Palestine have been repeatedly expressed in the clearest possible fashion. On two occasions, in 1941 and 1945, a majority of the members of both Houses of Congress joined in a declaration favoring the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. A similar declaration was made on July 4, 1945 by the Governors of 40 out of the 48 states of the Union. Further, the legislatures of 33 states, representing

85% of the population of the United States, have recently gone on record in favor of the Zionist objective. In the summer of 1944 the national Conventions of both major political parties adopted declarations favoring the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and, in the words of the Democratic platform, "such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth." The late President Roosevelt, as well as President Truman, were elected on that platform. It must be recalled finally that our government's support of the Jewish National Home, is recorded legislatively in two Acts forming part of the supreme law of the land, namely, the Joint Resolution (No. 73) unanimously adopted in 1922 by the 67th Congress of the United States; and the United States-British Convention on Palestine, ratified by the Senate on February 20, 1925 and proclaimed in December of that year.

X 3. The policy therefore to which our Government and people stand deeply committed is clear and unmistakable. Of this fact, however, neither the letter of President Roosevelt nor the statement of Secretary Byrnes take any cognizance whatever. It is true that in neither instance is the traditional American position in fact repudiated. Nevertheless it is deeply disturbing that it should not have been found necessary to make affirmatively clear that American policy on Palestine has already been established by the public pronouncements of the Presidents of the United States and otherwise - a policy which is predicated upon the right of the Jewish people to rebuild their National Home through free immigration and the close settlement of Jews on the land. That omission can only lead, and has already led, to serious doubts and misunderstandings. It is not conceivable that the law of the land, the will of the American people and the repeated pledges of the heads of our Administration publicly made, should

thus be disregarded in official correspondence. The issues raised by the publication of this correspondence cannot be ignored and places upon our Government the responsibility of indicating in clear and precise terms whether or not it abides by, and proposes to act in accordance with, the policy so long and firmly established.

4. President Roosevelt's letter refers to assurances previously given to King Ibn Saud regarding the attitude of the United States with respect to the question of Palestine. The exact nature of these assurances is not disclosed, but it is respectfully submitted that whatever their tenor, they would not be valid if inconsistent with the publicly stated objectives of American policy or with the terms of the Palestine Mandate.

X 5. At the same time, it is deeply to be regretted that President Roosevelt's letter, while assuring King Ibn Saud that no action would be taken by our Government that might prove hostile to the Arab people, failed to point out that the policy of the Jewish National Home, envisaging as it does free Jewish immigration into Palestine and the ultimate establishment there of a democratic Commonwealth under the auspices of a Jewish majority, could not be conceived as hostile to the Arab people. The desire of the Jews to live in friendship and good neighborliness with the Arab countries and with the Arab inhabitants of Palestine is well known, and neither Jewish aspirations in Palestine nor the declared policy of this country in support thereof, nor yet the conduct of the Jewish people in Palestine resulting in great good to the Arabs can be construed as hostile to them.

6. The occasion will be taken separately to deal in detail with the contents of King Ibn Saud's letter and with the Arab claim to Palestine, a matter which had been considered fully by the Allied Nations in connection with the territorial settlements made at the end of World War I and the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine. It is doubly regrettable that

the reply sent by President Roosevelt to that communication failed to repudiate its baseless attacks and its vilifications of the Jewish people. It is painful to observe that such calumnies as that the Arabs have reason to fear "a series of massacres" at the hands of the Zionists, that the latter "are preparing to create a form of Nazi-fascism" and that it is the intention to "do away with" the inhabitants of Arab countries, should have been allowed to stand unchallenged by one who knew how false those statements are.

7. It is sufficient to say here with regard to King Ibn Saud's letter that the Arabs have neither legal nor moral title to the sovereignty over Palestine. While they conquered the country over 1,300 years ago, Arab rule ceased as early as 1071. Throughout the centuries the role of the Arabs in Palestine has not been creative but destructive. In the eroded, poverty-stricken and disease-ridden country which within the last few decades the Jewish people set out to reclaim, it was difficult to recognize the land of milk and honey described in the Bible. In the twenty years between the two World Wars the Jews have done much to repair the ravages of the previous 1300. They have conquered deserts and swamps, revived agriculture and industry and established in Palestine a sturdy, self-reliant community. The Pan-Arab claim to Palestine is an attempt to add yet another to the immense, but for the most part thinly populated and undeveloped territories of the independent Arab states. This expansionist appetite has recently manifested itself also in the demands put forward by the Arabs for Eritrea, the Sudan and Cyrenaica. The great mass of the people in the various Arab states are kept down in ignorance and fanaticism, in dirt and wretchedness by a ruling class which shows little or no interest in the improvement of their miserable lot. As regards the ethnic claims, about 75% of the Arabic-speaking people in Palestine today are themselves recent immigrants or the descendants of persons who emigrated to Palestine in comparatively recent times. If Palestine exists as a separate concept, it is

because of its immemorial association with the Jews and Jewish History. At no time was there a Palestine Arab State. It was the Jewish people which produced in Palestine the civilization and religious culture which, along with that of Greece, molded the civilization and the spiritual life of the whole Western world.

