



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
35

Box
12

Folder
845

Jewish Agency, Adelson, Dorothy, 1947.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

March 18, 1947

FROM: Dorothy Adelson

SUBJECT: SECURITY COUNCIL OR ASSEMBLY? OPINION OF DR. ZULETA,
ACTING COLOMBIAN MEMBER OF SECURITY COUNCIL

I have great respect for Dr. Zuleta's opinion in any matter concerning the United Nations. He has been extremely active in the United Nations from its inception, and served as President of the Preparatory Commission of the General Assembly in London and as Chairman of the Headquarters Committee which selected New York as the site of the United Nations. For the past three months he has been representing Colombia on the Security Council in the absence of Dr. Lopez. He was scheduled to be Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Present Colombian Government, but refused the post because of his connection with American oil companies, for the majority of whom he is the lawyer in his country.

Since Dr. Zuleta is an old friend, I put to him frankly the dilemma in which we find ourselves as to whether the Security Council or the Assembly will be more favorable for the discussion of our case. I went into the various angles of the situation as I saw them thoroughly and extensively, and I must admit with a certain bias in favor of the Security Council. Dr. Zuleta put to me several pointed questions, and finally gave his verdict as follows:

The Security Council presents certain advantages and certain disadvantages, he said. Its advantages are, that it is faster in its operation, that your case will not be delayed until September, and that it has power to make a more forceful decision. But there are two big disadvantages. One is the veto. The other is a technical disadvantage, but one which in the case of Palestine would be extremely important. That is, it must be proved that the Palestine situation is a threat to international peace and security. He recalled that the Spanish case was a fiasco before the Security Council for this very technical reason, namely that a threat to international peace and security could not be proved. Our case in this respect was a weak one, for we did not have much to go on except a few threats of the Arab States. Once we lost in the Security Council, even on a technical ground, our case would be badly prejudiced in public opinion, which does not stop to consider the whys and wherefores of a decision. Having failed in the Security Council, we would be at a great disadvantage when the case came up again in the Assembly.

In the Assembly, on the other hand, although there was the disadvantage of delay, there were certain advantages here. The Assembly was much more flexible, there was no technical obstacle and no veto. He remarked that in the Assembly what mattered was the environment created by the orators on the spot. For example, if a string of Latin American Delegates got up one after the other and spoke with eloquence and idealism in favor of the Jewish case, then our chances would be quite good. The United States, he said, was committed by its public declarations to a pro-Zionist policy and would not dare, in the face of the American

press and public opinion, to take a stand openly opposed to Zionist aims. Similarly, he did not think that the European countries, such as France, Belgium, Holland, and so on, would actively fight against the Jewish case. Moreover, we could probably win the active support of the Scandinavian countries. All in all, considering the maneuverability of the Assembly, we could have fairly good hopes of obtaining a favourable decision there.

However, in order to check on his opinion regarding the Security Council, Dr. Zuleta told me that he would speak with Hershel Johnson of the American Delegation and sound him out on the American position if and when the Palestine question comes before the United Nations. I should have this information very shortly.

DA:LM

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Dorothy Adelson
March 25, 1947.

SUBJECT: Jewish Agency fails to receive consultative
status B with the Economic & Social Council.

*Dr. Abba Hillel
Silver*

On Sunday, March 23, the committee of the whole of the Economic and Social Council recommended to the Council to postpone consideration of the application of three organizations which had been named by the non-governmental-organization committee for status B. These three organizations were the Jewish Agency for Palestine, a Catholic organization, and one other non-Jewish organization.

Dr. Pedro Zuloaga, permanent Venezuelan United Nations representative, informed me of what had taken place in the meeting. He had not been present himself, but had made it his business to find out what happened. He said that the Lebanese delegate (probably Malik) had argued that the Jewish Agency was not an international but a national organization, since its aim was national. The Lebanese delegate said that an American company with branches all over the world was still considered a national organization; similarly, the Jewish Agency, although it had branches all over the world, was really national.

The most significant thing about the meeting, in Dr. Zuloaga's opinion, was that the United States had abstained from voting. "This is very serious for you", he said. "You must know that you cannot count on the 20 Latin American countries unless the United States comes out clearly and unequivocally in your favor. Possibly I could fight with my Government and vote for you, but that would be only one vote. Whether your case comes to the Security Council or to the Assembly, you must have the definite backing of the United States, otherwise you are lost. That is why I consider it serious that the United States abstained from voting in this case. They fought for the Salvation Army, they fought for some kind of women's federation, but they let you down".

