



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
13

Box
4

Folder
284

American Zionist Emergency Council, Shapiro, Harry, 1948.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date August 4, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

During the coming weeks, Israel will make a bid for admission into the United Nations. The attainment of this objective would be facilitated if the American delegation to the UN would take the initiative in urging Israel's membership in the United Nations. It would be very helpful if newspapers would editorially advocate such a step.

Attached is a memorandum on the subject, "The Admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations". It is background material in connection with this aspiration of the State of Israel. Please convey its contents to your local editors and try to induce them to write a favorable editorial or feature article on this subject.

Regards.

HLS:RB
Enc.

MEMORANDUM

THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on November 29, 1947, provided:

"When the independence of either the Arab or the Jewish State as envisaged in this plan has become effective and the declaration and undertaking, as envisaged in this plan, have been signed by either of them, sympathetic consideration should be given to its application for admission to membership in the United Nations in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations."
(Paragraph 1-F)

The question now arises whether the State of Israel should be admitted to the United Nations at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly in Paris.

I. ISRAEL'S QUALIFICATIONS

1) The Origin of the State:

Israel is the first state in history to be created as a result of the investigations, deliberations and decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Its credential for admission is thus a unique international birth certificate inscribed with a distinguished and honorable parentage. Thirty-three nations voted for the General Assembly's Resolution, and would therefore seem to have a moral commitment to favor Israel's early admission.

2) The Existence of the State:

Israel's existence is now a fact of international life of which the whole world is aware.

a) External Recognition:

Although admission to the United Nations and recognition are not synonymous - and many states which have sought admission have not had as many recognitions as the State of Israel - it is significant that the State of Israel was accorded recognition by fifteen powers in less than ten weeks time. These include:

United States	Yugoslavia	Finland
Guatemala	Nicaragua	Roumania
U.S.S.R.	Uruguay	Costa Rica
Poland	South Africa	Panama
Czechoslovakia	Hungary	Venezuela

b) Internal Recognition:

Fundamental in the establishment of a state is the writ of authority it derives from its own people and its capacity to control its area

and carry on the functions of government. The record of performance since May 15 has demonstrated the representative character of the organs of government established in Israel, their loyal acceptance by the people, and their competence to create a smoothly operating apparatus of government serving all the needs of the people.

The United Nations Mediator attested to this achievement in Paragraph 34 of his report to the Security Council:

"The de facto situation in Palestine today is that a Jewish Provisional Government, recognized by an increasing number of states, exists in an area of Palestine, and is exercising, without restrictions of any kind on its authority or power, all the attributes of full sovereignty, including the waging of war." (In Paragraph 17, the Mediator described the war as a defensive one.)

Moreover, although Israel was attacked by six Arab States within a few hours of the proclamation of its independence, its people rose loyally to its defense and not only repelled all attacks but succeeded in carrying the war to the enemy's territory.

II. FIDELITY TO THE UNITED NATIONS

1) Israel's Orientation to the United Nations:

Israel has given ample evidence of its independence and its freedom from the domination of foreign powers. The very fact that its birth was attended by a union of great powers which have been divided on other issues has developed in Israel an international attitude oriented to the United Nations and to that body alone.

2) Israel's Relations with the United Nations:

Since its establishment, the State of Israel has fully and faithfully responded to every decision and appeal of the United Nations and its organs. More than half a dozen times the State of Israel willingly complied with calls made upon it by the Security Council, despite the fact that those calls equated aggressor and victim and imposed onerous obligations and conditions which should have been reserved for the aggressors against Israel. This scrupulous and undeviating fidelity to the commands of the United Nations has confirmed the promise that the United Nations would be the keystone of Israel's foreign policy.

3) The Experience and Attitude of Israel's People:

The people of Israel, long before the State was formed, fought for the cause and in the armies of the United Nations. It was against the Jewish people that Hitler first declared war, and six million Jews perished in the cause for which the United Nations arose. Their contribution to victory in World War II, both in Palestine and on every front, was far more impressive than that of a number of countries which gave little or nothing to that cause but which nevertheless have been admitted to the United Nations.

III. THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF ISRAEL'S ADMISSION

1) Its Significance to the United Nations:

The admission of Israel to the United Nations would be an announcement to the world that the United Nations is prepared to honor its commitments. Delay would be an act of vacillation by the General Assembly which would undermine confidence in that body's disposition and capacity to give effect to its own recommendations. Recommendations of the General Assembly would have little force or meaning to the nations of the world if the Assembly itself were to set an example of indifference to or non-compliance with its own recommendations.

2) As a Contribution to Peace:

The most compelling reason for Israel's admission is that it will, more than any other act at this time, stabilize the situation in the Middle East. Arab aggression against Israel was encouraged by a delusion that Israel could be liquidated. When the Arab States are persuaded to realize that this is an objective impossible of achievement by arms or by diplomatic maneuver, there will be a powerful incentive to reach a peaceful settlement with Israel. But if Israel is denied admission at the forthcoming session, uncertainty will continue for another year, Arab intransigence will be emboldened and the prospects of negotiations leading to a final peace will be gravely prejudiced.

It should be noted that the language of the General Assembly's Resolution, quoted above, deliberately made the admission of the Jewish State independent of the establishment and admission of its neighbor.

It may be argued that Israel's admission should be deferred until an agreement is reached with the Arab States and until Israel has compromised its differences with the Arabs.

Clearly, the situation dictates the opposite course. Agreement with the Arab States is far more likely to be consummated if the international community removes all lingering doubts of Israel's status.

Experience in the Palestine controversy has shown that firm action by the United Nations and its organs facilitated progress towards a solution, and that equivocation and delay retarded a final and lasting settlement.

With the existence of Israel an immutable fact, the establishment of peaceful relations between Israel and its neighbors and the stabilization of the entire Middle East can best be achieved by formal and international confirmation of reality - Israel's acceptance into the family of nations.

Mr. Harry L. Shapiro

Washington Office
September 1, 1948

Hyman A. Schulson

CC-Dr. Abba Hillel Silver ✓
Cleveland, Ohio

"PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL"

My friend, Mr. X, has informed me that he has seen reports indicating that the Arab countries in cooperation with Great Britain have already brought to Paris scores of representatives and workers and attractive women in preparation for the forthcoming meeting of the General Assembly.

He suggested that the Israeli Government should also have a number of competent and able people on hand in Paris in advance of the meeting of the General Assembly to counteract the propaganda of the Arabs and the British. He also recommended that a number of leading American Zionists be on hand. Christian friends should also be on hand in advance in Paris to maintain contact with the American delegation. I understand that the American delegation will leave for Paris on the SS America on September 13.

He strongly urged that both Dr. Silver and Dr. Neumann be in Paris at the time of the Palestine discussions. I explained to him that Dr. Silver has duties to his congregation because of the holidays, but that I would certainly convey his message. He also suggested that Dr. Silver should see Mr. Dulles before he left for Paris.

It is also very important that the people who were in contact with Mrs. Roosevelt during the last meetings of the Assembly should again contact her in advance of her departure. We all know that she was a tower of strength to us and we should try to keep her so.

Mr. Marshall will definitely go to the Assembly and head the delegation. My friend strongly suggested that Mr. Shertok be present in Paris, as it is most important that the Foreign Minister deal with the Secretary of State and other foreign ministers himself and not delegate this task to underlings.

My friend has given very serious thought as to whether or not Mr. Charles Fahy would be more valuable to us in the United States or Paris. After weighing all the facts, he strongly recommends that Mr. Fahy be asked to go to Paris and keep in contact with the American delegation. Mr. Fahy is very close to most of the members of the American delegation, particularly Secretary Marshall, Mr. Jessup, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Dulles, and Mr. Gross, who will be the legal adviser and is obligated to Mr. Fahy for his present job and, of course, knows all the others. He also has valuable contacts with the delegations of the other countries and knows the ropes at UN, because he, himself, served as an alternate delegate at the General Assembly when partition was approved. I suggest that Dr. Silver consider this recommendation very seriously and that he take the matter up with Mr. Fahy immediately upon his arrival.