X 8. In general, it is desired to protest against a procedure which seems to accord a right to the various Arab states to be consulted in the affairs of Palestine. The right of our own Government as one of the principal Allied and Associated Powers in the first World War as well as by virtue of the United States-British Convention above mentioned, to participate in the future disposition of Palestine is obvious and unquestioned. The right of the Jewish people to be consulted is likewise clear and undeniable and is legally confirmed by the League of Nations Mandate which, in recognizing the right of the Jewish people to reconstitute their National Home in Palestine, authorized also the recognition of the Jewish Agency for Palestine as representing the interest of all Jews in the establishment of the National Home. The Arab states are in this matter without legal standing of any kind and we submit that their attitude in recent years is certainly far from giving them a moral voice in this issue.

X 9. We feel constrained, at the same time, to make a frank statement of our views with regard to the course of action pursued by the Executive branch of the Government and the State Department in particular, over a period of years. Despite the unbroken chain of pro-Zionist acts, promises and pronouncements to which we have referred, the policy they express has not been translated into action. On the contrary, numerous acts and omissions have emboldened the Arab leaders to allege that the American Government was, in fact, withholding its support from the Zionist cause, and that the pronouncements made here from time to time were meant for home consumption. We have consistently disregarded these allegations as unwarranted aspersions upon the good faith and political integrity of our Government.

10. We are now compelled to review the situation in the light of the recent correspondence. We must recall that so far as we are aware, the Government took no effective action to protect the interests of the Jewish National Home, at the time of the issuance of the British White Paper in 1939, or to rectify that wrong in the years which followed. The Government did not energetically intervene even when opening the doors of Palestine became an urgent humanitarian necessity because of the wholesale slaughter of the Jews of Europe. It appears further that our Government failed to advise its representatives abroad, particularly in the Near East, that it was definitely committed to the policy of the Jewish National Home and to instruct them to be guided accordingly. The State Department has, on various occasions, appointed to positions of importance in the Near East, persons known as avowed opponents of this policy, and has had to rely in turn, upon reports and advices emanating from them. On two occasions the Executive branch exerted its influence to prevent the adoption by Congress, of a resolution reaffirming the traditional American Policy on this subject. Above all, our Government has failed to utilize the fluid political conditions created by the war and the process of political reorientation and re-organization under way in the Near East, for the purpose of insuring the status of the Jewish National Home in the context of its Near East policies.

11. On the other hand, our country has given generous support to Arab aspirations. It was among the first to recognize the independence of Syria and Lebanon. It has encouraged Arab States to make last-minute declarations of war against Germany on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, assuring them places of honor among the United Nations, irrespective of their war records. Nor has it withheld its support from the Arab League despite the fact that the League has declared its opposition to Jewish aspirations and has proclaimed the liquidation of the Jewish National Home as one of its major objectives.

12. The one gratifying positive act in relation to Palestine has been President Truman's recent request to Prime Minister Attlee, the outcome of which, however, is still uncertain. We take grateful note that the statement of Secretary Byrnes indicates that measures to facilitate immigration into Palestine of substantial numbers of the survivors of European Jewry should, and can be undertaken forthwith, and that such immigration does not affect the "basic situation" in Palestine. The "basic situation," is in fact that established by the Mandate, which calls for the facilitating of the immigration of Jews into Palestine and their close settlement on the land. We therefore earnestly hope that our Government will continue to press for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe in line with President Truman's request. But the statement of the Secretary is silent regarding the attitude of the Government in relation to the "basic situation." The only light which it sheds on that issue - which is the crux of the whole matter - is the statement that "it would be the policy of this Government not to reach final conclusions without a full consultation with Jewish and Arab leaders." This is a point of procedure rather than a definition of policy. Moreover, the statement indicates an intention to wait until "any proposals emerge," rather than to act on its own initiative in conformity with established American policy.

