



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
12

Box
4

Folder
265

American Zionist Emergency Council, recognition of Israel by
Congress, 1948.

C
O
P
Y

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
May 14, 1948

SENATOR WAGNER CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE RECOGNITION
OF THE JEWISH STATE

The proclamation of the Jewish State today is the fitting climax of the collective action of the United Nations in bringing that State into existence and sanctioning its legality in international law by resolution of the General Assembly in November 1947.

This great landmark in the march of human progress is the culmination of twenty centuries of striving, prayer, and sacrifice by the Jewish people. The great advances they have already achieved in rebuilding their national home in Palestine now become the basis for their nationhood. At long last the Jewish people are taking their rightful place in the world family of nations. In this legally assured state of their own, they now have the unique opportunity to build a bulwark of freedom and democracy in the Middle East.

Liberty-loving people of every land, faith and creed have aided in bringing the Jewish State into being and will continue to give it their heartfelt encouragement and moral and material support. This is a solemn obligation of the Christian World.

The United States Government has from the beginning supported the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine and through its representatives in the United Nations voted to establish the legal basis for the Jewish State just proclaimed. In accordance with our best tradition and consistent policy, United States Government should immediately give formal recognition to the Jewish State, and lift the embargo on shipment of arms to those who at this moment are sacrificing their blood to defend it against brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Arab States. There must be no question anywhere about where the United States Government stands in this fateful hour.

THE PRESENT GENERAL SITUATION

Despite the ravaging of international law, I cannot agree with those who say that international law is dead. Violations of rules do not abolish the rules.

The Constitution of our land recognizes international law as a part of the laws of the United States. Associate Justice Gray, of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

"International law is part of our law and must be ascertained and administered by the courts of justice of appropriate jurisdiction, as often as questions of right depending on it are duly presented for their determination."

In other words, international law is real law in the United States.

There have been other periods in world history when we have heard it said that international law was dead. There have been other periods in world history when struggles for power have outreached the limitation of international law and men have chanted a requiem over the dead body.

However, it is significant that history has demonstrated that after every one of these periods, international law has always been resurrected and revitalized.

To say that international law is violated does not necessarily mean that the violation is made with complete impunity. When the Japanese began a ruthless program of shocking brutality with the American garrison at Bataan, this aroused a deep-rooted indignation and bitterness which will certainly find expression in the international law of the future.

The custom has been to further the tenets of the Geneva Convention. Violations bring protests and protests can result in unifying support behind a corrective program of international law.

When Manila was bombed in the Second World War, after General MacArthur had declared it to be an open city, that was essentially a reversion to a barbarism even more horrible than the primitive barbarians who drank blood from the scraped skulls of their victims.

We know that there is a basic conflict—an inherent conflict—between the concept of a state acting solely in its own interest in a completely unrestrained manner, and the idea that international law can set up a pattern of rules governing states in their conduct with each other.

There was a time before the First World War when international lawyers could conveniently catalog those regulations which they believed constituted international law—both public and private. At the present time, international lawyers are confronted with an unbelievable legal chaos which has resulted from two world wars within a single generation and from the technological developments, like the atomic bomb, which have blown the whole concept of international law sky high.

At the present time there is a very fundamental clash between the old concept of international law as custom and agreement governing the relations of one state with another, and the concept (which I challenge) of a world government or a world state with the authority to set up regulations governing international affairs.

The different concepts of international law—Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, the theories of the western world, the doctrines of Soviet Russia, the teachings of the Austrian school of international law, the Japanese concept of international law—have all collided head-on, and in the chaos which has resulted, there is a need for reconciling divergent views and emerging with a generally accepted understanding of what international law actually remains.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Early in the seventeenth century, Hugo Grotius gave some expressive substance to

international law. His concept was founded on legal and philosophical bases which tied international law to international morality. The League of Nations also attempted to tie morality and philosophy and law in one international bundle.

The League of Nations failed probably because it did not adequately consider the underlying power factors which existed in the world and because the nations were not ready for the League.

The pattern of international law which existed prior to 1914 has presumably vanished in the mists of time, and we are now presumably embarked on a new period of international collaboration—and possibly world government. As a matter of fact, however, that hasn't actually happened. We haven't as yet developed any effective international law within the framework of the United Nations. The necessary vision for this achievement has not come.

The Charter of the United Nations recognizes a very fundamental limitation on the sphere of operation of international law by recognizing a reserved dominion within which a state can act at its own discretion.

Less than 4 months after it was signed, the United Nations Charter came into force on October 24, 1945. During the period between the signing of the Charter and the time it came into force, the radio-active flames of the atomic bomb had been unleashed on the world.

That brought up the question of whether the United Nations was antiquated even before it came into existence.

The United Nations, however, embodied certain definite changes from the League of Nations, though the United Nations also is only "machinery through which nations can build up the habit of cooperation for the peaceful development of the earth," if there is a will to do so.

The provisions in the Charter recognize that the treatment of the individual citizen is not merely a matter of domestic concern and that the denial of fundamental human rights to a citizen can no longer be lost in the protective haze of national sovereignty.

Article 13 of the Charter of the General Assembly of the United Nations outlines a mandate to the General Assembly to "encourage the progressive development of international law and its codifications."

On December 11, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution to establish a committee of 16 members of the United Nations to be appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendations of the President, said committee to study the methods by which the General Assembly could encourage the progressive development of international law and its eventual codification.

All of this means that there is a possibility for a new horizon in international law. It opens up a vista in which we can see continuous attention being given to revitalizing and strengthening international law, if the nations have the will and intent to go forward.

The new United Nations organization, broadly speaking, has embraced the old social and economic institutions of the league, but with it, has new provisions of the rule of the law, new provisions for international economic and social cooperation, new concepts for the protection of human rights and new principles to govern trusteeships. But to make these effective, there must be the vitality and the vision among the nations to carry on.

International law faces the problem of human rights and nationality. Millions of people are stateless. Millions of people have been forced into voluntary exile. Millions of people have labored as slaves in the armed camps of totalitarian states. Genocide has been practiced almost without interruptions since 1931.

In theory the United Nations Organization has set up principles relating to human rights. A commission charged with developing these principles has been at work for some time. There is, however, a tragic lag. Displaced-persons camps are operating in Europe. Human rights are still being ravaged.

Meanwhile, the American Bar Association as usual, has been in the forefront of evaluation and recommendation on this neglect of human rights. In the May 1948 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, we have all undoubtedly read of the bar's proposal for an uncompromising convention or covenant to fulfill obligations under article 55 of the UN Charter so as to secure universal respect for human rights and for implementing of such a covenant through an association of truly freedom-loving nations.

INTERNATIONAL LAW MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE IN MOST ASPECTS WHICH GOVERN INJURIES TO INDIVIDUALS

Before the First World War we considered that international law was applicable only to the relationships between States, but in the last few years we have seen an expansion of so-called international regulations to many activities which involve individuals and states.

The times are certainly ripe for study of the rules governing the use of force for the preservation of international peace. There are agreements and commitments, agreements and commitments which are idealistic, which have been entered into, but there is no indication as to the extent to which they can be implemented.

There have been efforts made to define aggressor states. There have been efforts made to punish individuals who drive their people into war. But there is still no definition as to what constitutes aggression and how it may be identified.

In the world today there is no more serious problem than the expansion of subversive activities by Soviet Russia. As far as we know, in the whole rambling structure of such international law, as we have, there is no precise international legal remedy at hand for the nation whose very life may be threatened by the plotting of another state.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The Charter of the United Nations has annexed to it a statute on the International Court of Justice.

Chapter 14 of the Charter provides for the International Court of Justice and provides that the International Court of Justice shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and shall function in accordance with the statute of the permanent Court of International Justice.

All members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice. The question of whether the present International Court of Justice should not have an increased jurisdiction is one which should be explored.