My friend also reported that John McDonald, the U.S. representative in Jerusalem, has daily been sending in very bad reports regarding Israeli behavior in Jerusalem, and most of these reports border on the hysterical. John McDonald is definitely against Israel and is doing everything possible in his reports to the Department to discredit the Israeli government. Some device and technique should be used to have John McDonald removed. Dr. James G. MacDonald might also be of help in counteracting the type of reports John McDonald sends to the State Department.

Israel's great strength in the world of international opinion, both in the U.S. and in UN circles, has been due to the fact that the Israeli government was very correct in its behavior on all UN matters.

My friend has noticed that both Shertok and Ben-Gurion have been much too outspoken and not very diplomatic in their utterances in the last few weeks, and this has had a very bad effect even with some of our friends. He urged greater caution in their utterances and more restraint. One does not have to announce publicly to the world the motives behind every move made, nor does one have to advertise in advance the moves to be made.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date September 8, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Attached is a statement issued today by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. The latter part of it is an up-to-the-minute review of our present political situation and gives a clear indication of the line to be followed by our constituencies during the coming weeks.

A careful reading of the statement will show that we are dangerously close to the position we were in on March 19th last when the American Government reversed its policy and set in motion strenuous efforts to undo the partition decision of the General Assembly.

That we were able to bring our Government back to a realization of its responsibilities and a subsequent change in its attitude towards Israel is due in the largest measure to the loyal and effective work of the American Jewish community and its organized Zionist bodies.

A similar task lies before us now. Upon the outcome of this effort rests not only the UN decision of November 29th, but the future of the State of Israel itself. America still holds the key position and if we permit its actions to be dictated by British foreign policy and other special interests, the result for Israel may be catastrophic.

The following are the tasks we must set before us and carry out with every energy at our command:

1. Request every influential person and organization in your community -- Jewish and non-Jewish, civic, religious, labor -- to wire or write to the President setting forth in clear and unmistakable terms that they look to him to save the honor and the pledged word of our Government by fulfilling the promises contained in the Democratic Party platform.
2. Set up committees to visit newspaper editors, columnists and radio commentators to bring them up to date on the issues involved and to elicit public comment favorable to our cause. Orientation material to aid you in this task is enclosed on the questions of de jure recognition, economic aid and immigration. (Within a few days we will send you material on admission of the State of Israel into the United Nations for a follow up effort.) Please send us copies of the editorials which appear in your local newspapers resulting from this effort.
3. Set up committees and ask influential persons to visit the leaders of both political parties in your city, county and state.

Remind the heads of the Democratic Party of the plank in their platform which commits their Party to give political and economic aid to the infant State. Call their attention to the glaring fact that within recent months the President of our country and the head of their Party has been strangely silent while the State Department has continued its efforts to undermine the State of Israel. The loan of one hundred million dollars, which was promised, is now "postponed". Jews in the DP camps of Europe are restrained from exercising their right to go to Israel. American citizens who wish to visit Israel are denied passports and every action by the State Department is clearly designed to ape the pattern set up by Mr. Bevin's Foreign Office.

Remind the Republican leaders of their platform and their promises. Call their attention to the failure of any of their leading spokesmen to publicly mention the absence of positive and constructive Government action with regard to Israel. No Republican leader has as yet protested the failure of our Government to keep its pledged word. Ask them if this is a conspiracy of silence. If the foreign policy of our Government is a two-party policy then the Republicans must share equally with the Democrats the blame for the shameful behavior of our State Department towards Israel and towards the helpless refugees who are still penned up in concentration camps three years after the so-called peace.

Every indication points to another March 19th. We are told that the loan to Israel is to be held up pending inquiries into the stability of the State of Israel. Need we remind our politicians that they did not inquire into the stability of Greece and China before pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into these countries presumably in an effort to lay a foundation for stability. Need we remind our politicians that the United Nations Security Council specifically made provisions for the admission of men of military age into Israel, and that despite repeated assurances by Count Bernadotte that he never requested their exclusion, our State Department and our military authorities repeat in Germany and in Austria what Bevin is doing in Cyprus.

There is much to protest and now is the time to make that protest heard and felt. The task is yours and that of the men and women of your community. The coming eight weeks will be critical ones for Israel. We must devote ourselves to the tremendous job ahead. We must not fail! Please let me have a report from you on your activities as requested above.

Regards.

HLS:RB
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

DE JURE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

On the day of its proclamation, May 14, 1948, the Provisional Government of Israel was accorded de facto recognition by the Government of the United States. Though almost four months have elapsed since that date, full, so-called de jure, recognition is still being withheld by our Government from Israel.

It is often argued that the withholding of de jure recognition from Israel by the Government of the United States is due to technical reasons, notably to the "provisional" character of the present Government of Israel, to the absence of clearly defined frontiers and to generally unsettled conditions in that country. This argument is used to indicate that the withholding of de jure recognition does not denote any animosity on the part of the policy-making officials in the Department of State toward Israel.

The argument is totally incorrect. Full de jure recognition has often been accorded in the past by the United States to foreign governments which were provisional in character, and have ruled over an ill-defined territory amid disturbed conditions. These were the circumstances in which the provisional governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia were given full recognition after both World Wars. The Government of China and the Provisional Government of France were given de jure recognition in similar circumstances.

The withholding of full recognition from Israel after months of proven stability cannot therefore be justified by reference to precedent. It is, on the contrary, an indication that the Department of State, whose hostility to Israel is well known, has prevailed upon the President to withhold from Israel even that measure of cooperation which is normally extended to other countries.

The situation will appear even clearer if one considers that out of fifteen countries which have accorded diplomatic recognition to Israel, thirteen have granted full recognition. The only country beside the United States which has given to its recognition a limited de facto character is the Union of South Africa, a Dominion of the British Empire which, of course, is anxious to bow to the desires of the London government.

* * * * *

9/8/48

NOTE ON ECONOMIC AID TO ISRAEL

Amid conflicting reports and careful buck-passing between the White House, the Department of State and the Export-Import Bank, one fact has become clear: if the Administration can get away with it, Israel is not going to get any economic aid from the Government of the United States. The reasons used to justify this attitude shift: one day they are political, the next day technical, the third day they are due to "disturbed conditions" in Israel, the fourth day "the loan application is still under study." It is difficult to pin down the precise reason, just as it is difficult to pin down the party responsible for this denial of economic aid. But the fact remains.

It is perhaps unnecessary, at this late date, to take the reasons too seriously. Most people are aware by now that they are mere alibis. Still, let us keep some comparisons in mind.

Fierce civil wars rage in China and in Greece, and yet these countries receive economic aid. But Israel, where there reigns complete internal peace, is deemed too "disturbed" to be eligible for aid.

The Arab countries are still engaged in open aggression. Their armies are on the soil of Palestine, not a day passes without Jews or United Nations personnel dying from their bullets, they interfere with American and foreign shipping, and they keep their Jewish inhabitants in a state of abject terror. And yet these countries are considered eligible for American economic aid in different forms. But Israel is offered one postponement after another, one excuse after another.

Behind the scenes, the explanation is whispered that the United States and Great Britain wish to coordinate their policies on this issue: America should withhold assistance from Israel, while Britain would withhold aid from the Arabs. But this explanation too is untrue. Economic aid to Arabs is given both by America and by Britain. Military aid by Britain to Transjordan has been resumed. The truth is that Israel is being singled out for economic discrimination. Almost alone of all the countries outside the Soviet bloc it is denied American aid, despite the pledges to the contrary. The explanations vary, the denial remains.

* * * * *

9/8/48

MEMORANDUM

THE AMERICAN ATTITUDE ON TRAVEL TO ISRAEL

Two measures of far-reaching importance have been taken by our Government toward Israel. On the one hand, the Department of State is withholding passports from American citizens desirous of visiting Israel, especially if the visitors are men between the ages of 18 and 45. On the other hand, the same Department has issued instructions to the authorities of the American zone of occupation in Europe to restrict the emigration of Jewish Displaced Persons between the ages of 18 and 45 to Palestine.

These two acts, better than any words, illustrate the real attitude of the Department of State toward Israel. There is nothing in the truce resolution of the United Nations that would justify individual countries in taking such a course. On the contrary, a proposal to restrict the admission to Israel of persons of military age was debated and rejected by the Council, and the resolution expressly provides for the conditions under which persons of military age entering Israel in the course of the truce should be prevented from obtaining military training or joining military forces.