I suggested that perhaps the United States did not think this an important enough issue to fight on, and added that even we had had some doubts about the

advisability of applying for this status. But Dr. Zuloaga was still unconvinced. "Once the issue was raised, the United States should have fought for you", he insisted. "You must work hard on them".

There is another, less pessimistic, interpretation of the United States abstention. Walter Kotschnig, of the United States delegation, who is a Jew and friendly, told Harvey Dubinsky of the World Jewish Congress, that he could not understand why the Jewish Agency, which had a semi-governmental status under the Mandate, should classify itself with organizations. Lewis Lorwin, of the United States delegation, made a similar remark to me. Although I outlined the reasons why we had made application for consultative status B (see Dr. Kahany's memorandum of March 18) Lorwin seemed doubtful. Therefore, it is possible that the United States delegation abstained through sincere doubt on the advisability of our having consultative status together with ^{more} ~~other~~ organizations. Raoul Aglion, former French diplomat now holding an official position with the United Nations, also spoke to me critically about our application for consultative status. He said that, no matter how small a thing we asked for, we would be sure to be opposed; and since we would have the same fight for a large issue as for a small one, it was better to avoid the small issues. It is true that Malik of Lebanon never overlooks an opportunity for attacking us.

COMMENTS

The Agency's application has not been rejected but postponed until the next session of the Economic & Social Council. The Council, which meets three times a year, will probably meet again in ^{July} ~~late May or June~~. We ought to decide before then whether to press our application for consultative status B or, perhaps, withdraw it.

Dr. Silver

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Dorothy Adelson

March 26, 1947

SUBJECT: The Plans to Date for Special UN Session to Discuss Palestine.

John Hohenberg, of the "New York Post" gave me the inside story on his story which appeared in the "Post" on Monday, March 24. This was the first detailed press item on the special UN session for the Palestine question. Hohenberg gave me this information on condition that I reveal it only to our own people, otherwise his sources of information would be shut off.

William Stoneman, aide to Trygve Lie, gave him the information last Thursday. It seems that Abe Feller advised Trygve Lie that the idea of a preparatory investigating committee, to meet prior to the Assembly, was illegal. Consequently, Lie returned to the original idea of a special session of the Assembly. In the meantime, Anglo-American talks had been going on, especially in Washington; Arthur Sweetser, formerly of the State Department and now with the United Nations, had a prominent part in these talks. The British told the Americans that they would not accede to the American's request for a concrete formulation of their plans for Palestine, and the Americans were forced to give up. The Americans had been trying to put the British on the spot, but the British would not be put there.

probably in June
The snag in the idea of a special session was the question of finance, as the UN budget is tight. Therefore, Trygve Lie evolved the idea of a skeleton session, composed of permanent UN representatives and Ambassadors or Ministers from Washington, all of whom could meet in a small committee room for a brief two-week session at a figure of about \$50,000. So far, the United States and others are going along with this idea, Hohenberg said.

Hohenberg has talked with the Syrian Representative on the Security Council, El-Khoury, on the subject of a special session. El-Khoury says that the Arabs will claim that the special session is illegal also and will boycott it. Hohenberg remarks that El-Khoury's statements have to be checked, as he is not very reliable.

Hohenberg also warns of the dangers of the Arab-Latin American bloc. He mentioned that the Latins are meeting this weekend on Fifth Avenue at the Peruvian's.

Hohenberg also told me that Peter Bergson is spreading the rumor that he has got the Government of Guatemala, or, alternatively, Honduras or Mexico, to promise to represent him in the UN. In Mexico he is relying on Toledano.

Hohenberg spoke with Ambassador Lange of Poland yesterday and Lange told him that he is still thinking of bringing up Palestine in the Security Council. He is waiting for the British to make a move first.

MEMORANDUM

June 4, 1947

TO: Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine

FROM: Dorothy Adelson

SUBJECT: Notes on Plan of Work for Jewish Agency United Nations Department
(until September Assembly Session)

During the period of the United Nations special inquiry on Palestine, our position vis-a-vis United Nations delegates and governments is delicate. An attempt at direct negotiation on our part during this "wait and see" interval might be resented. However, this does not preclude certain indirect activities, such as fostering friendly contacts with United Nations delegates in New York and intensifying general pro-Zionist propaganda on a global scale.

Occasionally, conversations of a substantive nature may not be amiss. In addition to defining our policy and exploring alternate proposals, it might also be advisable to discuss interim immigration measures pending a final U.N. settlement.

Fields of Work:

1. UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT DELEGATIONS IN NEW YORK

At the present writing, ^{thirty}~~twenty-eight~~ U.N. delegations have permanent headquarters in New York, and ^{one}~~three~~ in Washington. (See List I attached) Among the New York delegation chiefs, the following seem to merit the personal attention of the members of the Agency Executive:

Ambassador Quo (China)

Ambassador Lange (Poland)

Ambassador Lopez (Colombia)

Ambassador Gromyko (USSR)

Ambassador Parodi (France)

Sir Alexander Cadogan (U.K.)