THE BASIC PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Some observers have said that the foundations of international law are just as dubious as they have ever been, and that consequently international law should be abolished—that it should be replaced with the municipal law of a federal system of world government.

That would mean that a part of the sovereignty of every state would be incorporated in that world government. That would mean that every state would concede certain external controls of the conduct of foreign policy and the weapons of war. That would mean the establishment of a world legislature directly responsible to the peoples of the world. That would mean a world police. That would mean a world judiciary. That would mean a world law.

I am not in accord with a program of this type—not yet.

The principal problem of international law is obviously how can international law be transmuted into a living, dynamic force, carefully geared to the fast-moving tempo of our times. This means the principal problem is man himself.

The tremendous cosmic forces which man has encountered in the last war open up such terrifying possibilities that it is quite obvious that unrestricted international action could endanger all mankind.

It is conceivable that effective international law implemented by force could control unilateral national gansterdom on an international scale before it could destroy mankind. It must be emphasized, however, that that same international law or control must be so conceived as to safeguard rather than jeopardize national security.

AREAS OF EXPLORATION FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW

There are many areas for international law which should be explored. First of all, it is necessary to reconcile the freedom of action of a state, the freedom of action of a state to protect itself and to secure its own ends—to reconcile that freedom with the growth of an international community and an international law which could be directed at controlling the awful inherent mass-destructive potentiality of bacteriological warfare, jet-propelled explosives, and the atomic bomb.

It is certainly desirable that international laws and regulations—however inadequate they may presently be—be constantly studied and improved. I believe that the committee charged with the codification of international law in the United Nations organization should be given every necessary support for the effective discharge of its obligation.

The most challenging single area of exploration for international law is that one which relates to the power conflict currently existing between the United States and Soviet Russia.

If this conflict is resolved, it would then be possible to reconcile the conflicting concepts of international law of many nations.

There should perhaps be some exploration of the common law of England and of the United States and of the principles of equity as developed in these two countries and as they may conceivably relate to a comprehensive system of international law. There probably should be some exploration of the possibility for vesting the present International Court of Justice with increased power, or at least increased jurisdiction.

It must be emphasized in all of the foregoing, however, that if international law is to develop effectively, it must have behind it the good will of the participating countries.

International law can only be as strong as the will of the people behind it and the confidence which it inspires in the world community.

While we are naturally concerned with strengthening international law, it is quite clear that our primary obligation is to ascertain what is left of international law and what is acceptable to the people of the world.

CONCLUSION

I cannot agree with the kind of thinking that envisions an immediate creation of a world government with legislative power. As a matter of fact, I believe that civilization and man himself could be seriously endangered by such a step at this time.

It seems more desirable that instead, the weight of public opinion be placed squarely behind the machinery which already exists so that this machinery could be used to carry on progressively and effectively in the field of international affairs and international law.

I am very doubtful also of the wisdom of contemplating giving the General Assembly the power to pass statutes having the effect of international law, particularly at a time when the world is so sharply divided. It may

be that what the United Nations needs at the present time is not a powerful legislature, but perhaps a more powerful court and enforcement arm.

I should like to emphasize in conclusion that while two world wars and technological developments have eroded away much of the structure of international law as we have known it, nevertheless the Constitution of our land still recognizes international law as a part of the law of the United States. Large areas of international law, as it was understood prior to 1914, still continue to be respected and are still applicable to the regulation of conduct among and between States.

Our problem is to get the nations of the earth to reason together so that the will and desire will be begotten to live in peace; to find acceptable standards of conduct to govern States in their relationships with each other. Our challenge in the future is to find rules for the settlement of disputes in an amicable manner. Our problem in the future is to write effective rules for the suppression and control of mechanical, technological, and organic means of destruction. Our problem and the problem of the world is to seek an orderly, a lawful manner of preventing a repetition of the horrible wars of the past. That is at once the challenge of the future and the hope of mankind.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered last night at St. Louis, Mo., on the subject of Palestine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNITION OF PALESTINE

"From the very beginning, likewise, our policy on recognition tallied with the fact that we ourselves had needed such recognition from 1776 to 1783 and could obtain it only if legitimist scruples were disregarded. It tallied with our interest in seeing revolutionary and republican states multiply in a predominantly power-ridden monarchical world. It was our first essay, this policy, in making the world safe for republics. * * * The aim of encouraging the establishment and maintenance of republican institutions was always implicit in our recognition policy, and the policy was not, therefore, a policy of pure de factoism."

The foregoing expresses the American policy regarding recognition as developed in the American Journal of International Law on the Nature of American Foreign Policy, by Prof. Pitman B. Potter, of the University of Wisconsin, appearing in the January issue, 1927, on page 69.

The new Jewish state in Palestine possesses a legitimacy never presented by any other new state in the history of the world. In this respect it is unique.

Most states have been born of revolution. Here is presented for the first time in history a state whose claim to self-government was recognized by the organized opinion of mankind.

The new Jewish state in Palestine is the child of the United Nations. No other state

in all the centuries has had so legitimate a birth.

Contrast the position of the American Colonies in declaring their independence of Great Britain and seeking the support of mankind. Men and munitions were allowed to come to us from Europe to enable the infant Nation to survive.

Lafayette, Kosciusko, Von Steuben have been names with which to conjure in America ever since. In Lafayette Park, immediately in front of the White House, the service of these heroes is commemorated in enduring marble as an eternal reminder of their assistance to America in its hour of greatest need.

From that day to this, American boys have been found on almost every battlefield where human freedom was at stake. The Lafayette Escadrille and the Flying Tigers were the symbols of the spirit of an America still carrying on the traditions of those who helped America at its birth.

Recognition of this new nation in Palestine is justified by every precept and practice of America and by the platform declarations of both great political parties in the last campaign.

The voice of America spoke at Lake Success last November when practically all the nations outside the Moslem world declared in favor of the creation of the Jewish state in Palestine. That declaration still stands, and is the warrant for the historic proclamation of this new state.

Lifting the embargo upon the shipment of arms to those who are fighting to sustain the new Jewish state in Palestine should be the immediate order of the day. Our statutes are clear upon this point and brook no such interference as has closed the door upon the shipment of arms to those who are carrying on the same battle for human freedom that America waged with the assistance that came from Europe a century and a half ago.

No legal or other ban exists upon any American boy who desires to volunteer to assist in this great cause. The cause is just. The full weight of disapproval by the United Nations and the United States should rest upon the neighboring Arab countries who are fomenting strife in Palestine in disregard of every obligation under the United Nations.

A ringing declaration denouncing the activities of the Arab League and the Arab countries surrounding Palestine by the United Nations and the United States would instantly bring peace.

Within Palestine itself, no difficulty will be experienced in bringing about harmonious adjustment between all elements of the population. Outside agitators supported by subsidies and royalties flowing through the Arab states and the Arab League are responsible for 90 percent of the difficulty in Palestine today. Stop these funds and the difficulties will instantly cease.

AMERICAN SECURITY

Palestine and petroleum will not mix. From the standpoint of our national security, the oil reserves of the Middle East are not worth a tinker's dam. This is the testimony of every competent military authority.

In the event of any trouble, the American and British oil developments in the Middle East will simply serve the Soviet.

The railroad and truck lines have already been built by American enterprise and generosity direct from the head of the Persian Gulf to the Russian border.

Logistics plus American-built transportation insure possession by the Red Army of the oil wells of the Middle East.

Sacrificing our honor in Palestine for the utterly unattainable oil of Arabia is not only dishonorable but stupid.

We shall lose the whole world and our own soul as well.

Let us be very sure that America gives no occasion for the indictment leveled at the Chamberlain government in 1939 by Herbert

Stanley Morrison, leader today of the labor majority in the British House of Commons:

"The Jews must be sacrificed to the Government's preoccupation with exclusively imperialist rather than human considerations."