In taking the two steps named above, the Department of State is therefore not acting in accordance with a Security Council resolution. The attempt of the Department to place part of the responsibility for these acts on Count Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator, by leaving it to him whether "clearance" is to be given to immigrants of military age to proceed to Israel is ingenious but hardly convincing. Since the Truce Resolution does not give the Count any powers to control immigration to Israel, such powers can certainly not be given to him by the Department of State in Washington. At best, the Count is used by the Department for buck-passing purposes. At worst, the Department is engaged in collusion with the Count to misinterpret the meaning of the UN resolution.

The action of the Department of State is calculated to interfere with the right of American citizens to visit freely a friendly country, to harm the legitimate interests of Israel, and -- above all -- to deny the hope of the Displaced Jews of Europe.

This latter aspect, coming as it does after years of insistence by President Truman that the humanitarian task of permitting the Jewish Displaced Persons to go to Palestine ought not to be postponed on account of political considerations, is particularly obnoxious. As the New York Herald-Tribune pointed out editorially on September 6th, this act of the United States Government is similar to British practice on Cyprus. As Great Britain has become the jailer of Jewish refugees on that island, so, but on a much larger scale, are the pro-British and pro-Arab officials of the State Department making President Truman the jailer of the multitudes of Jewish refugees in the American Zone of occupation.

* * * * *

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees **Date** September 8, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Attached is a statement issued today by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. The latter part of it is an up-to-the-minute review of our present political situation and gives a clear indication of the line to be followed by our constituencies during the coming weeks.

A careful reading of the statement will show that we are dangerously close to the position we were in on March 19th last when the American Government reversed its policy and set in motion strenuous efforts to undo the partition decision of the General Assembly.

That we were able to bring our Government back to a realization of its responsibilities and a subsequent change in its attitude towards Israel is due in the largest measure to the loyal and effective work of the American Jewish community and its organized Zionist bodies.

A similar task lies before us now. Upon the outcome of this effort rests not only the UN decision of November 29th, but the future of the State of Israel itself. America still holds the key position and if we permit its actions to be dictated by British foreign policy and other special interests, the result for Israel may be catastrophic.

The following are the tasks we must set before us and carry out with every energy at our command:

1. Request every influential person and organization in your community -- Jewish and non-Jewish, civic, religious, labor -- to wire or write to the President setting forth in clear and unmistakable terms that they look to him to save the honor and the pledged word of our Government by fulfilling the promises contained in the Democratic Party platform.
2. Set up committees to visit newspaper editors, columnists and radio commentators to bring them up to date on the issues involved and to elicit public comment favorable to our cause. Orientation material to aid you in this task is enclosed on the questions of de jure recognition, economic aid and immigration. (Within a few days we will send you material on admission of the State of Israel into the United Nations for a follow up effort.) Please send us copies of the editorials which appear in your local newspapers resulting from this effort.
3. Set up committees and ask influential persons to visit the leaders of both political parties in your city, county and state.

Remind the heads of the Democratic Party of the plank in their platform which commits their Party to give political and economic aid to the infant State. Call their attention to the glaring fact that within recent months the President of our country and the head of their Party has been strangely silent while the State Department has continued its efforts to undermine the State of Israel. The loan of one hundred million dollars, which was promised, is now "postponed". Jews in the DP camps of Europe are restrained from exercising their right to go to Israel. American citizens who wish to visit Israel are denied passports and every action by the State Department is clearly designed to ape the pattern set up by Mr. Bevin's Foreign Office.

Remind the Republican leaders of their platform and their promises. Call their attention to the failure of any of their leading spokesmen to publicly mention the absence of positive and constructive Government action with regard to Israel. No Republican leader has as yet protested the failure of our Government to keep its pledged word. Ask them if this is a conspiracy of silence. If the foreign policy of our Government is a two-party policy then the Republicans must share equally with the Democrats the blame for the shameful behavior of our State Department towards Israel and towards the helpless refugees who are still penned up in concentration camps three years after the so-called peace.

Every indication points to another March 19th. We are told that the loan to Israel is to be held up pending inquiries into the stability of the State of Israel. Need we remind our politicians that they did not inquire into the stability of Greece and China before pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into these countries presumably in an effort to lay a foundation for stability. Need we remind our politicians that the United Nations Security Council specifically made provisions for the admission of men of military age into Israel, and that despite repeated assurances by Count Bernadotte that he never requested their exclusion, our State Department and our military authorities repeat in Germany and in Austria what Bevin is doing in Cyprus.

There is much to protest and now is the time to make that protest heard and felt. The task is yours and that of the men and women of your community. The coming eight weeks will be critical ones for Israel. We must devote ourselves to the tremendous job ahead. We must not fail! Please let me have a report from you on your activities as requested above.

Regards.

HLS:RB
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

DE JURE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

On the day of its proclamation, May 14, 1948, the Provisional Government of Israel was accorded de facto recognition by the Government of the United States. Though almost four months have elapsed since that date, full, so-called de jure, recognition is still being withheld by our Government from Israel.

It is often argued that the withholding of de jure recognition from Israel by the Government of the United States is due to technical reasons, notably to the "provisional" character of the present Government of Israel, to the absence of clearly defined frontiers and to generally unsettled conditions in that country. This argument is used to indicate that the withholding of de jure recognition does not denote any animosity on the part of the policy-making officials in the Department of State toward Israel.

The argument is totally incorrect. Full de jure recognition has often been accorded in the past by the United States to foreign governments which were provisional in character, and have ruled over an ill-defined territory amid disturbed conditions. These were the circumstances in which the provisional governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia were given full recognition after both World Wars. The Government of China and the Provisional Government of France were given de jure recognition in similar circumstances.

The withholding of full recognition from Israel after months of proven stability cannot therefore be justified by reference to precedent. It is, on the contrary, an indication that the Department of State, whose hostility to Israel is well known, has prevailed upon the President to withhold from Israel even that measure of cooperation which is normally extended to other countries.

The situation will appear even clearer if one considers that out of fifteen countries which have accorded diplomatic recognition to Israel, thirteen have granted full recognition. The only country beside the United States which has given to its recognition a limited de facto character is the Union of South Africa, a Dominion of the British Empire which, of course, is anxious to bow to the desires of the London government.

* * * * *

9/8/48

NOTE ON ECONOMIC AID TO ISRAEL

Amid conflicting reports and careful buck-passing between the White House, the Department of State and the Export-Import Bank, one fact has become clear: if the Administration can get away with it, Israel is not going to get any economic aid from the Government of the United States. The reasons used to justify this attitude shift: one day they are political, the next day technical, the third day they are due to "disturbed conditions" in Israel, the fourth day "the loan application is still under study." It is difficult to pin down the precise reason, just as it is difficult to pin down the party responsible for this denial of economic aid. But the fact remains.

It is perhaps unnecessary, at this late date, to take the reasons too seriously. Most people are aware by now that they are mere alibis. Still, let us keep some comparisons in mind.

Fierce civil wars rage in China and in Greece, and yet these countries receive economic aid. But Israel, where there reigns complete internal peace, is deemed too "disturbed" to be eligible for aid.

The Arab countries are still engaged in open aggression. Their armies are on the soil of Palestine, not a day passes without Jews or United Nations personnel dying from their bullets, they interfere with American and foreign shipping, and they keep their Jewish inhabitants in a state of abject terror. And yet these countries are considered eligible for American economic aid in different forms. But Israel is offered one postponement after another, one excuse after another.

Behind the scenes, the explanation is whispered that the United States and Great Britain wish to coordinate their policies on this issue: America should withhold assistance from Israel, while Britain would withhold aid from the Arabs. But this explanation too is untrue. Economic aid to Arabs is given both by America and by Britain. Military aid by Britain to Transjordan has been resumed. The truth is that Israel is being singled out for economic discrimination. Almost alone of all the countries outside the Soviet bloc it is denied American aid, despite the pledges to the contrary. The explanations vary, the denial remains.

* * * * *

9/8/48

MEMORANDUM

THE AMERICAN ATTITUDE ON TRAVEL TO ISRAEL

Two measures of far-reaching importance have been taken by our Government toward Israel. On the one hand, the Department of State is withholding passports from American citizens desirous of visiting Israel, especially if the visitors are men between the ages of 18 and 45. On the other hand, the same Department has issued instructions to the authorities of the American zone of occupation in Europe to restrict the emigration of Jewish Displaced Persons between the ages of 18 and 45 to Palestine.