13. The point has now been reached, at which ambiguity and delay are no longer feasible. Millions of American citizens, who have a strong moral and humanitarian interest in this problem, look to the Administration for immediate and forthright action, which will once and for all dispel any possible uncertainty regarding its present position and future intentions. We cannot believe that the menacing words of the spokesmen of countries which did not lift a finger in their own defense during the war and which were, indeed, either actively or passively hostile to the democracies, should be allowed to deflect our country from a just

course of action. The request is made on behalf of masses of suffering humanity who cannot wait. It would be cruel to deny their last hope for individual and national rehabilitation; but it would be the very refinement of cruelty to keep them further in suspense, or to feed them with promises which turn to ashes in their mouth.

* * *



October 23, 1945.

STATEMENT BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

Why are the rulers of the Arab States permitted to meddle in the affairs of Palestine? Why are their ministers in Washington permitted to threaten the security of the Jewish National Home which has been guaranteed by international law and which is being administered under a mandate which does not recognize the right of any Arab State to determine its status or its progress?

These spokesmen of foreign Arab States have been threatening violence and war. The American Government should clearly indicate to them that it does not intend to be intimidated or blackmailed in the carrying out of its own policies. The Arab peoples of the Near East are far more in need of the friendship and help of America than America is in need of theirs. America has become great and prosperous without the aid of these Arab States, while these Arab States are likely to remain backward, impoverished and disease-ridden without the help which friendly America and other free peoples can give them.

They are not making friends for themselves in America by spreading the kind of infamous lies such as King Ibn Saud stated in his letter of April 5th, or by violently resisting the rights of other people to life and liberty which rights were guaranteed them by the nations of the world, and which have been approved by the Congress of the United States, by every President of the United States since Wilson and by the American people as a whole.

President Truman has asked Prime Minister Attlee to make it possible for an immediate migration of one hundred thousand Jews to Palestine. This is in keeping with the terms of the Mandate under which Great Britain undertook to facilitate Jewish immigration to that country. President Truman was dictated by the highest humanitarian interests to help rescue at least that many of the tragic survivors of the Nazi slaughter. Why has Great Britain rejected this

request of the President? Why is the British Labor Party permitting a shocking repudiation of its own commitments made as recently as four months ago? President Truman has indicated that he is not inclined to press his request on Great Britain. Why not? Is the matter of such little importance? Is Palestine a colony of Great Britain, or are six million Jewish dead not enough? Must the remainder of the Jews of Europe perish in order to maintain Great Britain's imperial interest in the Near East?

Who will suffer by the admission of one hundred thousand Jews into Palestine? Not the present Jewish settlers of Palestine. They are prayerfully waiting to receive them. Not the Arabs of Palestine. Their conditions have been bettered and their standard of living has been greatly improved with every influx of Jewish settlers into the country. There is room in Palestine for at least another three million people.

But who will suffer if the President's request is rejected? The hundred thousand innocent men, women and children who have gone through the several hells of Europe in recent years, who are doomed to an inescapable fate if they remain in that war-ravaged and hate-ridden continent, and whose only hope for survival is Palestine.

Is it not time for the conscience of the people of America and Great Britain and of the remaining free peoples of the world to make itself heard?

* * *

Text of Memorandum submitted by the
American Zionist Emergency Council to the
State Department on the occasion of the meeting of
Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise
with Secretary James F. Byrnes - October 23, 1945

1. The exchange of correspondence between President Roosevelt and King Ibn Saud which has now been made public and the statement by the Secretary of State of October 18 raise issues of fundamental importance in regard to the implementation of American policy on Palestine. Viewed in the light of the unequivocal and firmly established policy of the American Government and people as expressed in a long series of public and authoritative acts and pronouncements, that statement and correspondence, it is submitted, call for immediate clarification.

2. In March 1919 President Wilson, who was directly associated with the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, stated that:

"The Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."

Every President since that date has given his support to the Jewish National Home objective. Most recently, in statements issued by President Roosevelt on October 15, 1944 and March 16, 1945, that is to say, almost contemporaneously with his correspondence with King Ibn Saud, the late President expressed his support for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. In addition to these pronouncements by the heads of the Executive branch of the Government, the desires of the American people as to the policy to be pursued in Palestine have been repeatedly expressed in the clearest possible fashion. On two occasions, in 1941 and 1945, a majority of the members of both Houses of Congress joined in a declaration favoring the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. A similar declaration was made on July 4, 1945 by the Governors of 40 out of the 48 states of the Union. Further, the legislatures of 33 states, representing

85% of the population of the United States, have recently gone on record in favor of the Zionist objective. In the summer of 1944 the national Conventions of both major political parties adopted declarations favoring the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and, in the words of the Democratic platform, "such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth." The late President Roosevelt, as well as President Truman, were elected on that platform. It must be recalled finally that our government's support of the Jewish National Home, is recorded legislatively in two Acts forming part of the supreme law of the land, namely, the Joint Resolution (No. 73) unanimously adopted in 1922 by the 67th Congress of the United States; and the United States-British Convention on Palestine, ratified by the Senate on February 20, 1925 and proclaimed in December of that year.