Like the foolish dog in Aesop's fable, we shall drop our honor to get our oil and end up with neither.

Yet in the name of oil our national honor and good faith is being tarnished. Subtly, it has been whispered that Mideastern oil is vital to our security, and, therefore, our pledges in Palestine must be repudiated.

Confidence in American good faith among freedom-loving people everywhere is the most vital of strategic materials so far as America is concerned. Without confidence among people everywhere in our plighted word, America can never hope to bring into being an indissoluble union of those who love freedom more than life.

In the words of Winston Churchill:

"You are not going to found and forge the fabric of a grand alliance to resist aggression except by showing continued examples of your firmness in carrying out, even under difficulties, the obligations into which you have entered. * * * Never was the need for fidelity and firmness more urgent than now."

America has stood stultified before world opinion in seeking to support—all at the same time: (1) A truce with grand mufti fresh from 5 years in Berlin with Adolf Hitler, his hands still dripping with Jewish blood; (2) a trusteeship for Palestine under some unknown trustee and supported presumably by American arms; (3) and the partition plan solemnly adopted after extensive study by two-thirds of the United Nations. Janus was outdone. This was not two-faced but three-faced.

In the scathing words of Winston Churchill, commenting on Chamberlain and his white paper, one could only say of the President of the United States that "he had reason to complain of his advisers as he had been very poorly briefed." We may now rejoice that his clouded vision has been cleared. May it continue.

What will the world think of a great power that seeks a truce with the Grand Mufti because he defies with force of arms the considered conclusion of practically all the nations outside the Moslem world?

Having defeated Hitler and Hirohito, we find ourselves in full retreat before 7,500 Arab mercenaries who have recently invaded Palestine in deliberate and proclaimed defiance of the decision of the United Nations.

The Minute Men of Concord and Lexington find their spiritual descendants in the embattled hosts of Zion among the hills of Palestine.

The shots of the Haganah are being heard around the world by every ear attuned to love of human freedom and good faith.

A century and a half ago America became a new nation conceived in liberty because other people permitted their sons and their munitions to come to our aid. Embargoes on munition shipments and cancellation of the passports of those who dare to volunteer to fight in the cause of human freedom were fortunately unknown in 1776.

In both the First and Second World Wars, long before the United States was involved, munitions were flowing freely to our ultimate allies, and American boys who loved human freedom more than life were volunteering without restriction to enter the contest all around the world. The Lafayette Escadrille and the Flying Tigers were the symbols of an America still animated by the spirit of 1776.

Americans may well demand of those in authority that the embargo shall be modified to permit arms to go to those who are defending the decision of the United Nations.

American boys have the same inalienable right to volunteer to fight for human freedom in Palestine as in Europe or China. The

Old World has no monopoly upon the spirit of Steuben or Kosciusko or Lafayette.

Lake Success must not become a synonym for failure. One Munich for this generation should be quite enough.

The magnificent mausoleum of the League of Nations upon the shores of Lake Geneva at least served for a political generation.

In New York on the shores of the East River there is still proceeding the preparations to build a \$60,000,000 tomb for an organization that is being destroyed by its own hand. Its epitaph might well be "erected to the memory of the power of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem who succeeded where Hitler and Hirohito failed."

In the partition of Palestine the nations of the world were united in supporting a just solution of an age-old problem. To their support came the hosts of those who loved liberty more than life in many lands. In Palestine itself there is a deep yearning for peace among Arabs and Jews alike. The recurring assassinations of Arabs who dare to dissent from the edicts of the Grand Mufti sufficiently indicates the temper of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine.

With twice as many Arabs as Jews in Palestine, why is it necessary for the Grand Mufti to import thousands of hired mercenaries from countries pledged as members of the United Nations to assist in maintaining world order under law?

Is it not even more of a travesty to realize that these mercenaries, hired to defy the decision of the United Nations and the United States, are being paid indirectly but in large measure from the proceeds of American oil royalties. The Transjordan Legion this last month defied the power of Great Britain by invading Palestine, although this Arab force was organized and trained by the British and is today almost entirely supported by a grant of \$8,000,000 a year from the British Treasury, now in process of replenishment from the United States.

American intelligence and integrity cannot be so lightly trafficked with. American honor is far more important in this distraught world than Arabian oil.

The righteous wrath of the American people is gradually being aroused against those who would sell American good faith in the world for the will-of-the-wisp of 30,000,000 barrels of utterly unavailable petroleum.

Zionism and Zionists are not today on trial. The United Nations rather has its day in court to demonstrate whether the fond hopes of its founders are to be dashed by its failure at the first obstacle.

The great dream of Zion is to be fulfilled in our day and generation because it is profoundly right.

The Jewish homeland is to grow into the Jewish Commonwealth envisioned by its founders and pledged by Woodrow Wilson in the throes of the First World War.

Both great political parties in America have pledged the development of a homeland for Jews in Palestine. It is clear now that this must mean the implementation of the partition plan and the establishment of an independent commonwealth in the Jewish portion of Palestine.

Here is one of the keys to world peace.

Make no mistake about it. The vision of the last half century of Zionist pioneers will be converted into a reality that will forever serve.

The partition plan will be implemented.

The Jewish portion of Palestine as allocated by the United Nations has become an independent commonwealth. Recognition of this new state of Israel by the United States is a decisive victory in the struggle of the centuries. Much hard fighting, however, still lies ahead, not only in Palestine but in the councils of the United Nations and in maintaining a steadfast policy among those in authority in the United States. "On guard" must still be the watchword.

The rejoicing of today in this great victory must be followed by rededication to the struggle that still lies ahead. "Be careful and be constant" must still be the motto for Zionists everywhere throughout the world.

Salute to the Jewish State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS,

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the Salute to the Jewish State by the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists, held at the Polo Grounds, New York, May 15 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"After a stinging defeat, and in the opinion of many people an unjust one, an American statesman of half a century ago wrote a poem which ended with these words: 'No question is ever settled until it is settled right.' Tonight we mark the beginning of a new State and in the inauguration of this State's coming into the sisterhood of nations we are again confirmed in the theory of the poem. 'No question is ever settled until it is settled right.'"

The prayers of the ages, the wallings at the sacred places in Jerusalem, the words of the prophets, the aspirations of the gentile nations, sometimes in conflict but always somewhere in friendship, rush through our minds. An age-old dream realized, but realized with a spirit of uncertainty because men have not become rectified to ideals supported by faith, so long have men accepted the theories of force and lived out a life of fear protected by guns and battleships.

This is a day of great symbols. The outstanding symbol is one tensely religious in its nature, one firmly established in the hearts of men of good will who accept the theory that the world was created for a purpose and that there is meaning in the strivings of men. Link with this the noble thought that man in order to attain his eternal worth must work in partnership with God. In this have we not the fulfillment of the desires of devout hearts.

The next symbol is the symbol of a people coming home to rest after wandering and being scattered the world over. It is fine for any people to be able to say, "This land is mine; here we may work out our dreams of social justice."

The day gives us another great symbol, a symbol of freedom, a symbol of liberty, a symbol where we may take from the experiences of the great American experiment in attaining freedom for man and transporting those ideas back again to the land of their origin wherein we may again shout these words inscribed on the Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout all of the land and to all of the inhabitants thereof."

The next symbol is one of a people who have learned the worth of freedom the hard way from seldom having been able to experience it and are now given a chance to practice freedom under their own vine and fig tree. From this standpoint alone, the Jewish State gives promise of proving to the earth that those who have been denied may,

given the chance, show how to give and bestow graciously rights, privileges, and freedoms which they have prayed for but seldom had. This day marks in more ways than one the fulfillment of the desire of nations.

The day is a solemn one. It should be a day of prayer, prayer wherein thanksgiving is mingled with an outpouring desire of all men to prove that those who now have a chance may in every sense become worthy. God bless America. God bless Israel. God bless free people everywhere, and may God be thanked for that which has been brought about.