These two acts, better than any words, illustrate the real attitude of the Department of State toward Israel. There is nothing in the truce resolution of the United Nations that would justify individual countries in taking such a course. On the contrary, a proposal to restrict the admission to Israel of persons of military age was debated and rejected by the Council, and the resolution expressly provides for the conditions under which persons of military age entering Israel in the course of the truce should be prevented from obtaining military training or joining military forces.

In taking the two steps named above, the Department of State is therefore not acting in accordance with a Security Council resolution. The attempt of the Department to place part of the responsibility for these acts on Count Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator, by leaving it to him whether "clearance" is to be given to immigrants of military age to proceed to Israel is ingenious but hardly convincing. Since the Truce Resolution does not give the Count any powers to control immigration to Israel, such powers can certainly not be given to him by the Department of State in Washington. At best, the Count is used by the Department for buck-passing purposes. At worst, the Department is engaged in collusion with the Count to misinterpret the meaning of the UN resolution.

The action of the Department of State is calculated to interfere with the right of American citizens to visit freely a friendly country, to harm the legitimate interests of Israel, and -- above all -- to deny the hope of the Displaced Jews of Europe.

This latter aspect, coming as it does after years of insistence by President Truman that the humanitarian task of permitting the Jewish Displaced Persons to go to Palestine ought not to be postponed on account of political considerations, is particularly obnoxious. As the New York Herald-Tribune pointed out editorially on September 6th, this act of the United States Government is similar to British practice on Cyprus. As Great Britain has become the jailer of Jewish refugees on that island, so, but on a much larger scale, are the pro-British and pro-Arab officials of the State Department making President Truman the jailer of the multitudes of Jewish refugees in the American Zone of occupation.

* * * * *

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

WESTERN UNION

JOSEPH L. EGAN
PRESIDENT

(34) SYMBOLS

DL = Day Letter

NL = Night Letter

LC = Deferred Cable

NLT = Cable Night Letter

Ship Radiogram

CL395 PD=WUX NEWYORK NY 15 350P=

origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER THE TEMPLE=

=CLEVE=

=FOLLOWING FROM SHAPIRO TELAVIV QUOTE 371 YOURS 12/9 EXIT

PERMIT FOR JANCO GRANTED REGARDS UNQUOTE:

=LOURIE=

:371 12/9=

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date September 16, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

We hope that your local emergency committee is already carrying out the program of action outlined in my memorandum of September 8, 1948. Once again it is necessary that I emphasize the importance of speed. This is the critical period during which the Administration must be induced to fulfill its promises regarding Israel. We dare not allow this moment to pass without exerting maximum efforts to bring about de jure recognition of Israel and the economic aid which the President and the platforms of the Democratic and Republican parties have pledged. If these two objectives could be achieved quickly the possibility for political gains at the forthcoming meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in Paris would be greatly enhanced.

In addition to the activities suggested in our memorandum of September 8th we urge that you do the following:

1. Request your Senators and Representatives to phone or wire the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington urging that that institution grant the requested loan immediately. We are confident that a large number of the members of both Houses of Congress will be happy to join us in pointing out to the Export-Import Bank that there is no justification for the postponement of the \$100,000,000 loan to Israel and in demanding that it be extended forthwith. Such calls and telegrams should be addressed to William McC. Martin, Jr., Export-Import Bank of Washington, 734 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. (Phone: REpublic 7890).

2. We have already sent you background material on the questions of de jure recognition, economic aid and immigration. No doubt you are calling these to the attention of newspaper editors, columnists and radio commentators. Enclosed is the promised memorandum on the admission of Israel into the United Nations. Please put this material to good use so that helpful newspaper and radio comment will result from your efforts in this connection.

Please let me have regular reports on your activities, and bear in mind that now is the moment for action. Let us ensure that the American Zionist movement, which has accomplished so much in the struggle to bring Israel into being, shall never reproach itself for failure to meet the challenge of the hour.

Regards.

HLS:RB
Enc.

ISRAEL'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

To be admitted to membership in the United Nations is the right of all "peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the...Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations." (Art. 4 of the Charter)

Israel has already declared its acceptance of the obligations of the Charter. After Israel's record of repeated agreement to truce proposals in the face of Arab aggression, no one can doubt its peace-loving character. Nor will anyone doubt Israel's ability and willingness to carry out obligations freely undertaken. In both respects Israel's record compares more than favorably with that of a great many States admitted to membership. There is certainly no comparison between the record of Israel and that of the Arab States of whom six have been rewarded with membership in the international organization.

Neither independence nor internal democracy are listed in the Charter as prerequisites for membership. And indeed, many States are members of the United Nations which are not truly independent, while others live under regimes utterly devoid of any semblance of democracy. It is unimaginable, in the circumstances, that a State as genuinely independent and as firmly based on democratic ideals as Israel be denied membership.

It is said at times that Israel's membership might be delayed on account of the lack of stability or the indefinite character of its boundaries. The argument is certainly far from candid. China and Greece, to name but the most blatant cases, are obviously not enjoying stability. Poland, for one, had its frontiers undefined at a time when it joined the United Nations. Attempts to prevent or delay Israel's membership on this or any similar basis must be considered therefore as a crass example of application of a double standard. What Israel is undergoing now is not internal instability but foreign aggression. To defend States against foreign aggression is the most sacred duty of the United Nations, and an attempt to evade it by denying membership to the victim of aggression would be a scandalous performance.

There is, however, one added circumstance which makes the admission of Israel especially urgent. Israel has emerged as an independent State as a consequence of a solemn verdict of the United Nations. Surely the United Nations owes it to itself speedily to admit to membership a nation thus formed.

The announcement of the Department of State (in a letter by Counselor Bohlen to Representative Javits) that the U.S. delegation will support Israel's application for membership is, of course, very gratifying. At the same time it ought to be clear to all observers that a great deal depends on the extent to which this support will be whole-hearted and energetic or merely perfunctory. It is well known to what extent the Western countries are inclined to follow the American lead, as long as they know that a certain course is indeed desired by the Government of the United States.

Both in the Security Council and in the Assembly, a majority is certain to emerge in favor of Israel's admission if the American Government makes its position on this issue sufficiently clear to the governments concerned. Happily, in this case there is no fear of a Soviet veto, since this is one of the few questions on which American and Soviet policies do not conflict. Should the U.S. Government, on the other hand, maintain a calculated hands-off policy except for registering a favorable vote, the foreign governments will be exposed to the unilateral pressure of the British and Arab Governments against Israel's admission, and no action on this issue will be taken at the forthcoming Paris session of the United Nations. This should not be allowed to happen.

In explaining to all friendly governments the value it sets by Israel's speedy admission to U.N. membership, President Truman and Secretary Marshall will raise the prestige of the United Nations and introduce a badly needed element of firmness and stability in the situation in the Middle East. Should the Paris session of the U.N. pass without Israel being admitted, it will be difficult to escape the conclusion that this is due to the Department of State once more having put its own idiosyncrasies and Mr. Bevin's personal bias ahead of the dictates of honor and world peace, and to President Truman's tolerance of this regrettable stand.

Aside from everything else, the question raises the fundamental issue of the integrity of party pledges. Both party platforms have come out in favor of Israel's speedy admission into the United Nations. Here is an example of bi-partisan foreign policy in the truest sense of the word. Should either the Democratic Administration or the Republican Party manifest a tendency to renege on this pledge, this would be a most serious matter.

* * *

9/16/48

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date September 16, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

We hope that your local emergency committee is already carrying out the program of action outlined in my memorandum of September 8, 1948. Once again it is necessary that I emphasize the importance of speed. This is the critical period during which the Administration must be induced to fulfill its promises regarding Israel. We dare not allow this moment to pass without exerting maximum efforts to bring about de jure recognition of Israel and the economic aid which the President and the platforms of the Democratic and Republican parties have pledged. If these two objectives could be achieved quickly the possibility for political gains at the forthcoming meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in Paris would be greatly enhanced.