3. The policy therefore to which our Government and people stand deeply committed is clear and unmistakable. Of this fact, however, neither the letter of President Roosevelt nor the statement of Secretary Byrnes take any cognizance whatever. It is true that in neither instance is the traditional American position in fact repudiated. Nevertheless it is deeply disturbing that it should not have been found necessary to make affirmatively clear that American policy on Palestine has already been established by the public pronouncements of the Presidents of the United States and otherwise - a policy which is predicated upon the right of the Jewish people to rebuild their National Home through free immigration and the close settlement of Jews on the land. That omission can only lead, and has already led, to serious doubts and misunderstandings. It is not conceivable that the law of the land, the will of the American people and the repeated pledges of the heads of our Administration publicly made, should

thus be disregarded in official correspondence. The issues raised by the publication of this correspondence cannot be ignored and places upon our Government the responsibility of indicating in clear and precise terms whether or not it abides by, and proposes to act in accordance with, the policy so long and firmly established.

4. President Roosevelt's letter refers to assurances previously given to King Ibn Saud regarding the attitude of the United States with respect to the question of Palestine. The exact nature of these assurances is not disclosed, but it is respectfully submitted that whatever their tenor, they would not be valid if inconsistent with the publicly stated objectives of American policy or with the terms of the Palestine Mandate.

5. At the same time, it is deeply to be regretted that President Roosevelt's letter, while assuring King Ibn Saud that no action would be taken by our Government that might prove hostile to the Arab people, failed to point out that the policy of the Jewish National Home, envisaging as it does free Jewish immigration into Palestine and the ultimate establishment there of a democratic Commonwealth under the auspices of a Jewish majority, could not be conceived as hostile to the Arab people. The desire of the Jews to live in friendship and good neighborliness with the Arab countries and with the Arab inhabitants of Palestine is well known, and neither Jewish aspirations in Palestine nor the declared policy of this country in support thereof, nor yet the conduct of the Jewish people in Palestine resulting in great good to the Arabs can be construed as hostile to them.

6. The occasion will be taken separately to deal in detail with the contents of King Ibn Saud's letter and with the Arab claim to Palestine, a matter which had been considered fully by the Allied Nations in connection with the territorial settlements made at the end of World War I and the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine. It is doubly regrettable that

the reply sent by President Roosevelt to that communication failed to repudiate its baseless attacks and its vilifications of the Jewish people. It is painful to observe that such calumnies as that the Arabs have reason to fear "a series of massacres" at the hands of the Zionists, that the latter "are preparing to create a form of Nazi-fascism" and that it is the intention to "do away with" the inhabitants of Arab countries, should have been allowed to stand unchallenged by one who knew how false those statements are.

7. It is sufficient to say here with regard to King Ibn Saud's letter that the Arabs have neither legal nor moral title to the sovereignty over Palestine. While they conquered the country over 1,300 years ago, Arab rule ceased as early as 1071. Throughout the centuries the role of the Arabs in Palestine has not been creative but destructive. In the eroded, poverty-stricken and disease-ridden country which within the last few decades the Jewish people set out to reclaim, it was difficult to recognize the land of milk and honey described in the Bible. In the twenty years between the two World Wars the Jews have done much to repair the ravages of the previous 1300. They have conquered deserts and swamps, revived agriculture and industry and established in Palestine a sturdy, self-reliant community. The Pan-Arab claim to Palestine is an attempt to add yet another to the immense, but for the most part thinly populated and undeveloped territories of the independent Arab states. This expansionist appetite has recently manifested itself also in the demands put forward by the Arabs for Eritrea, the Sudan and Cyrenaica. The great mass of the people in the various Arab states are kept down in ignorance and fanaticism, in dirt and wretchedness by a ruling class which shows little or no interest in the improvement of their miserable lot. As regards the ethnic claims, about 75% of the Arabic-speaking people in Palestine today are themselves recent immigrants or the descendants of persons who emigrated to Palestine in comparatively recent times. If Palestine exists as a separate concept, it is

because of its immemorial association with the Jews and Jewish History. At no time was there a Palestine Arab State. It was the Jewish people which produced in Palestine the civilization and religious culture which, along with that of Greece, molded the civilization and the spiritual life of the whole Western world.