Oil, Guns, and Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Oil, Guns, and Honor," delivered by me on Thursday evening, May 13, 1948, to the Fighters for a Free Palestine, in Madison Square Garden, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL, GUNS, AND HONOR

Oil and water do not mix. In Palestine, unlike water and oil, guns and oil are mixing freely and together they are making a mockery of our national honor.

The attempt of the State Department clique to prevent the creation of a Hebrew state must be stopped at once. Unless this policy is reversed immediately we stand to lose forever the good will and respect of world opinion. In the name of humanity—in the name of common decency, the United States must support the fight for freedom now being waged in Palestine.

When Senators CHARLES TOBEY, WAYNE MORSE, and I summoned an emergency conference in Washington to propose a United States policy for Palestine and the Middle East, we were compelled to take this step since it had become apparent that the vacillation of the State Department was not in the best interests of the United States, does not represent American public opinion and is not consistent with our traditional espousal of freedom and democracy.

I hope to be able in the time allotted to relate the entire story of the manipulation of American foreign policy in the Middle East by the oil interests and to point out how this policy is loaded with danger to the United States and how it promises to wreck the good-neighbor policy and put an end to Western Hemisphere solidarity which Ambassador Austin calls an oak beam supporting American security. I will call attention to our policy of arming the Arab League and supporting the imperialistic policy of Great Britain. I will demonstrate that the consistent opposition to the establishment of a Hebrew national homeland is in direct violation of our pledged word, a reflection on our honor, and a direct repudiation of a century and a half of tradition of courageous and honorable fighting for freedom.

Every person here tonight is to be congratulated for participating in this great gathering and demonstrating faith and confidence in the ultimate success of a great cause. As Americans we must look on the

problems of Palestine from two standpoints: First, as Americans who want the solution of the Palestinian problem to be in accordance with what is best for the United States; next, as Americans who sympathize, respect, and actively support the cause of free Palestine in accordance with American traditions.

This issue is not the exclusive concern of the Jews of the United States. The freedom of Palestine is necessary for all Americans, Jews, and gentiles alike. A modern, progressive, democratic state in Palestine is necessary for the United States because of sound political, economic, and military considerations.

The heroic fight which the Hebrews are waging is no more than a replica of the war which our Revolutionary fathers waged to free this country from the tyranny of George III. We, too, were fighting for a homeland, freedom of worship, our independence, and a government and institutions of our own. How can we do otherwise than espouse their cause?

We are making a grave mistake in Palestine. The State Department should be made acquainted with the facts of life. Its approach to the problem is unrealistic, wrong, and un-American.

The policy is unrealistic because it fails to take into consideration the true facts about Palestine. The Hebrews have forged a nation for themselves. This is a fact whether the British like it or not, whether the oil companies like it or not, and whether the anti-Semites like it or not. Perhaps one of these days the Middle East Division of the State Department may become aware of it. A Hebrew nation exists today in Palestine; history and the Dov Gruners, have seen to that.

I do not care to argue or discuss the merits of Hebrew rights in international law. That point is firmly established, although in the eyes of the British and our own State Department Hebrew rights have been consistently ignored.

Both the League of Nations and the United Nations have proclaimed that the peoples of Palestine are ready for self-government. Surely if the semilliterate Arabs of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon were ready for independence and full-fledged United Nations membership, the people of Palestine are long overdue in receiving their independence and we are long overdue in recognizing them.

Ambassador Austin presented the temporary trusteeship on March 19 as a substitute for the General Assembly's resolution on partition and economic union. Why did the United States reverse its position after going to such lengths to jam partition through the Assembly? The answer reflects on the dignity and honor of our country. I am discouraged that the greed of certain oil interests, the pro-Arab sympathies of certain of our military, and a State Department clique could combine to force this new and ruinous policy on the United States.

Strategically an anti-Hebrew policy is unwise and dangerous. The Combined Chiefs of Staff of Great Britain and the United States, we are informed, are working on the theory that only four bases would be available in Europe in the event that the Continent is overrun by Russia and that we would have to operate from bases in the British Isles, Spain, north Africa, and the Middle East. The base of operations in the Middle East would be Transjordan.

I am not a military strategist, but it seems inconceivable to me that a land-locked, primitive, sparsely populated country such as Transjordan would make a better base than western Palestine. I firmly insist that a strong, tightly knit, well-organized, progressive Hebrew state, with Mediterranean ports, is our best insurance against a Communist-dominated Middle East. The Hebrews have shattered the myth of Arab military superiority and have shown the world that they are capable of defending themselves if left alone.

In the Middle East only the Hebrews can be depended upon to be strong and faithful allies against any aggressor should the occasion arise.

The British have renounced their responsibilities under the mandate and are quitting at 1 minute after 6 o'clock tomorrow evening, New York time. In 20 hours from now they will conclude the sacred trust which they have so viciously and flagrantly distorted for a generation. But even now, when they claim to be withdrawing, according to the press, they are still reenforcing their troops in the Holy Land, and seeking to maintain control by shrewd schemes in which we hope the United States is not aiding and abetting.

Dispatches from Lake Success this morning stated that the United States proposed that the United Nations General Assembly appoint a single man to be "a new Palestine high commissioner."

Why does Palestine need a new high commissioner or any outside ruler and why must the United States come forth with this scheme of a new Cunningham for the Holy Land? Why the talk of a trusteeship and the curious attempt to delay the Hebrews from proclaiming the independence of Palestine? It is strange and sinister that the most advanced and progressive country in the Middle East is the only one which has been denied any measure of self-government, and concerning whose freedom there are so many cunning delays.

The British would like to have their cake and eat it too. They would like to see America finance and participate in a new occupation of Palestine under some sort of trusteeship arrangement. Not only will any trusteeship rob Palestine of its independence but with trusteeship inevitably will come the request for American troops, in order to "enforce peace" in Palestine.

I am unalterably opposed to sending American troops to Palestine. They would be no more welcome than the British troops are today. The presence of our troops would replace good will by hatred. We must recognize that an underlying residue of anti-Semitism remains in this country. Any injury to American troops, any loss of life at the hands of either Hebrew or Arab extremists and the Jews of America and all minority groups would suffer. Our troops must not be sent there.

I am familiar with the arguments used to support such a plan: that the United States must assume responsibility for preserving peace; that the United States is the only nation capable of supplying a police force at this time; and that with the announced withdrawal of British forces tomorrow, unless American troops are dispatched, a full-scale war will break out in the Middle East.

I am deeply concerned with the effect that such a move might have on Palestine. I am more concerned, however, with its effect on the United States. I fail to see how American troops, or, for that matter, how the troops of any nation, could peacefully bring together the opposing forces in Palestine.

The British have not been able to disarm the Arab and Hebrew forces and there is no reason to believe that United States soldiers could accomplish this task without being involved in the conflict and without loss of life. Of course, the British would welcome the presence of American troops in Palestine. For us to take over Great Britain's insolvency and replace her as the target of the animosity of all colonial peoples who are battling for freedom against imperialistic powers would be a feather in the cap of the Foreign Office, but it would certainly not benefit the people of the United States.

How can such a policy be reconciled with the interests of the American people? I am in favor of finding a final solution of the terrible problems confronting Palestine. Only a total solution can bring peace and order; but I don't want American soldiers to

Association. This teacher takes full credit for the success of these outstanding Utah boys, but I probably forgot or did not have the foresight to give them A's.

Another former student is vice president of one of America's big paper companies which buys much of its paper from Finland. This young man, though located in the biggest city of the world, speaks of Utah as home. He has traveled extensively throughout Europe in connection with his business and brought with him to my office the other day a top notch Finnish exporter. We talked about Russian-Finland relations because our friend from Finland has just returned from two trips into Russia. He speaks Russian fluently and therefore gained something from his visit to bring to us that other people were not able to get who did not know the language.