In addition to the activities suggested in our memorandum of September 8th we urge that you do the following:

1. Request your Senators and Representatives to phone or wire the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington urging that that institution grant the requested loan immediately. We are confident that a large number of the members of both Houses of Congress will be happy to join us in pointing out to the Export-Import Bank that there is no justification for the postponement of the \$100,000,000 loan to Israel and in demanding that it be extended forthwith. Such calls and telegrams should be addressed to William McC. Martin, Jr., Export-Import Bank of Washington, 734 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. (Phone: REpublic 7890).

2. We have already sent you background material on the questions of de jure recognition, economic aid and immigration. No doubt you are calling these to the attention of newspaper editors, columnists and radio commentators. Enclosed is the promised memorandum on the admission of Israel into the United Nations. Please put this material to good use so that helpful newspaper and radio comment will result from your efforts in this connection.

Please let me have regular reports on your activities, and bear in mind that now is the moment for action. Let us ensure that the American Zionist movement, which has accomplished so much in the struggle to bring Israel into being, shall never reproach itself for failure to meet the challenge of the hour.

Regards.

HLS:RB
Enc.

ISRAEL'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

To be admitted to membership in the United Nations is the right of all "peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the...Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations." (Art. 4 of the Charter)

Israel has already declared its acceptance of the obligations of the Charter. After Israel's record of repeated agreement to truce proposals in the face of Arab aggression, no one can doubt its peace-loving character. Nor will anyone doubt Israel's ability and willingness to carry out obligations freely undertaken. In both respects Israel's record compares more than favorably with that of a great many States admitted to membership. There is certainly no comparison between the record of Israel and that of the Arab States of whom six have been rewarded with membership in the international organization.

Neither independence nor internal democracy are listed in the Charter as prerequisites for membership. And indeed, many States are members of the United Nations which are not truly independent, while others live under regimes utterly devoid of any semblance of democracy. It is unimaginable, in the circumstances, that a State as genuinely independent and as firmly based on democratic ideals as Israel be denied membership.

It is said at times that Israel's membership might be delayed on account of the lack of stability or the indefinite character of its boundaries. The argument is certainly far from candid. China and Greece, to name but the most blatant cases, are obviously not enjoying stability. Poland, for one, had its frontiers undefined at a time when it joined the United Nations. Attempts to prevent or delay Israel's membership on this or any similar basis must be considered therefore as a crass example of application of a double standard. What Israel is undergoing now is not internal instability but foreign aggression. To defend States against foreign aggression is the most sacred duty of the United Nations, and an attempt to evade it by denying membership to the victim of aggression would be a scandalous performance.

There is, however, one added circumstance which makes the admission of Israel especially urgent. Israel has emerged as an independent State as a consequence of a solemn verdict of the United Nations. Surely the United Nations owes it to itself speedily to admit to membership a nation thus formed.

The announcement of the Department of State (in a letter by Counselor Bohlen to Representative Javits) that the U.S. delegation will support Israel's application for membership is, of course, very gratifying. At the same time it ought to be clear to all observers that a great deal depends on the extent to which this support will be whole-hearted and energetic or merely perfunctory. It is well known to what extent the Western countries are inclined to follow the American lead, as long as they know that a certain course is indeed desired by the Government of the United States.

Both in the Security Council and in the Assembly, a majority is certain to emerge in favor of Israel's admission if the American Government makes its position on this issue sufficiently clear to the governments concerned. Happily, in this case there is no fear of a Soviet veto, since this is one of the few questions on which American and Soviet policies do not conflict. Should the U.S. Government, on the other hand, maintain a calculated hands-off policy except for registering a favorable vote, the foreign governments will be exposed to the unilateral pressure of the British and Arab Governments against Israel's admission, and no action on this issue will be taken at the forthcoming Paris session of the United Nations. This should not be allowed to happen.

In explaining to all friendly governments the value it sets by Israel's speedy admission to U.N. membership, President Truman and Secretary Marshall will raise the prestige of the United Nations and introduce a badly needed element of firmness and stability in the situation in the Middle East. Should the Paris session of the U.N. pass without Israel being admitted, it will be difficult to escape the conclusion that this is due to the Department of State once more having put its own idiosyncrasies and Mr. Bevin's personal bias ahead of the dictates of honor and world peace, and to President Truman's tolerance of this regrettable stand.

Aside from everything else, the question raises the fundamental issue of the integrity of party pledges. Both party platforms have come out in favor of Israel's speedy admission into the United Nations. Here is an example of bi-partisan foreign policy in the truest sense of the word. Should either the Democratic Administration or the Republican Party manifest a tendency to renege on this pledge, this would be a most serious matter.

* * *

9/16/48

TRUMAN REAFFIRMS HIS ISRAEL STAND IN REPLY TO DEWEY

By Clayton Knowles

Washington, Oct. 24 -- President Truman declared tonight that he would approve no change in the United Nations partition of Palestine, effected last fall, that in turn was not acceptable to the State of Israel.

Apparently supplementing the position taken by Secretary of State Marshall last month before the United Nations, the President, referring to the Democratic platform plank on the Holy Land, declared:

"This has been and is now my position."

At Paris on September 21, Secretary Marshall called upon both sides in Palestine to accept "the Bernadotte plan in its entirety", asserting that it offered "a generally fair basis for settlement of the Palestine question". He stated that "no plan could be proposed which would be entirely satisfactory in all respects to every interested party".

In his statement tonight, issued just before he boarded his campaign train for his last big appeal to the voters, the President noted that the Palestine situation was again before the United Nations. He said that these proceedings looked toward "an amicable settlement of the conflicting positions of the parties in Palestine".

"In the interests of peace," he said, "this work must go forward. A plan has been submitted which provides a basis for a renewed effort to bring about a peaceful adjustment of differences. It is hoped that, by using this plan as a basis for negotiations, the conflicting claims of the parties can be settled".

While he thus took cognizance of what is transpiring at Paris, the whole tone of the President's statement was regarded as tentative, when compared to the strong stand taken by Secretary Marshall last month. At that time, the Secretary said:

"The United States considers that the conclusions contained in the final report of Count Bernadotte offer a generally fair basis for settlement of the Palestine question. My Government is of the opinion that the conclusions are sound, and strongly urges the parties and the General Assembly to accept them in their entirety as the best possible basis for bringing peace to a distracted land".

It was noted that, at no point, did the President place his endorsement upon the Bernadotte proposals as "sound" as had Secretary Marshall, contenting himself instead with saying that they offered "a basis of negotiation".

The President's statement came in answer to a statement by Governor Dewey on Friday in which he reaffirmed his endorsement of the Republican Party's platform plank on Israel. This statement, limited to two paragraphs, apparently made Mr. Truman angry, for he referred to it in his very first words...

The President's statement, while pegged on Governor Dewey's answer to a request by the American Christian Palestine Committee of New York, followed a series of newspaper advertisements by Zionist groups calling upon Mr. Truman to clarify his own position.

One such advertisement, running a full page, was paid for by the American Zionist Emergency Council of New York. Calling attention to the position taken by Secretary Marshall, this advertisement asked:

"Mr. Truman: where do you stand on this issue?"

This advertisement directly challenged Mr. Truman to repudiate his Secretary of State.

"Which is it, Mr. President?" the advertisement asked. "The policy which you have stated in the past, which determined our Government's stand in November, 1947, and which is also the declared policy of your party -- or the policy most recently expressed by Mr. Marshall, which is in violent contradiction to it?"

"We respectfully await your answer."

HLS:MSR
Enc.



RECEIVED	
NOTED BY	DATE
SEP 28 1948	SEP 28 1948
AKI	SS WK
ANSWERED	

September 25, 1948

Dear Harry,

I have received your cables and have airmailed you the B report and also sent you regular mail two copies of the text as soon as it was released so you should get them by this week end. I also sent you a copy of Marshall's statement and a summary of the B. report. I have been in close touch with X and everything reported to you in my first cable was 100 % accurate. I communicated the information to Eban and he was very glad to have it because he was unaware of lots of the stuff I gave him and much of it jibed with his to the letter. I am not writing separately to Silver knowing that you are transmitting all the dope to him. I have been checking regularly with Eban re the line which I mailed you in the Statement the Israeli office issued here upon the release of the B report.

Please inform Dingol that there is no point to my sending him material which he can get in the press services or JFA or Palcor, but I shall only send stuff which is exclusive and which no one else gets. There is no point in sending stuff which comes over the wires any way.