Ambassador Romulo (Philippines)

Senator Austin (U.S.)

There are also certain new delegates to be seen by the staff:

Minister Snouck Hurgronje (Netherlands)

Ambassador Van Langenhove (Belgium)

Minister Borberg (Denmark)

Dr. Vilfan (Yugoslavia)

Ambassador Enriques-Urena (Dominican Republic)

Mr. de la Guardia (Panama)

Ambassador Holguin de Lavalley (Peru)

During this interim period (until late September) the entertainment program we have often contemplated might finally be pursued to good advantage. Private individuals like Morgenthau, Herbert Bayard Swope, Bernard Baruch and Governor Lehman might invite U.N. delegates together with members of the Agency Executive.

In our meetings with U.N. delegates in New York during this period, it might be useful to ascertain who, in the Foreign Office of the country concerned, will probably handle the Palestine question. We might then be able to supply the respective Foreign Offices with documents and literature, in some hope of their not finding their way promptly to the waste-basket.

Use of World Committee as a Front

Also, the World Committee for Palestine, now under the supervision of Mr. Mowatt of Canada, may prove useful during this period as a front for Jewish Agency public relations activity in New York. The World Committee has scheduled a dinner on Wednesday, June 11th, at the Biltmore Hotel, to which all United Nations permanent delegates in New York have been invited, as well as a group of U.N. Secretariat members. This would be a good opportunity for those of the Executive who are still in New York to meet some of the delegates. After the dinner, it is planned to take the guests in

special buses to the Palestine Exhibit in Radio City.

It has also been suggested that the World Committee give several cocktail parties during July and possibly early September in honor of the U.N. delegations. This might be an occasion for bringing together U.N. delegates and prominent Zionists, Jewish and non-Jewish.

The World Committee can also be used as a front for the distribution of pro-Zionist literature to the delegates of the various commissions of the U.N. Economic and Social Council. Four such commissions are meeting at Lake Success currently, and each one contains a quota of distinguished representatives from the U.N. member states. A mailing of Voss pamphlets is being sent to these delegates with the compliments of the World Committee for Palestine.

2. THE WORLD COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE

Obviously this is the time for intensified work by the Christian pro-Palestine Committees all over the world.

Pro-Palestine Committees exist in the following countries:

a) Nineteen Latin American republics.

b) Eleven other U.N. member countries:

Australia	Norway
Belgium	South Africa
Canada	Sweden
Denmark	United Kingdom
France	United States
New Zealand	

c) Two non-member countries:

Portugal
Surinam (Dutch Guiana)

New Christian pro-Palestine committees probably could be set up in the following U.N. member countries:

Luxembourg	India
Netherlands	Iran
Haiti	Greece
Iceland	

It would probably not be feasible to set up Christian pro-Palestine committees in the following U.N. member countries:

U.S.S.R.)	Afghanistan
Byelorussia)	China
Ukraine)	Ethiopia
Poland)	Liberia
Czechoslovakia)	Philippines
Yugoslavia)	Siam
)	Turkey

Russian bloc

Since Hungary and Italy have already applied for admission to the U.N., it might be forehanded to establish relations with these countries and other countries which may soon become U.N. members, to wit:

Ireland	Albania
Hungary	Roumania
Italy	Bulgaria
Portugal	Finland

It might be possible to set up pro-Palestine committees in Italy and in Ireland. (Incidentally, the pro-Palestine committee in Portugal is headed by an anti-Fascist, who did us a good turn by writing to Gromyko congratulating him on his U.N. speech.)

Coordination and Language Problems

Problems of coordination and language still face the World Committee for Palestine.

a) Spanish-speaking Countries:

Nineteen Spanish- and Portugese-speaking countries in Latin America, will be supplied with bulletins in those languages by the new director, Bruges Carmona, who will operate during the summer months from Bogota, Colombia. He will also take charge of the two regional Christian pro-Palestine conferences planned for Latin America.

b) English-speaking Countries:

At present, there are nine (presumably) English-using countries in which Pro-Palestine Committees exist:

Australia	Sweden
Canada	United Kingdom
Denmark	United States
New Zealand	Norway
South Africa	

English-language material could be sent from the central World Committee headquarters in New York to these countries. (Mr. Mowatt is supplying Canada and the other Dominions with bulletins. Particular effort is needed in these countries in view of Mr. Comay's report on the pro-British and anti-Zionist feeling there.)