An interesting experience of the week was with Lord Beaverbrook and his London Daily Express. You might ask, now how can Utahns figure in this picture. But here is the story. Beaverbrook represents those interests in England who are opposed to our European recovery plan, cooperation with America, and the British loan. He wants England to stand alone in the world under the old empire structure. I got my name in his feature because I called attention to one of his editorials and labeled it "An Unfriendly Friendly Editorial." His paper liked the term and he gave me another half column. Our Utah missionaries in London clipped the editorials and sent them to me by air mail. Utah is surely close to the world. A paper comes out in the morning in London, we get it the next morning in Washington. No matter what theory you have—one world, two worlds, or a multitude of worlds, we are surely living close to one another and half of the world does know what the other half is doing.

We met another Utahan at the Thomas Jefferson meeting at Columbia University. He is leaving Columbia to join our university after profitable years of experience away from Utah. He is a great man and another great asset to our country.

Then, at the annual meetings of the American Society of International law held in Washington recently, we met a Utahan who is now municipal judge in one of the big eastern cities. What a wonderful experience to renew acquaintances with old friends in that society who are interested in building a new and better world. The bright spot here was to listen to two men, who have spent their lives attempting to bring about world order, speak about gains, realizing that there is going to be a long struggle, but who find optimistic encouragement almost every day. The people of the world may not be ready for world government, but they are getting ready. They are learning a little bit at a time through practical experience as our people have learned. The growth is slow but it is steady, and it is more and more coming under American leadership, and Utah's contribution is reflected in that leadership. Here again some of the things I have talked about seem far removed from our everyday life, but I want to repeat they are closer to you than any program you have in your own backyard. What happens to you if we cannot keep the American dollar stable? What happens to you if the third world war starts? What happens to you if a jet plane or if something equivalent to the bomb picks one of our towns? Stability and peace mean more to every man, woman, and child who is able to listen to my voice tonight than any other two things we can think of, and Utah is reflected in the strivings for that peace and stability through the tireless efforts of her sons and daughters.

Then, calling in my office was another great man, an educator who has brought national recognition to our State, the presi-

dent of the National Education Association. This man's election to this place of high honor places Utah in the field of education where she rightly belongs.

I have a letter on my desk from my old university classmate who has just been elected president of the National Bar Association, saying he will be in Washington to visit me this month. This is another great reflection on Utah.

Two young men from Salt Lake came to Washington to testify before one of the Senate committees in opposition to the bill under consideration. These young men were well prepared, modest, and honest, and everyone trusted them and had confidence in what they said. Even the proponents of the bill made comment to this effect. My heart fills with joy when my colleagues in the Senate go out of their way to commend witnesses appearing in their committees, who have come from home, for their forthrightness, straightforwardness, and honesty.

Two former students dropped in to say "Hello" from San Francisco and Oakland; one here on business with the Government as the legal representative of one of the large real estate firms in San Francisco, organized and operated by Utahans—the other representing the Standard Oil of California, a lawyer for that firm. Both of these boys told me that the President of the Standard Oil of California is a Utahan.

Here I have only mentioned, without naming, those Utahans who have visited me in my office or who have written me from elsewhere in the United States or from abroad within the last 2 weeks. Time will not permit mentioning the hundreds of Utahans living in Washington who are successful and who are praiseworthy and who do honor to all of you at home. Our Utah heritage is reflected in all of these young people, they are proud of their beginnings, and when we view their lives and become thoughtful we say, "Only in America can these things happen."

Utah has so much to offer in the way of resources, heritage, and manhood that if our own people would honor each other by emphasizing our strength and assets, not calling attention to our weaknesses, we would grow still further in stature in the eyes of the world. No one then would be able to say like one famous modern author, that the "people in Utah are dead from their shoulders up."

I am for Utah and Utahans. Utah's greatness is truly reflected in her sons, not only in America, but abroad in the world. I am proud to be a Senator from Utah because of the greatness reflected in the people of our State. I am proud to represent Utah people, but if I am thought worthy of being representative of Utah people I am prouder still.

Charles L. Gifford

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1948

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unusual and interesting characters that I have ever known was the late CHARLES GIFFORD, who so ably represented the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts. I will remember him for his profound Americanism, his common sense, his high principles, and his sense of humor.

Mr. GIFFORD was a devoted public servant. He made a distinct contribution to his community, his State, and to our great Republic. He has earned his reward.

Recognition of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Record of Bungling," from the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday, Sunday, dealing with the recognition of Israel by our Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RECORD OF BUNGLING

Mr. Truman was indubitably right in recognizing the state of Israel. But the fact that the porpoiselike progress of American policy toward Palestine has, at this moment, succeeded in bringing the Nation's head above water, affords no confidence that there will not be another plunge. It would be difficult, indeed, to discover in the history of American diplomacy a more peculiar sequence of events than that which has marked the national policy in the Near East, and the vast bewilderment which swept the world on the announcement of the recognition of Israel is a clear warning of danger ahead.

The United States has long been regarded as the principal exponent of Jewish aspirations in the Holy Land. American criticism was an important factor in inducing the British to withdraw from the mandate, and American support for partition was essential to the adoption of that program by the United Nations. This country's reversal on partition was a great shock to world opinion; whether other nations agreed with the American stand or not, they were astonished to find it changed so abruptly and with such a lack of candor. The same reaction, doubled in intensity, will accompany Mr. Truman's recognition of partition. The patent fact that the President's actions caught the American delegation at Lake Success completely by surprise will do nothing to enhance the dignity or the prestige of the diplomatic representatives of the United States.

This is of far more than casual importance in the present state of world affairs. The position of the United States in the eyes of the world is one of great power. There is comfort in that for nations struggling with intricate economic problems and confronting the threat of Communist aggression. But there is also a latent fear, no little jealousy, and some suspicion, which is assiduously fostered by Communists everywhere. If the world comes to conceive of the United States as a fumbling giant, it will be alarmed, because power, ignorantly used, is always dangerous. If the world loses respect for America's moral purpose and steadfastness, the situation will be worse. The most benevolent gestures will be looked on with cynicism and apprehension, and the fast-developing unity of the non-Communist nations will be weakened at the heart.

The ticklish Palestine problem has not been disposed of, so far as the United States is concerned, by the recognition of the

radiant gas, clouds and bacteria, the only sound military defense is a world-wide good-neighbor policy. Military men are always experts in the last war and amateurs in the next war. What I am saying is that science has now made peace the only possible military security for the United States.

I say furthermore that our present program of trying to run the entire world by force and dollars will lead to limitless demands which will ruin us. One year it will be \$400,000,000, the next year \$8,000,000,000, the next \$40,000,000,000, and so on in rapid progression until war itself soon becomes the only possible answer as domestic discontent rises. That is why I am fighting so hard to bring about a complete reversal of the Truman, Forrestal, Vandenberg doctrine of domestic militarization and foreign support of kings and reactionaries.

There are other things to be done, of course. We need a UN police force. We need a more democratic structure for the UN, with direct representation of the people. We need world law with teeth in it. But we can't get these things until we do the others, and we certainly can't get them by building landing barges, tanks, pursuit planes, atom bombs, and uniforms for our 18-year olds.

Mr. Truman and the others can raise their false cry of "Communist" but they won't stop us from fighting for peace. They can't stop millions of Americans from coming into the new party and building the political organization that will win the fight for peace. If the few thousand American Communists support Glen Taylor and myself, they are supporting our program. It is the program I have outlined. It is an American program based on our belief in democracy—on our faith in our fellowmen—on our faith in their judgment when they are given the facts.

In closing let me repeat my challenge to Mr. Truman and to all the other candidates for office—I ask them to join me in the following pledge:

"I shall not knowingly accept the support of any individual or group advocating the limitation of democratic action for any other individual or group; nor the support of any individual or group which would restrict the civil liberties of others for reasons of race, color, or creed; nor the support of any individual or group advocating the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States."