There are some good features in the B report: the expression of the central fact of Israel's independence and vitality as a State, the granting of the Western Galilee, etc. I think you should sharply attack the report because it excises the Negev and takes away roughly two-thirds of Israel's area, reduces it to a miniature State, constricts its growth, denies Israel available land reserve for future large scale development. Point the fact that the Democrat platform called for the boundaries of the Nov. 29 Resolution and that no changes to be made without Israel consent; the Jerusalem recommendation is not too clear and is also open to attack.

Actually what must have happened in the behind the scenes U.S. negotiations with U.K. was U.S. insistence that UK recognize Israel, award Israel the Galilee, refrain from giving Jerusalem to the British (Abdullah), free port for Haifa, but within Israel's sovereignty, free airport of Lydda - all in return for which the UK asked the U.S. that it must support the granting of the Negev to the Arabs. Actually the UK took one step forward while US took three steps backward insofar as Israel's interests are concerned.

There is only one person who can still save the Negev for us and that is Truman. I am sure you are trying to put the heat on him as much as you can to instruct Marshall here to change his position on the Negev. Without Truman's firm instruction and Dewey's forcing the President's hand by public statements and instructions to Dulles, we will have a hell of a chance here of getting the Negev.

254
MTH
The few Latin American friends we have are rather down in the mouth
over the B incident and even men like Granados and Fabrigat are not
fighting behind the scenes with their former enthusiasm. Mrs. FDR
should be barraged with cables from her close friends urging her
to fight for the Negev and at least the new city of Jerusalem.
Eban has seen her and she told him she would do the best she can for
us. Dulles has not done a thing for us and will not do so unless
Dewey raises hell with him. Jessup and Austin are following Marshall,
and the alternates do not count for much. Marshall is running this
show and it will be very tough to soften him. The Russians are advising
our people to stick to the Nov. 29th resolution and they appear to be
the only ones who will fight for us.. I am enclosing a copy of
Marshall's speech today, the Poland foreign minister's speech,
some remarks by El-Khoury, and UN survey of opinion. Egypt made
a blackmail speech today, condemning Zionists as murderers and
aggressors with expansionist designs. By comparison with other
speeches of Egypt, observers thought it was somewhat conciliatory.
I do not share that view..

Unfortunately, many of the countries who were ~~xx~~ friendly to Israel in
the past have not yet indicated a burning desire to pitch in Israel's
behalf and they are using the B incident as the excuse. Truman
probably will seize the B incident as his "out" to deny Israel for the
time being de jure recognition and other things we are after unless
Israel accepts the B report and goes along. Unless Truman takes
a very strong stand with Marshall, I fear that Israel will take a
beating at the UN. This is also the opinion of many of the most
reliable observers and our friends and X.

I realize that I may have written to you many things which are
obvious, but I am reporting the facts to you as I see them and
based on the best opinion.

If there is any news at your end of interest, please pass them on.
My regards to you and the staff, and Dr. Silver.

Yours,

Hr

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
342 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date September 28, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Attached is copy of an advertisement which will appear in a number of newspapers on September 29 and 30.

It is a statement of the Zionist position with reference to the Bernadotte proposal. It would be very helpful in the influencing of public opinion if this ad could appear in your city. Please take the matter up with your committee and try to have it reprinted in your community.

Regards.

HLS:RB

Enc.

(Text of Advertisement)

ANOTHER REVERSAL -- ANOTHER BETRAYAL

In a sudden burst of speed, the British Government and our Administration are seeking to bring about the earliest adoption of the last Bernadotte proposals on Palestine by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Bernadotte report recommends that the Negev, consisting of two-thirds of the State of Israel as set up by the United Nations Resolution of November 29, 1947, should be torn away from Israel and handed over to the Arab invaders, preferably Transjordan. It also proposes that Jerusalem be placed under United Nations control, without any corridor connecting it with Israel.

These proposals were put forward by Count Bernadotte merely as a basis for discussion, as his report makes clear. However, both Foreign Secretary Bevin and Secretary of State Marshall have chosen to ignore that fact and have urged acceptance of the Bernadotte plan in toto. The reason for this blanket endorsement and for their haste in trying to achieve the immediate adoption of the plan is transparent. The British Foreign Office, whose longstanding hostility to the Jewish state has produced a lamentable record of deceit, is currently trying to make capital out of the assassination of Count Bernadotte -- and our State Department is collaborating. They are attempting to railroad Count Bernadotte's plan through the General Assembly -- as a monument to his memory -- while his tragic death is still fresh in the public mind.

Such cynical exploitation of a criminal act, committed by outlaws whom the State of Israel is trying to hunt down and root out, is what we have come to expect of Mr. Bevin's Foreign Office. But it is unworthy of our country and its traditions of justice. We do not think we are asking too much when we call upon the United States Government to deal with the Bernadotte proposals solely on their merits and quite apart from the tragedy of September 17.

An Unjust, Unworkable Plan

When viewed objectively and dispassionately, the Bernadotte plan is manifestly unjust and unworkable. By cutting away the Negev from Israel, the plan would reduce the Jewish state in size by no less than 3800 square miles, while a mere 420 square miles of rocky and hilly western Galilee would be added to it "in compensation". Thus, the entire State of Israel would consist of approximately 2400 square miles -- a tiny area incapable of absorbing and supporting the hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees who are desperately seeking emigration to Israel.

Moreover, if it were removed from Israel the Negev would be doomed to remain a desert wasteland; for the Jews alone are prepared to make it habitable by costly and extensive irrigation projects -- something which is not to be expected from King Abdullah, whose 35,000 square miles are largely underpopulated and uncultivated.

Not to be overlooked also is the fact that cutting away the Negev would deprive Israel of the waters and minerals of the Dead Sea and thereby seal off an important avenue for economic development which the new state sorely needs. It would also deprive Israel of access to the Red Sea and render it extremely difficult for Israel to engage in commerce with the Far East and with Africa.

Perhaps one of the real reasons why it is now proposed to take the Negev from Israel and hand it over to Britain's puppet, Abdullah, is to be found in recent reports of oil deposits in that area. Surely the industry of Israel could use such a fuel reserve without remaining forever at the mercy of British-Arab production in Iraq.

Last year the British induced our State Department to argue in the United Nations that the Negev should be removed from the Jewish state area. After the Jewish Agency agreed to the transfer of sizable portions of the Negev to the Arab state, the State Department ceased its agitation. On November 22, 1947 Herschel V. Johnson, our delegate to the United Nations, declared: "We think that the Jewish Agency has made, from its point of view, an equitable and fair proposal, and whatever reservation the United States delegation maintains with respect to this area (the Negev) is withdrawn."

Has anything happened since November 22, 1947 to warrant a change of this clearly-expressed attitude on the question of the Negev? Why, then, should our Government be a party to the latest British attempt to cripple Israel?

The Jerusalem Proposal

The Bernadotte proposal regarding Jerusalem is surely the most unrealistic of statements when viewed against the background of recent events in the Holy City. After having repulsed the wanton attacks of the British-led, British-supplied Arab Legion and after having endured months of siege and privation, the Jews of Jerusalem will hardly consent to leave their city unprotected in the midst of hostile Arab surroundings, unconnected with the State of Israel, and with no greater security for life and property than would be forthcoming from the nominal "control" of the United Nations. The Jews of Jerusalem and of Israel know only too well what it means to be dependent on Arab respect for United Nations authority. The almost daily flaunting of that authority by the Arabs has not served to reassure them that a better attitude will be demonstrated in the future. The Jews know that it was their own strength -- their fight on the battlefields against overwhelming odds -- rather than United Nations "control" which saved New Jerusalem and its inhabitants from destruction. They are not prepared to expose themselves to such murderous attacks again.

Israel Cannot Submit

For all of these reasons -- and there are many more -- Count Bernadotte's proposals must be rejected. It should be added that the British and American officials who are now working for the adoption of this plan are incredibly naive if they expect Israel to submit to it. No self-respecting nation would passively accept its own dismemberment -- and Israel is a self-respecting nation. Having successfully defended their political independence, having spilled their blood in expelling the invaders from their territory, the citizens of Israel will surely not permit any part of their land to be presented to an Arab potentate. They had accepted the United Nations partition decision of November 29, 1947 -- at great sacrifice to their legitimate rights and aspirations -- because they believed that this was a final compromise solution. But they will not accept a third partition of Palestine.