I would suggest also that the bulletin, PALESTINE, put out by Miss Sulamith Schwartz for the American Christian Palestine Committee, might very well be adapted for use by English-speaking countries. For example, in the latest issue (April-May, 1947), there are three articles, one on social conditions in Egypt, one on an Englishman's view of Palestine's martial law and one on Britain's immigration policy in Palestine

during the War, which are universally valid.

In English-using countries, we might also arrange for distribution of the Crum and the Thorbecke books through the pro-Palestine Committees.

c) French-speaking Countries:

There remains the problem of bulletins in French for the French Committee and the newly-established Belgian Committee, as well as for the contemplated Netherlands, Luxembourg and Haitian Committees. The newly-strengthened Jewish Agency office in Paris might be the center for the dissemination of French-language literature. Alternately, World Committee headquarters in New York might engage a French translator to adapt portions of the bulletin, PALESTINE, for use in French-speaking countries, or the translations and adaptation might be done in Paris from material supplied by the World Committee office here. In any event, liaison should be maintained between the World Committee headquarters in New York and all Christian pro-Palestine Committees.

Incidentally, the translation into French of our basic propaganda books and pamphlets lags far behind our translations into Spanish. Although the Spanish-speaking countries are more numerous than the French-speaking ones, it would seem unwise to neglect the latter. Translations into Spanish exist of the Lowdermilk and Van Paasen and of McLean's HIS TERRIBLE SWIFT SWORD; translations will soon be ready of the latest Jewish Agency book of documents, the Voss pamphlet, the Frankenstein book and the Crum book. A French translation of Lowdermilk will be ready in August or September; little else in French is projected at the moment. Possibly our reorganized Jewish Agency office in Paris might take this matter in hand.

d) Regional Conferences of Pro-Palestine Committees:

Two regional conferences are being planned for Latin America during the summer months. It has been suggested that, with proper preparation, a regional conference of pro-Palestine committees could be arranged in the Scandinavian countries as well.

Setting-up of New Pro-Palestine Committees

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, during his stay in Europe this summer, plans to revive the moribund French Pro-Palestine Committee and to establish a Pro-Palestine Committee in Italy.

It is suggested that the establishment of committees in India, Iran and Greece be left to the Jerusalem office. Word has been received in the New York office that steps are being taken to set up a Pro-Palestine committee in Iran. It has been also suggested (by Dr. Taraknath Das) that the Jewish Agency send a permanent liaison officer to India who, among other duties, might attempt to set up a pro-Palestine Committee there.

No plans have been made to date for setting up Pro-Palestine Committees in the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Haiti, or Iceland. Major Eban found at the time of his visit to the Netherlands, that there were not enough prominent pro-Zionist Christians to form a nucleus of a committee. However, recent information suggests that we should not cease our efforts in this country. We are also informed that it is possible to set up committees in Luxembourg and in Haiti (with which latter country we are continuing negotiations.)

The setting up of a pro-Palestine Committee in Iceland might be arranged through Mr. Faye Hansen, director of the pro-Palestine committee in Norway, who has on his own initiative organized committees in Denmark and Sweden. He is the author of a book on Palestine in the Norwegian language, and knows Palestine at first hand.

List I

DELEGATIONS MAINTAINING PERMANENT OFFICES IN NEW YORK

ARGENTINA.....Dr. Jose Arce (Ambassador)
AUSTRALIA.....Colonel W.R. Hodgson (Minister)
BELGIUM.....H.E. M. Fernand van Langenhove (Ambassador)
BOLIVIA.....Dr. Humberto Palza (Minister)
BRAZIL.....H.E. M. Joao Carlos Muniz (Ambassador)
CANADA.....Mr. George Ignatieff (Advisor)
CHILE.....H.E. Sr. Hernan Santa Cruz (Ambassador)
CHINA.....H.E. Dr. Quo Tai-chi (Ambassador)
COLOMBIA.....H.E. Dr. Alfonso Lopez (Ambassador)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA.....Dr. Jan Papanek (Minister)
DENMARK.....Mr. William Bowberg (Minister)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.....H.E. Dr. Max Henriquez-Urena (Ambassador)
ECUADOR.....Dr. Jose A. Correa (Secretary-General)
FRANCE.....H.E. M. Alexandre Parodi (Ambassador)
GREECE.....H.E. Mr. Vassili Dendramis (Ambassador)
INDIA.....Mr. S. Sen (Liaison Officer)
MEXICO.....H.E. Dr. Luis Padilla Nervo (Ambassador)
NETHERLANDS.....Jonkheer J.W.M. Snouck Hurgronje (Minister)
NORWAY.....Mr. Finn Moe (Minister)
PANAMA.....Sr. Roberto de la Guardia (Counsellor)
PERU.....H.E. Sr. Carlos Holguin de Lavalley (Ambassador)
PHILIPPINES.....H.E. Brig. General Carlos P. Romulo (Ambassador)
POLAND.....H.E. Dr. Oscar Lange (Ambassador)
SWEDEN.....H.E. Mr. Herman G. Eriksson (Minister)
U.S.S.R.....H.E. Mr. Andrei A. Gromyko (Ambassador)
UNITED KINGDOM.....The Rt. Hon. Sir Alexander Cadogan (Ambassador)
UNITED STATES.....The Hon. Warren R. Austin (Ambassador)
URUGUAY.....Professor Enrique Rodriques Fabregat (Minister)
VENEZUELA.....H.E. Dr. Carlos Eduardo Stolk (Ambassador)
YUGOSLAVIA.....Dr. Joza Vilfan