Candidates who accept the support of the race supremacy fiends, who would limit the democratic actions of trade unions, who would restrict the flow of free speech, who support intimidation and campaigns of hate and fear can't join in this pledge.

Those of us who believe in democracy pledge it with pride.

Pay Increase for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justified Pay Raise," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTIFIED PAY RAISE

When complaint is heard about the inefficiency of Federal employees, the workers

in the postal system are rarely included. As a class, these workers are recognized as being among the best and most efficient in the Government service. In comparison with the responsibilities their duties involve, they likewise are among the most poorly paid.

Up until 1945, postal employees had received no increase in basic pay since 1925. Two raises since then have not brought it to a lavish scale. The beginning postal clerk or letter carrier receives, in this day of high prices, \$2,100 a year. The top limit that can be reached after years of service is \$3,100, plus a slight addition in longevity pay. The increase won in 1945 virtually was nullified by elimination of overtime work. A similar \$400 increase the next year was offset by the rising cost of living.

Three bills to boost the pay of postal workers to a level more nearly in keeping with present conditions are pending in Congress. One of them, favorably reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would add \$800 a year to the basic scale of postal employees and would increase the pay of other Government workers by \$650 a year.

Undoubtedly a raise in any amount would be welcomed by all Federal employees, but the handlers of mail are especially deserving. Because they started lower in the pay scale, their compensation still lags behind that of comparable Government workers despite the modest gains in 1945 and 1946. Whether or not the \$800 a year specified in the pending bill is the proper figure, a raise to the postal employee to prevent him from falling further behind in the cost-of-living race is justified.

In spite of the high costs of government and the need for economy in its operations, Congress can afford to grant a raise to this group of employees purely on the basis that "a laborer is worthy of his hire."

Editorial Tribute to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, from the Washington Post of May 14.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDERSON'S SERVICE

As Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson proved himself equally adept at enunciating and administering broad-gaged agricultural policies and at fending off unfounded attacks on his Department. In the best sense a diplomat, he knew how to deal with men, particularly his old colleagues in Congress, and his services in the Cabinet will be missed as he enters the contest for the Democratic senatorial nomination in New Mexico. Mr. Anderson occasionally was accused, and rightly, of vacillation. Nevertheless, when stacked up against Mr. Anderson's record of constructive accomplishment, these instances were few and minor. The former Secretary was, of course, first and foremost a champion of agricultural interests, but his view of agriculture was related to the entire economy, and not limited.

This was shown in the role that Mr. Anderson played in encouraging farm produc-

tion to meet world hunger, even though he was not unaware of the danger of potential surpluses. He also lent useful assistance to the domestic food-conservation drives. At the same time he served the Nation as well as agriculture in keeping Congress forever reminded of the need for adequate long-range farm protection. It will be no easy task to replace Clinton Anderson with a man of like ability. We hope to see him back in Washington.

Utah Reflected in Her Sons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of
Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of an address I made on the subject of Utah Reflected in Her Sons, broadcast over the facilities of Station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH REFLECTED IN HER SONS

I am reading a book written by one of Utah's great men, Dr. Parley A. Christiansen, of the Brigham Young University. The book is a series of essays entitled "All in a Teacher's Day." I am wondering if my listeners would be interested in a series of thoughts on Utahans which we could label "all in a Senator's day."

When I delivered the commencement address at the Utah State Agriculture College a few years ago I said that Utah's first duty is to produce leaders for the Nation. The ideals of our people and of our State are such that we can do that and do it well. Under the democratic system, this, of course, is being done everywhere in America, but that it is strikingly being done in Utah is proved by a report of the visits and a few of the letters received by me from Utahans within the last fortnight.

We hear a great deal these days about the word "proletariate." This word came to life again as part of the vocabulary of the modern Russian movement. The first time I saw the word was in reading Cicero in my old Latin days. Cicero defined a person who belonged to this proletariate as one who did nothing for his state but raise children. The German military idea under the Kaiser when they used to talk of gun fodder is something akin to it. Utah must never produce gun fodder nor must she supply a proletariate. Our ideals and our educational institutions are too fine for that. We want to produce and develop leaders for our Nation. That we can do, and that we are doing, although we are not a rich State nor a powerful State in the sense that other States are powerful and rich. That Utah's influence is being felt the Nation over, yes, even in the far corners of the earth, is truly reflected in her sons.

First, an item that brings gratitude and appreciation to a teacher's soul—two letters have been received from former students who were in one of my classes at the same time while I was teaching at the university. One student told me he has become vice president of the Ford Motor Corp., the other that he is now vice president and general manager of one of the country's biggest corporations, the Nash-Kelvinator Co. Then another classmate of these boys has just become president of the National Restaurant

Jewish state. Israel is in danger, the war is developing with ominous speed, and America cannot remain complacent. The world, certainly, will be watching critically as American policy develops in the Near East. If the old pattern continues—of alternate strength and weakness, of dodging responsibility until overtaken by events, of big words and petty deeds—the cost to the United States in terms of international respect will be incalculable.

Mr. Truman has expressed the pious hope that foreign policy will be kept out of the coming Presidential campaign. So far as major objectives are concerned, most Americans share his wish. But it is impossible for the voters to overlook, or candidates to ignore, obvious bungling in the conduct of foreign affairs. The Palestine question has been badly bungled thus far, and though the worst effects of the errors may still be repaired, the errors themselves cannot be forgotten.

The President's Off-the-Record Address to Newspaper Editors and Publishers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a column entitled "Lighter Vein," by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register, of Springfield, Ill. Mr. Dallman is a very outstanding newspaperman of our State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHTER VEIN

(By V. Y. Dallman (admiral))

MIRACULOUS REINCARNATION OF HARRY TRUMAN AT PRESS FEAST MAKES HIS NOMINATION CINCIN

President Truman was speaking. Four hundred newspaper editors and publishers and an additional 400 guests were according the President of the United States indifferent attention. There was the usual black-tie and evening-gown politeness, but Harry Truman wasn't getting any applause.

Then came as near a miracle in politics as this writer has ever witnessed. We were lolling at ease after a sumptuous banquet in the President's room of the beautiful Statler Hotel in Washington.

The scene was an iridescent dream of beauty. The indirect lighting system shed a tricolor red, white, and blue effect across the ceiling and upon the walls. The deep-red curtain behind the long speaker's table where the President and many dignitaries sat was studded with brilliant stars.

All of this rich color blended perfectly with the deep meaning of the national anthem which the Marine Band orchestra played inspiringly from an elevated stage off to one side.

There was some buzz of conversation and no little smoking of cigars and cigarettes as the mostly Republican audience of men and their ladies of affluence sat back to endure the Democratic President's speech in a twangy voice.

For 15 minutes Mr. Truman broadcast his address. It was echoing across the continent on a great network. He talked about national defense, inflation, Russia, communism, and what not, but it was just another Truman speech.

Then came the miracle.

Occupying a ringside seat only 15 feet from the President, I could study his facial expressions and interpret the personal qualities which always enter into any speech.

Strangely enough, the President's entire personality seemed to change. He had brushed his papers aside, announced that what he was about to say for another 15 minutes was "off the record," and was pouring out his heart as I had never seen him do before.

If he had been a Wilson, a Roosevelt, a Bryan, a Norris or a Vandenburg he couldn't have done better.

Republicans forgot that they were Republicans; Democrats that they were Democrats, as they actually leaned forward seeking to catch every syllable falling from the lips of a man whose voice changed for the better under the pressure of heart throbs as he poured out his soul in an appeal for national unity to prevent war, promote peace and serve mankind here and throughout the world.

What the President said I must not quote, but as he finished his off-the-record address, bowed and with his aides walked across the stage, down the steps and through an exit, he was given a prolonged, tumultuous ovation which continued after he had disappeared.