8. In general, it is desired to protest against a procedure which seems to accord a right to the various Arab states to be consulted in the affairs of Palestine. The right of our own Government as one of the principal Allied and Associated Powers in the first World War as well as by virtue of the United States-British Convention above mentioned, to participate in the future disposition of Palestine is obvious and unquestioned. The right of the Jewish people to be consulted is likewise clear and undeniable and is legally confirmed by the League of Nations Mandate which, in recognizing the right of the Jewish people to reconstitute their National Home in Palestine, authorized also the recognition of the Jewish Agency for Palestine as representing the interest of all Jews in the establishment of the National Home. The Arab states are in this matter without legal standing of any kind and we submit that their attitude in recent years is certainly far from giving them a moral voice in this issue.

9. We feel constrained, at the same time, to make a frank statement of our views with regard to the course of action pursued by the Executive branch of the Government and the State Department in particular, over a period of years. Despite the unbroken chain of pro-Zionist acts, promises and pronouncements to which we have referred, the policy they express has not been translated into action. On the contrary, numerous acts and omissions have emboldened the Arab leaders to allege that the American Government was, in fact, withholding its support from the Zionist cause, and that the pronouncements made here from time to time were meant for home consumption. We have consistently disregarded these allegations as unwarranted aspersions upon the good faith and political integrity of our Government.

10. We are now compelled to review the situation in the light of the recent correspondence. We must recall that so far as we are aware, the Government took no effective action to protect the interests of the Jewish National Home, at the time of the issuance of the British White Paper in 1939, or to rectify that wrong in the years which followed. The Government did not energetically intervene even when opening the doors of Palestine became an urgent humanitarian necessity because of the wholesale slaughter of the Jews of Europe. It appears further that our Government failed to advise its representatives abroad, particularly in the Near East, that it was definitely committed to the policy of the Jewish National Home and to instruct them to be guided accordingly. The State Department has, on various occasions, appointed to positions of importance in the Near East, persons known as avowed opponents of this policy, and has had to rely in turn, upon reports and advices emanating from them. On two occasions the Executive branch exerted its influence to prevent the adoption by Congress, of a resolution reaffirming the traditional American Policy on this subject. Above all, our Government has failed to utilize the fluid political conditions created by the war and the process of political reorientation and re-organization under way in the Near East, for the purpose of insuring the status of the Jewish National Home in the context of its Near East policies.

11. On the other hand, our country has given generous support to Arab aspirations. It was among the first to recognize the independence of Syria and Lebanon. It has encouraged Arab States to make last-minute declarations of war against Germany on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, assuring them places of honor among the United Nations, irrespective of their war records. Nor has it withheld its support from the Arab League despite the fact that the League has declared its opposition to Jewish aspirations and has proclaimed the liquidation of the Jewish National Home as one of its major objectives.

12. The one gratifying positive act in relation to Palestine has been President Truman's recent request to Prime Minister Attlee, the outcome of which, however, is still uncertain. We take grateful note that the statement of Secretary Byrnes indicates that measures to facilitate immigration into Palestine of substantial numbers of the survivors of European Jewry should, and can be undertaken forthwith, and that such immigration does not affect the "basic situation" in Palestine. The "basic situation," is in fact that established by the Mandate, which calls for the facilitating of the immigration of Jews into Palestine and their close settlement on the land. We therefore earnestly hope that our Government will continue to press for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe in line with President Truman's request. But the statement of the Secretary is silent regarding the attitude of the Government in relation to the "basic situation." The only light which it sheds on that issue - which is the crux of the whole matter - is the statement that "it would be the policy of this Government not to reach final conclusions without a full consultation with Jewish and Arab leaders." This is a point of procedure rather than a definition of policy. Moreover, the statement indicates an intention to wait until "any proposals emerge," rather than to act on its own initiative in conformity with established American policy.

13. The point has now been reached, at which ambiguity and delay are no longer feasible. Millions of American citizens, who have a strong moral and humanitarian interest in this problem, look to the Administration for immediate and forthright action, which will once and for all dispel any possible uncertainty regarding its present position and future intentions. We cannot believe that the menacing words of the spokesmen of countries which did not lift a finger in their own defense during the war and which were, indeed, either actively or passively hostile to the democracies, should be allowed to deflect our country from a just

course of action. The request is made on behalf of masses of suffering humanity who cannot wait. It would be cruel to deny their last hope for individual and national rehabilitation; but it would be the very refinement of cruelty to keep them further in suspense, or to feed them with promises which turn to ashes in their mouth.