DELEGATION MAINTAINING PERMANENT OFFICE IN WASHINGTON

CUBA.....H.E. Dr. Guillermo Belt (Ambassador)

List II

Countries Where
Pro-Palestine Committees
Exist

Countries Where
Establishment of
Pro-Palestine Committees
is Suggested

Countries Where
Establishment of
Pro-Palestine Committees
is Not Feasible

19 Latin American
countries:

Argentina
Bolivia
Brazil
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
El Salvador
Guatemala
Honduras
Mexico
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Uruguay
Venezuela

U.N. Members:

Luxembourg
Netherlands
Haiti
Iceland
India
Iran
Greece

USSR)
Byelorussia)
Ukraine) Russian
Poland) bloc
Czechoslovakia)
Yugoslavia)

Non-members of U.N.:

Italy
Ireland

Afghanistan
China
Ethiopia
Liberia
Philippines
Siam
Turkey

11 other U.N. Member
countries:

Australia
Belgium
Canada
Denmark
France
New Zealand
South Africa
Sweden
United Kingdom
United States
Norway

Non-members of U.N.:

Portugal
Surinam (Dutch Guiana)



Doc # 3

UNITED NATIONS

LAKE SUCCESS, NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK

4 June 1947.

Dear Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, after careful consideration of your letter of 19 May 1947 and of the general problem of relations with representatives of the Mandatory Power and of the population of Palestine, adopted on 3 June at its third meeting the following rule of procedure:

"The Mandatory Power, the Arab Higher Committee, and the Jewish Agency for Palestine may appoint liaison officers to the Committee who shall supply such information or render such other assistance as the Committee may require. The liaison officers may, suo moto, present at the discretion of the Committee such information as they may think advisable."

I would appreciate it if you would inform me at an early date of the name of the Liaison Officer of the Jewish Agency if it may wish to designate such an officer.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

/s/ V. Hoo
VICTOR CHI-TSAI HOO
Personal Representative of
The Secretary-General
Special Committee on Palestine

Abba Hillel Silver, Chairman
American Section
The Jewish Agency for Palestine
16 East 66th Street
New York 21, N. Y.

Doc # 4

THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

16 East 66th Street

New York, 21, NY

June 9, 1947

The Honorable
Trygve Lie
Secretary-General of the United Nations
Lake Success
New York

Dear Sir:

With reference to the note of the British Government of May 23, 1947 circulated by the Secretary-General to the member nations of the United Nations, I have the honor on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine to transmit to you the accompanying observations of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

The attention of the Secretary-General is drawn to paragraph 10 of these observations, and it is respectfully hoped that the same circulation will be given them as in the case of the original note of the British Government.

Sincerely yours,

Abba Hillel Silver
Chairman
American Section

AHS:IBG
Enc.

THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

16 East 66th Street

New York, NY

June 9, 1947

The Honorable
Justice Emil Sandstroem
Chairman, Special Committee
on Palestine
United Nations
New York

Dear Sir:

I have the honor, in behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, to submit for your information and that of the other members of the Special Committee and for such action as may be deemed advisable the enclosed Observations on the Note of the British Government, of May 23, 1947, circulated by the Secretary-General to the Member Nations of the United Nations, which has also been transmitted this morning to the Secretary-General.