I saw hard-boiled Republicans turn one to another in surprise. I heard many of them say: "That was a great speech!"

That miracle made history. What the President said to stir those Republican minds and hearts was only a part of the miracle. The surprising companion part was that those Republican hearts could be so warmed by any Democrat and especially by Harry Truman.

Reverberations from that miracle have echoed across the Nation. Time magazine of May 3, 1948, was so moved that it gave preferred position on its first page of National Affairs to the report of that speech by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor. It quoted Drummond as saying:

"I put it as a careful statement of fact that I never heard any political personage receive any longer, sustained or more spontaneous applause than came from that group of overwhelmingly Republican newspaper editors. They liked what Mr. Truman had to say and they liked the way he said it. They felt an integrity, a humility, a morality of purpose * * * which stirred their esteem, their regard, and their good will."

Time magazine went on to say:

"A good two score of the guests remarked to Presidential press secretary, Charles Ross, that if Harry Truman carried on his campaign with that kind of effectiveness, 'he'll be a hard guy to beat.'"

As I wired back from Washington to this paper that night, "a new Harry Truman had been revealed." Moreover, from that moment on, there was not the slightest doubt that President Truman would be nominated at Philadelphia for a full term as President.

United States Landholdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "United

States Landholdings," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 13, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LANDHOLDINGS

County officials in California are disturbed, with ample good reason, over Federal ownership of real property within the State. The situation has reached the point that the Federal Government now owns 47 percent of the State's total area, and its acquisitions have taken \$900,000,000 in valuations off the assessment rolls. Federal ownership of this land deprives the State and counties of \$35,000,000 a year in revenues they would receive if the properties were subject to taxation.

These statistics were gathered for the County Supervisors' (Commissioners) Association, to be used in a plea for Congress for some measure of relief. The plea is one in which local officials of all States and counties might well join. California's plight may be worse than that of some other States, but to a greater or lesser degree the same situation exists in all States.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, made a report to Congress back in 1943, which showed that on January 1 of that year Federal ownership of real estate comprised more than one-fifth of the entire land area of the country. A table accompanying the report showed some Federal land holdings in every State of the Union. And considerable amounts of land were acquired by the Government after January 1, 1943.

As a rule, federally owned real estate is exempt from taxation, although in some cases payments in lieu of taxes have been made to local units of government which formerly taxed the property. Generally speaking, however, the Government's land acquisitions have placed heavy burdens on adjacent property remaining in private hands, and in some cases they have created financial crises for school districts and municipalities.

Equal Opportunity in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, May 10), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address on the subject Equal Opportunity in Education, by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, at the conference on human rights, civil and cultural, at Howard University, Washington, D. C., May 13, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I realize that you wish me to speak today on equality of educational opportunity in the college. But there can never be equal opportunity at the highest levels until there is more equality in the preparation given our boys and girls in our elementary and grammar schools. The children who come from States with less per-capita wealth, or those who come from rural areas and city slums, now have the poorest schools. This militates against their chances of getting into college. But even in our most prosperous States we have neglected the schools and

teacher training to such an extent that many of the graduates find themselves handicapped by inadequate preparation for college.

At the health conference last week a dean of one of our leading medical schools stated that only a few of the best schools have a full quota of top-notch students. One-eighth of the students in other medical schools are not the proper material, and we are not producing enough top-flight men for scientific research. Everywhere the bottleneck of talent, said this medical man, is on the lowest level of education. As for the rank and file, I need not remind you that we rejected about 5,000,000 men in the last war for illiteracy and mental or physical instability.

One admiral who is in favor of universal military training said last week that we wouldn't need universal military training so urgently, if only our public schools did a more thorough educational job throughout the country. But, said he, many of our high-school graduates are so badly prepared that we have to begin their mathematics all over again.

In other words, equality of opportunity at the college level is a myth, as long as it depends on the geographical area in which the applicant happens to be born. It is a myth for many others whose schools have lost so many of their good teachers that they no longer give their students a sound education. We have allowed our elementary education to run down to a point where we are endangering our whole intellectual and cultural life.

And we have done this at a moment when as never before, this country is confronted by a demand for the greatest possible number of informed, educated, and mature citizens. We need them for the country's functioning as the world's leading Nation. We need them to maintain our responsibilities toward other nations. We need them for military defense. Above all, we need a form of defense that transcends mere military power. To be sure, we must be strong enough to wage war. We must be strong enough to prevent aggression that threatens peace. And we cannot achieve the requisite moral, mental, and physical poise to prevent war, unless we underpin our whole social structure with educated people.

Such progress as communism has made among our people is largely due to the fact that its propaganda emphasizes the undeniable weaknesses in our social structure. Secretary Marshall in his recent speech made it clear that communism is not so much the danger to American security as the conditions that give rise to communism. If we use all instrumentalities wisely and courageously to fight those conditions in our own country and abroad, the United States can become, said the Washington Post last week, a master builder. Only with faith in democratic principles can the master builder undermine the master destroyer.

But faith in the power, the resilience and the justice of democracy cannot be sustained in our country, if we ignore our own breeding grounds of communism on the plea that we are too busy cleaning them up in Europe. Unless we mend some of the basic weaknesses in our social structure, such as inadequate educational facilities and inadequate housing, there will be serious unrest in our country. And this unrest will be strongest among your people, for they have suffered the greatest injustices in both areas. But however important the housing problem may be, education is the more vital need, for it is the foundation of our democratic liberties. Without an educated citizenry able to preserve and extend freedom, the Nation cannot endure—least of all when communism flaunts its false but utopian ideology.

Therefore, one of our basic, immediate needs in this country is Federal aid to education. The best bill to achieve it is now in Congress. It has already passed the Senate

by a vote of 58 to 22. But it is hung up in the Committee of Labor and Education in the House, because the Republican majority leaders will not give it the green light. Why not? Because they want to balance the budget. Now, I have every respect for the Nation's need of economic solvency. Our expenditures for the Marshall plan, for armaments, for a possible military training program are vast. But the most elementary social needs of the American people cannot be neglected if our people are to be fit to carry out the Marshall plan and a defense program that makes not only for military strength, but holds aloft the moral superiority of democratic principles.

My friends, we have at present a Senate of outstanding ability, courage, and statesmanship. It is a deliberative body in the finest sense of the word. Both the Republican and Democratic leadership have made a distinguished record on national and international questions of the greatest moment. But the House of Representatives has not taken the same broad perspective. To be sure, it has passed the anti-poll tax bill and reduced taxes. And only last week the Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, indicated that the House would pass the measures for the entry of our country into the World Health Organization and for the acceptance of our quota of European displaced persons. This recent statement indicates an awareness of our international social responsibilities. They should be balanced by an equal awareness of the serious social problems that confront us here at home.

Let us examine the House record in regard to Federal aid to education. The hearings have been completed under the able chairmanship of Mr. McCOWEN, of Ohio. Since the Senate passed the bill with an overwhelming majority a barrage of national organizations and distinguished individuals have pleaded with the Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, to get the bill reported out in the House. Only last week in one single delegation 20 national organizations—labor unions, farm organizations, women's clubs, and professional groups—representing many millions of citizens, called on the Speaker to urge enactment of the education-aid bill at this session. He tells everybody the same thing. He thinks there are enough votes to pass the bill in the House. He is for it, he says. But we are already spending too much money. We can't afford it.