The United Nations should consider well the full implications of the proposals which Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall have endorsed so heartily. What they are suggesting is that military aggressors receive in a gift package what they failed to win by force of arms, and that a nation which successfully defended its territory against international gangsterism be penalized for its efforts. That, in effect, is what Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall are advocating. We fervently hope that the United Nations will refuse to become a party to this immoral scheme.

The Bernadotte recommendations do not even possess the virtue of Arab agreement to commend them to the serious attention of the United Nations. The Arabs have already rejected the proposals. The Bernadotte report and Mr. Bevin's statement make it clear that the plan would have to be imposed. If a solution is to be imposed in Palestine, why not that solution which has the backing of world opinion -- the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947? Why does Mr. Marshall seemingly prefer to impose a new, unjust, unworkable plan rather than a just, workable compromise which has received the overwhelming approval of the nations of the world, including the United States?

The Latest Pledge and the Latest Performance

Mr. Marshall's unequivocal endorsement of the Bernadotte report can only be regarded as another unwarranted reversal of United States policy, such as took place on March 19, when the Administration suddenly attempted to scuttle the partition decision and proposed a trusteeship for Palestine.

President Truman is seeking re-election on a platform which declares: "We approve the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations Resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel."

How does President Truman reconcile this plainly-stated pledge with the position taken by his Secretary of State?

The American people have a right to know.

9/29/48

October 7, 1948

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

My dear Mr. Shapiro:

Would you be good enough to send us two copies of the current
Manhattan telephone directory? Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary to Dr. Silver

er

TELEGRAM

OCTOBER 14, 1948

MR. HARRY SHAPIRO

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
342 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

THE YIDDISH EDITORIALS ON DEWEY SHOULD BE SENT WITH A TRANSLATION
TO DEWEY'S HEADQUARTERS AND ALSO TO ROGER STRAUS.

SILVER



PRESS RELEASE from AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

Associated Organizations

Zionist Organization of America • Hadassah • Mizrahi Organization of America • Labor Zionist Organization of America-Poale Zion
United Zionists-Revisionists of America • Hashomer Hatzair • Achdut Havodah-Poale Zion (United Labor Zionist Party)

342 Madison Avenue • New York 17, N. Y. • MU 2-1160

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL VOICES GRATITUDE

FOR TRUMAN AND DEWEY STATEMENTS ON ISRAEL

- - - -

ZIONISTS LOOK FORWARD TO ACTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH DECLARATIONS

- - - -

New York, Oct. 27 -- The American Zionist Emergency Council, which speaks for all Zionist organizations in the United States, today expressed its deep gratitude to both President Truman and Governor Dewey for their recent statements reaffirming the platforms of their parties with respect to Israel.

The Council, whose chairman is Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, declared that the "timely action" of President Truman and Governor Dewey "at a moment when the subject of Palestine is pending before the Political Committee of the United Nations will indicate to the delegations there assembled that the American people, regardless of political affiliation, through their leaders wholeheartedly and unitedly endorse the territorial integrity of Israel. It represents, indeed, American bi-partisan action on its highest level and places the question of Israel above domestic politics."

The text of the Council's statement follows:

"The American Zionist Emergency Council, which speaks for all major Zionist organizations in the United States, is deeply grateful to both President Truman and Governor Dewey for their recent statements reaffirming the platforms of their parties with respect to Israel.

(more)

"Their timely action at a moment when the subject of Palestine is pending before the Political Committee of the United Nations will indicate to the delegations there assembled that the American people, regardless of political affiliation, through their leaders wholeheartedly and unitedly endorse the territorial integrity of Israel. It represents, indeed, American bi-partisan action on its highest level and places the question of Israel above domestic politics.

"American policy on Israel no longer remains in doubt. The world now knows where the American people stand. We can confidently expect that all appropriate assistance will be speedily rendered by our Government to Israel in the form of adequate economic aid, in accordance with the President's public directive; that the American delegation will support before the United Nations in Paris the just claims of Israel to exist as a free nation, safe from aggression; and that no modification of its boundaries shall be made without the consent of the State of Israel."

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees **Date** October 27, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

The enclosed press release issued today by the American Zionist Emergency Council expresses the gratitude of our movement to President Truman and Governor Dewey for their recent statements reaffirming the platforms of their parties with respect to Israel.

We are sending you herewith the full text of both declarations. Governor Dewey issued his statement on Friday, October 22 in the form of a letter to Dean Alfange, chairman of the American Christian Palestine Committee of New York.

The exchange of letters between Governor Dewey and Mr. Alfange follows:

Hon. Thomas E. Dewey
Governor of the State of New York
Albany, New York

October 20, 1948

Dear Governor:

As Chairman of the American Christian Palestine Committee of New York, I have been gravely concerned with the fast-moving events which concern the fate of the State of Israel and the stability of the peace of the Middle East.

I recall that in September, 1947 you approved the majority report of the United Nations Special Committee which recommended a partition of Palestine. This report was adopted by the resolution of the UN Assembly on November 29, 1947.

In June, 1948 the Republican Party, assembled in convention in Philadelphia, adopted the following platform: "We welcome Israel into the family of nations and take pride in the fact that the Republican Party was the first to call for the establishment of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth. The vacillation of the Democratic Party on this question has undermined the prestige of the United Nations. Subject to the letter and spirit of the UN Charter we pledge to Israel full recognition, with its boundaries as sanctioned by the UN and aid in developing its economy."

At this moment when the fate of Israel is at stake, the reaffirmation of your endorsement of the Republican Party's platform pledge in respect to Israel would be most reassuring.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Alfange, Chairman
American Christian Palestine Committee
of New York

October 22, 1948

Hon. Dean Alfange, Chairman
American Christian Palestine Committee
9 East 40 Street
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dean:

I have your letter of October 20 and I want to assure you that I, too, have been deeply disturbed by the events in Palestine. As you know, I have always felt the Jewish people are entitled to a homeland in Palestine which would be politically and economically stable. My views have been clearly expressed over the years and I did, indeed, approve the majority report of the United Nations Special Committee which recommended partition of Palestine.

In my acceptance speech at Philadelphia I pledged my whole-hearted support of the Republican platform and that certainly included the Palestine plank. My position today is the same.

The Jews have brought twentieth century civilization to Palestine. They have shown that the Holy Land can be industrious and abundant. Since the creation of Israel the Jewish people have made great sacrifices for their goal of independence and freedom.

Organizations such as the American Christian Palestine Committee of New York can give great moral support to the people of Israel in attaining their objectives -- peace and security in their hard-won homeland. Toward that end I wish them every success.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Dewey

- - - -

The New York Herald-Tribune of Saturday, October 23 reported Governor Dewey's action as follows:

DEWEY STANDS BY UN PLAN ON PALESTINE

By Murray Snyder

Governor Thomas E. Dewey in effect repudiated the Truman Administration's Palestine policy yesterday.

Without referring directly to the Administration's indorsement of the Bernadotte plan to take the Negeb region away from Israel, the Governor said his own position in support of the original United Nations partition plan was unchanged.

He reaffirmed his "wholehearted support" of the Republican platform pledge last June of "full recognition (to Israel) with its boundaries as sanctioned by the United Nations and aid in developing its economy".

He recalled that he previously had approved the UN partition recommendations, and ranking Republicans, who had sought a

reaffirmation of his position for its campaign value, said that in this statement of approval, issued September 11, 1947, he said: "It may be that certain adjustments will have to be made in the actual boundaries, but, on the face of it, the partition recommended seems a minimum for Jewish needs".

This major break between the Republican Presidential candidate and the Democrats on foreign policy was disclosed in an exchange of letters between Mr. Dewey and Dean Alfange, chairman of the American Christian Palestine Committee of New York. The letters were released at Dewey-Warren headquarters at the Hotel Roosevelt.

It was regarded as of particular significance because, if Mr. Dewey is elected on November 2, his policy is likely to supersede the present policy of the United States when the General Assembly begins its postponed discussion of the Palestine question...

- - - -

President Truman issued his statement on Sunday, October 24. The full text follows:

The Republican candidate for President has seen fit to release a statement with reference to Palestine. This statement is in the form of a letter dated October 22, 1948, ten days before the election.