Sincerely yours,

Abba Hillel Silver
Chairman
American Section

AHS:LNF
Encl.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE NOTE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT, OF
MAY 23, 1947 CIRCULATED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE MEMBER NATIONS
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. On April 21, 1947, one week prior to the opening of the Special Session of the General Assembly to deal with Palestine, a note was filed by the British Government with the Secretary-General of the United Nations for circulation among the member nations requesting that they do all in their power to discourage "illegal immigration" of Jews to Palestine. This note was withdrawn before any action had been taken in pursuance of it by the Secretary-General.
2. In the course of the debate which subsequently took place at the General Assembly appeals for peace for the period of the "inquiry" were made by a number of delegates both in the First Committee and in the General Assembly. A Resolution along these lines was thereafter adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Assembly with five Arab States abstaining.
3. It is submitted that this Resolution, as its wording indicates and as appears clearly from the discussion at the Special Session, was intended to refer to violence or the threat of violence in Palestine pending the report of the Special Committee. By no stretch of the imagination can it properly be interpreted as calling for cooperation by the United Nations in the campaign being waged by the British Government against the immigration of Jews into Palestine outside the quotas prescribed by the Palestine Government.
4. Indeed, at no time in the course of the discussion at the Special Session did the British Delegation ask for the inclusion in the proposed Resolution of any clause designed to prevent such "illegal immigration." Nor by a single word was it suggested that the so-called peace Resolution was directed at the continuance of such immigration, the legality of which in the face of Britain's illegal policy under the 1939 White Paper the Jewish Agency has repeatedly asserted. Had the British Government sought to do so its action would undoubtedly have been challenged on the ground that it was bringing into issue the very matter for which the Special Committee of the United Nations was being appointed.
5. The Jewish Agency now learns that on May 23, 1947, eight days after the conclusion of the Special Assembly, the British Government renewed its request to the Secretary-General to circulate to the

member nations of the United Nations its note requesting their active support in discouraging "illegal immigration"; and that on May 29 a circular note was sent out to this effect by the Secretary-General to the member nations who were also asked to inform him of any action that they may take.

6. This request of the British Government and the ensuing action of the Secretary-General would appear to be altogether out of order.
7. The British Government, if it desired action on the part of the United Nations with regard to "illegal immigration," could and should have sought such action in the course of the eighteen-day Session of the Assembly -- all the more in view of its abortive attempt prior to the Session to use the machinery of the United Nations for this purpose. The failure of the British Delegation to bring up the problem openly before the United Nations was undoubtedly, as suggested above, because the British were uncertain of the possible reaction of other Delegations. Now that those Delegations have left for their homes, however, by a forced interpretation of a Resolution directed to another end, Great Britain seeks to obtain by subterfuge what she could not achieve by open discussion. This can only be described as a devious and improper stratagem to which it is regrettable that the Secretariat has given its support.
8. But beyond that, it must be observed that the United Nations is not committed to the immigration policy of Great Britain in regard to Palestine and can, therefore, take no action on this score. As for the statement of the British representative that "illegal immigration" should be discouraged while the matter is sub judice, it must be emphasized that, by Article 80 of the Charter, Great Britain is committed to respect the right of the Jewish people under the Mandate to have its immigration to Palestine "facilitated" and not curbed. It is urged that the proper course would accordingly be for the Mandatory Government to revert to the obligations to which it is committed under the Mandate and, pending the inquiry, to abandon its illegal restrictions on Jewish immigration. The Secretary-General, by asking the member nations to inform him as to the action taken by them in pursuance of the British note has improperly identified the United Nations with the policy of Great Britain on Jewish immigration as arbitrarily determined by Great Britain alone.

9. It is clear that the Secretary-General is not bound to accept Great Britain's unilateral interpretation of the Resolution of the Assembly. Nor is there anything in the so-called peace Resolution which empowers the Secretary-General to take any action in the implementation of that Resolution or to ask an accounting from member states as to their compliance with the request of the British Government. In doing so it is submitted that he has gone outside and beyond the scope of his functions.
10. It is with deep regret that we find ourselves constrained to protest the action of the Secretary-General. The Jewish Agency for Palestine, as the body officially recognized both under the League of Nations Mandate and by the General Assembly of the United Nations as representing Jewish interests in regard to Palestine, accordingly requests the Secretary-General to circulate these observations to the member nations of the United Nations.
11. Insofar as the action of the Secretary-General introduces new and prejudicial factors into the situation at a time when the Special Committee of the United Nations has begun its inquiry, the Jewish Agency for Palestine is transmitting a copy of this note to the Chairman of the Special Committee for the information of the members of the Committee and for such action as they may deem advisable.

* * * * *

הסוכנות היהודית לארץ ישראל

The Jewish Agency for Palestine

MEMORANDUM

June 10, 1947

To: Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

FROM: Dorothy Adelson

You might be interested to see the attached memorandum
which I mentioned at the Executive meeting on Monday, June 9th.

C
O
P
Y

June 5, 1947.