The answer to that argument was made by the United States Chamber of Commerce when it issued its detailed study that proved the close relationship throughout our country between the per capita production and buying power of each State and community to the per capita expenditure on education. But the best analysis of educational finance in its relationship to the Nation's economy is contained in a book recently published by Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics in the Harvard Graduate School of Administration, entitled "How Shall We Pay for Education?" Professor Harris makes out a strong case for increased Federal aid to education. He points out that from 1913 to 1950 (estimated), Federal revenues will have risen about 12 times as much as State and local revenues. Furthermore the Federal tax system responds better to changing economic conditions, is more productive of revenue, and is also less depressing on the economy, dollar for dollar, than the State and local tax systems. The Federal Government should bear larger responsibilities, too, because it has held for itself the most productive forms of revenue. Finally since maleducation in one part of the country affects the rest of the country adversely the Federal Government in the interests of the country as a whole should redress the balance. He reports that State aid for education by 12 Southern States recently amounted to 1.4 percent of the income of these relatively poor States; and 9 wealthy

Northern States contributed only 0.65 percent of the income of their citizens as State aid to education. "How much longer," demands Mr. Harris, "will the Federal Government go on spending less than a hundred million per year on the schools of the country, that is, less than 0.3 percent of its income and less than 0.1 percent of the Nation's economy?" To the budget minded Mr. Harris demonstrates that for every billion dollars spent by Government for education the returns in the rise of the Nation's economy would be many times the outlay. That it would also bring about more important if unmeasurable non-economic gains is almost self-evident, says Professor Harris.

He might well have stated the case more strongly. For all the arguments of the United States Chamber of Commerce and by Professor Harris indicate that if the \$300,000,000 provided in the bill for Federal aid to education are invested in strengthening our human resources, that sum will produce more wealth, material, moral, and spiritual, than any other investment of a similar sum.

But in spite of the material and moral arguments in favor of Federal aid to education, and in spite of the overwhelming national sentiment behind it, the power of the Speaker is such that he can nullify the wishes of the people and the Congressmen who represent them. The improper exercise of such power is a stultification of the democratic process. It is an arbitrary disregard of the national welfare. It is a situation as tragic as it is dangerous for the Republican Party. For the social consciousness displayed by the Senate Republicans will not counteract the impression of social indifference that is being made in the House.

It is conceded by the House leadership that no bill for national health protection can pass at this session. A housing bill of some sort may pass, but there is doubt about the most necessary part of such a bill, the provision for public housing. Therefore, Federal aid to education is the only measure by which the Republican leadership in the House can demonstrate its interest in the public welfare. JOE MARTIN, himself, told the press that there is more public interest in Federal aid to education than in any other measure now before the Congress and that the bill would surely pass if it is reported out. Mr. MARTIN has every reason to know about the enormous pressure behind the Federal aid to education bill. Early returns on a Gallup poll not yet completed confirm his opinion that a clear-cut majority of the American people are in favor of the bill. But it ought to interest JOE MARTIN that the majority of these people also say that they are willing to pay the taxes to raise the \$300,000,000 to foot the bill.

The question I should, therefore, respectfully like to ask the Speaker is this: Can the Republican Party face the people of this Nation at the coming election without a single measure to its credit that indicates sympathy for our country's social progress and welfare? How does Mr. MARTIN think it will sit with the voters when he tells them that with billions for Europe and for armaments, we can't afford \$300,000,000 to educate our own children properly and give their teachers a living wage? How can he continue to plead the need for economy when the people, themselves, are willing to pay the extra taxes to foot the bill? Surely his argument that nothing but the need to balance the budget keeps the Federal aid to education bill bottled up in committee no longer has any validity, if the people are willing to accept additional tax burdens to meet its cost.

The education of millions of your children is at stake, for this bill (S. 472 and its counterpart, H. R. 2593) provides for a just and equitable distribution of funds for the benefit of a minority group in all States which maintain segregated schools by law. Here is

C O P Y

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

May 17, 1948

Mr. Hyman A. Schulson
American Zionist Emergency Council
701 Ring Building
1200 18th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Schulson:

Thank you very much for your letter of the 13th referring
to the new Jewish State in Palestine.

I have long supported the creation and establishment of this
State and I wish to assure you of my continued sympathetic attention
to any problems affecting its welfare and success.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

/s/ John S. Cooper

JOHN S. COOPER

C O P Y

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

May 17, 1948

Mr. Hyman A. Schulson
American Zionist Emergency Council
701 Ring Building
1200 Eighteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Schulson:

Upon receipt of your letter of May 13th, I contacted the State Department, believing that direct contact is always so much better than speeches and press releases. I found that recognition was "in the works" and a few hours later, I heard it announced on the radio.

Needless to say, I feel the decision was an eminently sound one. Let us hope that it will lead to happier times for the people of Palestine who have suffered so much.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

/s/ H. C. Lodge, Jr.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
United States Senator

WASH. POST
5/18/48

Washington Calling

By Marquis Childs

Stormy Israel

NO ISSUE in many years has so confused the average American as the issue of Palestine. One obvious reason, of course, is that policy-makers in Washington have themselves appeared to be overwhelmed by confusion.

There are other reasons, too. The ordinary citizen has sensed that a deep injustice has been done to the Jews, who have seen a whole series of promises broken. But at the same time a current of conflicting propaganda has made for doubt and uncertainty.

Among the Jews in this country the divisions are deep. The terrorist acts of the Stern Gang in Palestine have alienated some sympathy for those who failed to realize that this is a tiny minority in a people struggling mightily to maintain discipline under conditions of desperate provocation.

At least a half dozen times the United States has taken positions that no one was prepared to back up. That is the primary reason why so many people feel they cannot find any reason in the welter of headlines about Palestine. The most conspicuous example, of course, was partition, which came about because of United States pressure. But when the full implications of this move were apparent, then the United States backed down, or, to put it more accurately, the little group in the State and Defense Departments that had all along opposed partition succeeded in getting it nullified.

IT IS this background that raises doubts about President Truman's sudden and dramatic move in according recognition to the new state of Israel. The move was a bold one. It should hearten the embattled Jews now defending what they have for 30 years considered their homeland.

But the decision for partition was also a bold one. If recognition is to be merely a gesture, then it can be worse than empty.

After all, the United States "recognized" Loyalist Spain all through the desperate years when that duly constituted government was being destroyed with the help of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Materials of war were going to Germany while an embargo kept them from the Loyalists in Spain.

The test will come in the meaning of recognition. Will the Arabs continue to have access to arms from the outside while an embargo prevents the Jews at the head of a duly constituted state from buying the materials they need in this country or elsewhere?

The very fact that one can talk of the conflict in these terms is to show how great is the peril to the peace of the world. In spite of the talk of invading Egyptian and Syrian armies, there is a comfortable assumption that the forces of the Arabs will not be too great for the forces of Israel to withstand. But that has almost too easy a sound.

THUS FAR, it is true, the Arabs have seemed so divided and so impotent that those who built them into a powerful bogey must feel more than a little foolish. But if they move with a unified and powerful force, the threat to the peace of the Near East and, in fact, to the world will be great. Those within the United Nations who have been forced to stand by while constructive policy has been sabotaged and the prestige of the U. N. dangerously and perhaps fatally weakened will then be able to say, "I told you so."

There will, however, be small satisfaction in that. An ever-spreading war will call for positive action if it is not to continue to spread and once again stir a general conflagration.

In the murky atmosphere of election-year Washington, there are all sorts of rumors about Palestine. From influential policy-makers come dark hints of pressure and the threat of exposure.

If it were possible to have a fair and honest inquiry, the public would be served. But that is quite obviously impossible. So we will continue to get a barrage of warring propaganda.

Now and then a shaft of truth cuts through the murk. Such is the *Collier's* article by Jorge Garcia Granados, Guatemala's delegate to the U. N. He tells of the intrigues, in which important Americans participated, to sabotage partition. It is a wretched story, full of shame and humiliation.

The only real hope is in the strength of the new state and the pioneering people who have created it. They have shown, long before Israel came into formal being, remarkable powers of resistance and endurance. Perhaps in the face of their unyielding resistance, a decent settlement will be possible, one that recognizes the rights and promises that go back for three decades.