* * *



October 23, 1945.

STATEMENT BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

✓ Why are the rulers of the Arab States permitted to meddle in the affairs of Palestine? Why are their ministers in Washington permitted to threaten the security of the Jewish National Home which has been guaranteed by international law and which is being administered under a mandate which does not recognize the right of any Arab State to determine its status or its progress?

✓ These spokesmen of foreign Arab States have been threatening violence and war. The American Government should clearly indicate to them that it does not intend to be intimidated or blackmailed in the carrying out of its own policies. The Arab peoples of the Near East are far more in need of the friendship and help of America than America is in need of theirs. America has become great and prosperous without the aid of these Arab States, while these Arab States are likely to remain backward, impoverished and disease-ridden without the help which friendly America and other free peoples can give them.

They are not making friends for themselves in America by spreading the kind of infamous lies such as King Ibn Saud stated in his letter of April 5th, or by violently resisting the rights of other people to life and liberty which rights were guaranteed them by the nations of the world, and which have been approved by the Congress of the United States, by every President of the United States since Wilson and by the American people as a whole.

✓ President Truman has asked Prime Minister Attlee to make it possible for an immediate migration of one hundred thousand Jews to Palestine. This is in keeping with the terms of the Mandate under which Great Britain undertook to facilitate Jewish immigration to that country. President Truman was dictated by the highest humanitarian interests to help rescue at least that many of the tragic survivors of the Nazi slaughter. Why has Great Britain rejected this

request of the President? Why is the British Labor Party permitting a shocking repudiation of its own commitments made as recently as four months ago? President Truman has indicated that he is not inclined to press his request on Great Britain. Why not? Is the matter of such little importance? Is Palestine a colony of Great Britain, or are six million Jewish dead not enough? Must the remainder of the Jews of Europe perish in order to maintain Great Britain's imperial interest in the Near East?

Who will suffer by the admission of one hundred thousand Jews into Palestine? Not the present Jewish settlers of Palestine. They are prayerfully waiting to receive them. Not the Arabs of Palestine. Their conditions have been bettered and their standard of living has been greatly improved with every influx of Jewish settlers into the country. There is room in Palestine for at least another three million people.

But who will suffer if the President's request is rejected? The hundred thousand innocent men, women and children who have gone through the several hells of Europe in recent years, who are doomed to an inescapable fate if they remain in that war-ravaged and hate-ridden continent, and whose only hope for survival is Palestine.

Is it not time for the conscience of the people of America and Great Britain and of the remaining free peoples of the world to make itself heard?

* * *

Text of Memorandum submitted by the
American Zionist Emergency Council to the
State Department on the occasion of the meeting of
Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise
with Secretary James F. Byrnes - October 23, 1945

1. The exchange of correspondence between President Roosevelt and King Ibn Saud which has now been made public and the statement by the Secretary of State of October 18 raise issues of fundamental importance in regard to the implementation of American policy on Palestine. Viewed in the light of the unequivocal and firmly established policy of the American Government and people as expressed in a long series of public and authoritative acts and pronouncements, that statement and correspondence, it is submitted, call for immediate clarification.

2. In March 1919 President Wilson, who was directly associated with the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, stated that:

"The Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."

Every President since that date has given his support to the Jewish National Home objective. Most recently, in statements issued by President Roosevelt on October 15, 1944 and March 16, 1945, that is to say, almost contemporaneously with his correspondence with King Ibn Saud, the late President expressed his support for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. In addition to these pronouncements by the heads of the Executive branch of the Government, the desires of the American people as to the policy to be pursued in Palestine have been repeatedly expressed in the clearest possible fashion. On two occasions, in 1941 and 1945, a majority of the members of both Houses of Congress joined in a declaration favoring the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth. A similar declaration was made on July 4, 1945 by the Governors of 40 out of the 48 states of the Union. Further, the legislatures of 33 states, representing

85% of the population of the United States, have recently gone on record in favor of the Zionist objective. In the summer of 1944 the national Conventions of both major political parties adopted declarations favoring the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and, in the words of the Democratic platform, "such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth." The late President Roosevelt, as well as President Truman, were elected on that platform. It must be recalled finally that our government's support of the Jewish National Home, is recorded legislatively in two Acts forming part of the supreme law of the land, namely, the Joint Resolution (No. 73) unanimously adopted in 1922 by the 67th Congress of the United States; and the United States-British Convention on Palestine, ratified by the Senate on February 20, 1925 and proclaimed in December of that year.