Mr. Arthur Lourie

Dorothy Adelson

At the Executive meeting on Tuesday, May 27th, a program of visits to governments by Jewish Agency representatives was outlined. Although my knowledge of the plans is probably incomplete, the following tabulation may be useful as a check list:

As I recall, there was no definite plan for visiting the home governments of the following U. N. member countries:

Denmark	Norway
Iceland	Philippines
Luxembourg	Poland

Also, I do not recall definite plans for visiting the home governments of the following U. N. member countries which are said to fall more particularly within the province of our Jerusalem office:

Ethiopia (Note: Mention was made of a highly-placed Jew in the Ethiopian Government.)

Greece
Iran
Liberia
Siam
Turkey

We do not know exactly when Italy, Albania, Ireland, Roumania, Bulgaria and Finland will become U.N. members, but it is not too soon to lay the groundwork for good relations with these countries. Exploratory conversations could be planned for this summer.

MEMORANDUM

June 25, 1947.

TO: Members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency

FROM: Dorothy Adelson

SUBJECT: FURTHER NOTES ON THE WORLD COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE.

PURPOSE OF MEMORANDUM: To advocate a comprehensive, long-range program for the World (Christian) Committee for Palestine.

ARGUMENT:

1. We cannot look forward to a definitive solution of the Palestine question in the September Assembly Session. It may be at best several years before the United Nations sets the seal of final approval on a Palestine decision. Consequently, prudence demands that we take into consideration for some years to come the voices and votes of the United Nations member countries.

2. Lesson of U.N. Special Session on Palestine

The strength of our case in the U.N. is not based on material factors such as oil and strategic considerations. In the Special Session an elementary sense of justice obliged some small informed powers to take a stand in our defense. Their outspokenness forced the hand of the United States. We owe a good part of our success in the Special Session to imponderables, e.g., Smut's personal loyalty to Zionism, the idealistic leanings of some Latin-American statesmen, the traditional fair-mindedness of the Scandinavian countries, the eager public repentance of an embarrassed Poland. In view of present United States reluctance to champion us, it may well be that we shall again have to rely upon such imponderables in the hard fight that lies before us.

The obvious inference is that we must intensify our efforts to marshall behind us the public opinion of all countries which have votes in the U.N. or which are likely to have votes in the near future. Perhaps the tool most ready

to our hand for this purpose is the World Committee for Palestine, whose committees in U.N. member countries could be a rallying-point for non-Jewish pro-Zionist sentiment.

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

A decision faces us:

With regard to the World Committee for Palestine, we face a choice of alternatives:

1. We may continue our patchwork, haphazard procedure of stimulating the establishment of a pro-Palestine Committee here and of putting through a translation of a Zionist book there, while a temporary part-time administrator, sans adequate staff or permanent headquarters, makes a few feeble efforts in the general direction of our aims, or

2. We can break with fumbling and make a clean-cut start. This means an integrated world-wide program including:

(a) the establishment of pro-Palestine committees in all possible countries (as centers of further Zionist work among non-Jewish personalities and governments) and

(b) the translation of all basic Zionist literature into the U.N. working languages (English, French and Spanish)

Difficulties:

The difficulties in the way of such a comprehensive program are not insuperable if faced up to squarely and given full attention. They include:

1. The difficulty of finding the proper administrator.
2. The difficulty of the far-flung geographical distribution of the countries concerned, such as Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Holland, Italy, India and the Philippines.
3. The difficulty of finding competent field workers.
4. Budget difficulties.

Administrative Difficulty:

Zones for the administration of the World Committee for Palestine may be allocated according to three criteria:

1. geographic
2. linguistic
3. political

We are faced with the complex organizational problem of deciding which of these criteria to employ or perhaps better, what combination of these criteria to use as a basis of administration.

1. Geographic basis:

According to this distribution, the New York office of the World Christian Committee (in conjunction with the American branch of the Jewish Agency) would assume responsibility for North and South America.

The London office of the Agency would assume responsibility for Britain (including the Dominions), Ireland, the Scandinavian countries.

The Paris office would assume responsibility for the European continent.

The Jerusalem office would assume responsibility for the Near and Far East.

2. Linguistic basis:

According to this criterion the world would be divided into three great linguistic zones, the English, the French and the Spanish, with headquarters respectively in New York, Paris and a Latin-American capital. Each zone would have responsibility for the administration of the pro-Palestine committees in the zone and for publications in the appropriate language.

3. Political basis:

Unfortunately, political considerations cut across the lines of linguistic criteria, as was pointed out by Dr. Sneh. For instance, French literature with a distinct anti-British flavor, suitable for distribution in France and in the Russian satellite countries, would not be suitable for distribution in pro-British French-speaking countries such as Belgium and Holland.