I had hoped our foreign affairs could continue to be handled on a nonpartisan basis without being injected into the Presidential campaign. The Republican candidate's statement, however, makes it necessary for me to reiterate my own position with respect to Palestine.

I stand squarely on the provisions covering Israel in the Democratic platform.

I approved the provisions on Israel at the time they were written. I reaffirm that approval now.

So that everyone may be familiar with my position, I set out here the Democratic platform on Israel:

"President Truman, by granting immediate recognition to Israel, led the world in extending friendship and welcome to a people who have long sought and justly deserve freedom and independence.

"We pledge full recognition to the State of Israel. We affirm our pride that the United States, under the leadership of President Truman, played a leading role in the adoption of the resolution of November 29, 1947, by the United Nations General Assembly for the creation of a Jewish State.

"We approve the claim of the State of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations' resolution of November 29 and consider that modifications thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel.

"We look forward to the admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations. We pledge appropriate aid to the State of Israel in developing its economy and resources.

"We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the State of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the United Nations to the extent that it may prevent any such revision.

"We continue to support within the framework of the United Nations, the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places in Palestine."

I wish to amplify the three portions of the platform about which there has been considerable discussion.

On May 14, 1948, this country recognized the existence of the independent State of Israel. I was informed by the Honorable Eliahu Epstein that a Provisional Government had been established in Israel. This country recognized the Provisional Government as the de facto authority of the new State of Israel. When a permanent Government is elected in Israel it will promptly be given de jure recognition.

The Democratic platform states that we approve the claims of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947, and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel.

This has been and is now my position.

Proceedings are now taking place in the United Nations looking toward amicable settlement of the conflicting positions of the parties in Palestine. In the interests of peace this work must go forward.

A plan has been submitted which provides a basis for a renewed effort to bring about a peaceful adjustment of differences. It is hoped that by using this plan as a basis of negotiation, the conflicting claims of the parties can be settled.

With reference to the granting of a loan or loans to the State of Israel, I have directed the departments and agencies of the executive branch of our Government to work together in expediting the consideration of any applications for loans which may be submitted by the State of Israel.

It is my hope that such financial aid will soon be granted and that it will contribute substantially to the long-term development and stability of the Near East.

- - - -

The New York Times of October 25 reported the President's action in the following dispatch:

TRUMAN REAFFIRMS HIS ISRAEL STAND IN REPLY TO DEWEY

By Clayton Knowles

Washington, Oct. 24 -- President Truman declared tonight that he would approve no change in the United Nations partition of Palestine, effected last fall, that in turn was not acceptable to the State of Israel.

Apparently supplementing the position taken by Secretary of State Marshall last month before the United Nations, the President, referring to the Democratic platform plank on the Holy Land, declared:

"This has been and is now my position."

At Paris on September 21, Secretary Marshall called upon both sides in Palestine to accept "the Bernadotte plan in its entirety", asserting that it offered "a generally fair basis for settlement of the Palestine question". He stated that "no plan could be proposed which would be entirely satisfactory in all respects to every interested party".

In his statement tonight, issued just before he boarded his campaign train for his last big appeal to the voters, the President noted that the Palestine situation was again before the United Nations. He said that these proceedings looked toward "an amicable settlement of the conflicting positions of the parties in Palestine".

"In the interests of peace," he said, "this work must go forward. A plan has been submitted which provides a basis for a renewed effort to bring about a peaceful adjustment of differences. It is hoped that, by using this plan as a basis for negotiations, the conflicting claims of the parties can be settled".

While he thus took cognizance of what is transpiring at Paris, the whole tone of the President's statement was regarded as tentative, when compared to the strong stand taken by Secretary Marshall last month. At that time, the Secretary said:

"The United States considers that the conclusions contained in the final report of Count Bernadotte offer a generally fair basis for settlement of the Palestine question. My Government is of the opinion that the conclusions are sound, and strongly urges the parties and the General Assembly to accept them in their entirety as the best possible basis for bringing peace to a distracted land".

It was noted that, at no point, did the President place his endorsement upon the Bernadotte proposals as "sound" as had Secretary Marshall, contenting himself instead with saying that they offered "a basis of negotiation".

The President's statement came in answer to a statement by Governor Dewey on Friday in which he reaffirmed his endorsement of the Republican Party's platform plank on Israel. This statement, limited to two paragraphs, apparently made Mr. Truman angry, for he referred to it in his very first words...

The President's statement, while pegged on Governor Dewey's answer to a request by the American Christian Palestine Committee of New York, followed a series of newspaper advertisements by Zionist groups calling upon Mr. Truman to clarify his own position.

One such advertisement, running a full page, was paid for by the American Zionist Emergency Council of New York. Calling attention to the position taken by Secretary Marshall, this advertisement asked:

"Mr. Truman: where do you stand on this issue?"

This advertisement directly challenged Mr. Truman to repudiate his Secretary of State.

"Which is it, Mr. President?" the advertisement asked. "The policy which you have stated in the past, which determined our Government's stand in November, 1947, and which is also the declared policy of your party -- or the policy most recently expressed by Mr. Marshall, which is in violent contradiction to it?"

"We respectfully await your answer."

HLS:MSR
Enc.



MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees Date November 22, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

On Saturday, November 20 the United States Delegate to the United Nations made a statement of policy on Israel. We are now able to provide you with suggestions for the resolutions which should be adopted in connection with the November 29 anniversary of the United Nations decision. We also suggest that the points listed below be emphasized by speakers at meetings held in observance of the anniversary.

We urge that you incorporate the following ideas in your resolutions:

1. The United Nations decision of November 29, 1947 favoring the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine has been recorded as one of the great events in the long history of the Jewish people. We take pride in the fact that it was the leadership of our Government which made this event possible. In observing the anniversary of the United Nations decision we are deeply conscious of the fact that its objective -- the establishment of the Jewish State -- has been realized by the Government and people of Israel who single-handedly defended their political independence and territorial integrity against the military aggression of the Arab States.
2. During the first six months of its existence the State of Israel has already absorbed tens of thousands of Jewish immigrants and has carried forward a tremendous resettlement program under the fire of the enemy. We are hopeful that the remainder of the homeless and displaced Jews of Europe, as well as the persecuted Jews in Middle Eastern countries, will be enabled to emigrate to Israel speedily, thereby ending the Jewish refugee problem. We are profoundly aware of the great cost of this immigration and resettlement program and pledge our greatest efforts and fullest resources to secure the funds for the successful completion of this task.
3. We express our satisfaction over the reaffirmation by the Government of the United States of its support of the original United Nations decision of November 29, and its declaration that no alteration shall be made in the boundaries of the Jewish State without Israel's consent. We commend the President of the United States for stating this policy clearly and forthrightly, and we welcome the statement of the United Nations Delegate before the United Nations on Saturday, November 20 as an indication that the President's views begin to be reflected in American policy.
4. In conveying our gratitude to the President for standing firm on the question of Israel's territorial integrity, we

respectfully urge him to remain on the alert lest his policies be frustrated by officials of his own Administration who have, in the past, sought to nullify his positive acts concerning Israel.

5. Recognizing that the best hope for lasting peace in Palestine now lies in direct negotiations between the Government of Israel and the Arab states, we respectfully urge the President to use the full weight of his authority to advance such direct peace conferences between Arabs and Jews.

Please make certain that copies of all such resolutions adopted in your community are sent to the President at the White House in Washington. We would also like to have copies for our own records.

Regards.

HLS:MSR



MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees **Date** November 26, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

I assume that you are aware of the reorganizations which have recently taken place in the various branches of our movement. Following my election as Executive Vice-Chairman of the United Palestine Appeal, I submitted my resignation as Executive Director of the American Zionist Emergency Council. This, then, is my last memorandum to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

In leaving the offices of the Emergency Council, I wish to express my thanks to all Local Committee Chairmen and leaders who have given me their fullest cooperation and assistance during the past five years. I am profoundly aware of the fact that the numerous activities launched by the Council during my executive directorship could not have been carried through successfully without your efforts, and I accept my new responsibilities in the United Palestine Appeal with a sense of gratitude to the community leadership of our movement.

I am confident that my successor as Executive Director, Mr. Abe Tuvim, a capable and devoted servant of our movement, will receive the same full measure of cooperation from you and that the work of the American Zionist Emergency Council will be carried forward with undiminished vigor.

HLS:MSR