3. The policy therefore to which our Government and people stand deeply committed is clear and unmistakable. Of this fact, however, neither the letter of President Roosevelt nor the statement of Secretary Byrnes take any cognizance whatever. It is true that in neither instance is the traditional American position in fact repudiated. Nevertheless it is deeply disturbing that it should not have been found necessary to make affirmatively clear that American policy on Palestine has already been established by the public pronouncements of the Presidents of the United States and otherwise - a policy which is predicated upon the right of the Jewish people to rebuild their National Home through free immigration and the close settlement of Jews on the land. That omission can only lead, and has already led, to serious doubts and misunderstandings. It is not conceivable that the law of the land, the will of the American people and the repeated pledges of the heads of our Administration publicly made, should

thus be disregarded in official correspondence. The issues raised by the publication of this correspondence cannot be ignored and places upon our Government the responsibility of indicating in clear and precise terms whether or not it abides by, and proposes to act in accordance with, the policy so long and firmly established.

4. President Roosevelt's letter refers to assurances previously given to King Ibn Saud regarding the attitude of the United States with respect to the question of Palestine. The exact nature of these assurances is not disclosed, but it is respectfully submitted that whatever their tenor, they would not be valid if inconsistent with the publicly stated objectives of American policy or with the terms of the Palestine Mandate.

5. At the same time, it is deeply to be regretted that President Roosevelt's letter, while assuring King Ibn Saud that no action would be taken by our Government that might prove hostile to the Arab people, failed to point out that the policy of the Jewish National Home, envisaging as it does free Jewish immigration into Palestine and the ultimate establishment there of a democratic Commonwealth under the auspices of a Jewish majority, could not be conceived as hostile to the Arab people. The desire of the Jews to live in friendship and good neighborliness with the Arab countries and with the Arab inhabitants of Palestine is well known, and neither Jewish aspirations in Palestine nor the declared policy of this country in support thereof, nor yet the conduct of the Jewish people in Palestine resulting in great good to the Arabs can be construed as hostile to them.

6. The occasion will be taken separately to deal in detail with the contents of King Ibn Saud's letter and with the Arab claim to Palestine, a matter which had been considered fully by the Allied Nations in connection with the territorial settlements made at the end of World War I and the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine. It is doubly regrettable that

the reply sent by President Roosevelt to that communication failed to repudiate its baseless attacks and its vilifications of the Jewish people. It is painful to observe that such calumnies as that the Arabs have reason to fear "a series of massacres" at the hands of the Zionists, that the latter "are preparing to create a form of Nazi-fascism" and that it is the intention to "do away with" the inhabitants of Arab countries, should have been allowed to stand unchallenged by one who knew how false those statements are.

7. It is sufficient to say here with regard to King Ibn Saud's letter that the Arabs have neither legal nor moral title to the sovereignty over Palestine. While they conquered the country over 1,300 years ago, Arab rule ceased as early as 1071. Throughout the centuries the role of the Arabs in Palestine has not been creative but destructive. In the eroded, poverty-stricken and disease-ridden country which within the last few decades the Jewish people set out to reclaim, it was difficult to recognize the land of milk and honey described in the Bible. In the twenty years between the two World Wars the Jews have done much to repair the ravages of the previous 1300. They have conquered deserts and swamps, revived agriculture and industry and established in Palestine a sturdy, self-reliant community. The Pan-Arab claim to Palestine is an attempt to add yet another to the immense, but for the most part thinly populated and undeveloped territories of the independent Arab states. This expansionist appetite has recently manifested itself also in the demands put forward by the Arabs for Eritrea, the Sudan and Cyrenaica. The great mass of the people in the various Arab states are kept down in ignorance and fanaticism, in dirt and wretchedness by a ruling class which shows little or no interest in the improvement of their miserable lot. As regards the ethnic claims, about 75% of the Arabic-speaking people in Palestine today are themselves recent immigrants or the descendants of persons who emigrated to Palestine in comparatively recent times. If Palestine exists as a separate concept, it is

because of its immemorial association with the Jews and Jewish History. At no time was there a Palestine Arab State. It was the Jewish people which produced in Palestine the civilization and religious culture which, along with that of Greece, molded the civilization and the spiritual life of the whole Western world.

8. In general, it is desired to protest against a procedure which seems to accord a right to the various Arab states to be consulted in the affairs of Palestine. The right of our own Government as one of the principal Allied and Associated Powers in the first World War as well as by virtue of the United States-British Convention above mentioned, to participate in the future disposition of Palestine is obvious and unquestioned. The right of the Jewish people to be consulted is likewise clear and undeniable and is legally confirmed by the League of Nations Mandate which, in recognizing the right of the Jewish people to reconstitute their National Home in Palestine, authorized also the recognition of the Jewish Agency for Palestine as representing the interest of all Jews in the establishment of the National Home. The Arab states are in this matter without legal standing of any kind and we submit that their attitude in recent years is certainly far from giving them a moral voice in this issue.

9. We feel constrained, at the same time, to make a frank statement of our views with regard to the course of action pursued by the Executive branch of the Government and the State Department in particular, over a period of years. Despite the unbroken chain of pro-Zionist acts, promises and pronouncements to which we have referred, the policy they express has not been translated into action. On the contrary, numerous acts and omissions have emboldened the Arab leaders to allege that the American Government was, in fact, withholding its support from the Zionist cause, and that the pronouncements made here from time to time were meant for home consumption. We have consistently disregarded these allegations as unwarranted aspersions upon the good faith and political integrity of our Government.

10. We are now compelled to review the situation in the light of the recent correspondence. We must recall that so far as we are aware, the Government took no effective action to protect the interests of the Jewish National Home, at the time of the issuance of the British White Paper in 1939, or to rectify that wrong in the years which followed. The Government did not energetically intervene even when opening the doors of Palestine became an urgent humanitarian necessity because of the wholesale slaughter of the Jews of Europe. It appears further that our Government failed to advise its representatives abroad, particularly in the Near East, that it was definitely committed to the policy of the Jewish National Home and to instruct them to be guided accordingly. The State Department has, on various occasions, appointed to positions of importance in the Near East, persons known as avowed opponents of this policy, and has had to rely in turn, upon reports and advices emanating from them. On two occasions the Executive branch exerted its influence to prevent the adoption by Congress, of a resolution reaffirming the traditional American Policy on this subject. Above all, our Government has failed to utilize the fluid political conditions created by the war and the process of political reorientation and re-organization under way in the Near East, for the purpose of insuring the status of the Jewish National Home in the context of its Near East policies.

11. On the other hand, our country has given generous support to Arab aspirations. It was among the first to recognize the independence of Syria and Lebanon. It has encouraged Arab States to make last-minute declarations of war against Germany on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, assuring them places of honor among the United Nations, irrespective of their war records. Nor has it withheld its support from the Arab League despite the fact that the League has declared its opposition to Jewish aspirations and has proclaimed the liquidation of the Jewish National Home as one of its major objectives.

12. The one gratifying positive act in relation to Palestine has been President Truman's recent request to Prime Minister Attlee, the outcome of which, however, is still uncertain. We take grateful note that the statement of Secretary Byrnes indicates that measures to facilitate immigration into Palestine of substantial numbers of the survivors of European Jewry should, and can be undertaken forthwith, and that such immigration does not affect the "basic situation" in Palestine. The "basic situation," is in fact that established by the Mandate, which calls for the facilitating of the immigration of Jews into Palestine and their close settlement on the land. We therefore earnestly hope that our Government will continue to press for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe in line with President Truman's request. But the statement of the Secretary is silent regarding the attitude of the Government in relation to the "basic situation." The only light which it sheds on that issue - which is the crux of the whole matter - is the statement that "it would be the policy of this Government not to reach final conclusions without a full consultation with Jewish and Arab leaders." This is a point of procedure rather than a definition of policy. Moreover, the statement indicates an intention to wait until "any proposals emerge," rather than to act on its own initiative in conformity with established American policy.

13. The point has now been reached, at which ambiguity and delay are no longer feasible. Millions of American citizens, who have a strong moral and humanitarian interest in this problem, look to the Administration for immediate and forthright action, which will once and for all dispel any possible uncertainty regarding its present position and future intentions. We cannot believe that the menacing words of the spokesmen of countries which did not lift a finger in their own defense during the war and which were, indeed, either actively or passively hostile to the democracies, should be allowed to deflect our country from a just

course of action. The request is made on behalf of masses of suffering humanity who cannot wait. It would be cruel to deny their last hope for individual and national rehabilitation; but it would be the very refinement of cruelty to keep them further in suspense, or to feed them with promises which turn to ashes in their mouth.

* * *