Similarly, anti-British literature in English, suitable for distribution in the United States and possibly in the Scandinavian countries, would arouse resentment in Britain and the Dominions. Therefore, in planning the organization of the World Committee, the double considerations of language and politics must condition the organizational arrangements.

Simultaneous Translation Program

In dealing with a world organization of nations, we must accustom ourselves to the principle of simultaneous translation of our most important publications into French and Spanish (in addition to English).

CONCLUSION:

A clear-cut decision by the Agency Executive now to sponsor a program for the World Committee for Palestine and allocate responsibility for its execution will enable us fully to mobilize the latent justice and humanity of the world's peoples in the interests of our struggle.

CONFIDENTIAL

December 22, 1947.

TO: Jewish Agency Executive

FROM: Dorothy Adelson

SUBJECT: United Nations Activities in re Special International
Regime, City of Jerusalem.

(Conversation with Mr. Paul Mohn)

Mr. Paul Mohn (formerly Swedish alternate on UNSCOP) occupies a strategic position with regard to the future of Jerusalem. He is the only person attached to both groups of experts who are now preparing a draft statute for the City of Jerusalem. Also, he expects to go to Jerusalem subsequently to help prepare the "plan of administration" of the future Governor. In the conversation I had with him on Friday, December 19th, he told me that this plan will probably be submitted to the Trusteeship Council before the Governor leaves for Jerusalem, or even before he is chosen.

On the Trusteeship Council's plan of work regarding Jerusalem, Mr. Mohn supplied the following dates:

(1) The two groups of experts meeting at present to draft a statute will probably complete their work before Christmas. (These groups of experts, appointed by the six-nation Working Committee on Jerusalem, consist of representatives of Trusteeship Council members and of the United Nations Secretariat, plus Mr. Mohn. For full description, see attached page).

(2) The Working Committee on Jerusalem will reassemble on January 5th, 1948, to receive the draft statute prepared by the two groups of experts. At this stage, they will probably hear the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Mr. Mohn favored hearing the Jewish Agency earlier, but was over-ruled, partly, he thought, because the Working Committee was new to the question of Jerusalem and accordingly self-conscious.

(2)

(3) The Trusteeship Council will reassemble on February 9th, 1948, to consider the revised draft statute on Jerusalem prepared by the Working Committee.

Mr. Mohn had been working on a scheme of proportional representation, which had kept him up to 2:00 a.m. the previous night. He was using as a basis the Scandinavian system, derived from Belgium.

Discussing the personnel of the groups of experts, Mr. Mohn implied that Mr. Gibson (United Kingdom) was rather conservative, and greatly regretted the absence of Mr. MacGillivray, whom he characterized as "fair and impartial". He spoke favorably of the personnel of the Working Committee. (Of the six representatives on the Working Committee, four are known to be liberal in their outlook, namely, Gerig (U.S.), Liu Chieh (China), Garreau (France), and Noriega (Mexico). Of these four, all but the Chinese I know to be personally sympathetic to us).

Mr. Mohn's attitude towards the Jewish position is a combination of the friendly and the skeptical. For instance, he takes credit for the assignment of the Southern Negev to the Jewish State, which, he says, the other members of UNSCOP (at Geneva) wanted to detach. He also deliberately restrained certain adverse comments he had to make on our plan for boundaries during the United Nations Assembly session because, he said, he realized that the matter was very serious for us. On the other hand, he made the following doubtful observations:

(1) That many Jews in Jerusalem might prefer not to be affiliated with the Jewish State, since that State might become Fascist or Communist;

(2) That illegal immigration after the Jewish State was set up might be sponsored by the Stern Group or the Irgun and might prove the starting point for a civil war;

(3) That the Polish Government might abet such illegal immigration because of its desire to get rid of its Jews.

At this point in the conversation we were joined by Major Aubrey Eban. In the subsequent discussion, Mr. Mohn touched on the following points:

(3)

(1) As chief of the future boundary delimitation committee, he suggested a certain Swiss Colonel, retired, 67 years old, with previous experience in delimiting the boundary between Iraq and Syria and also between Burma and a neighboring state.

(2) He mentioned again his plan for an international police force divided into two parts:

(a) A Big Power force not to be used except as a last resort and quartered in Jerusalem itself, and

(b) A Small Power force to be stationed throughout the country and to do the actual job of policing.

(3) He supported the idea that the United Nations could not permit the British to delay the date of the United Nations Palestine Commission's arrival.

COMMENT:

Mr. Mohn affirms the fact that our Jerusalem experts should be on hand by January 5th, 1948.

He did not think that any important outside group besides the Jewish Agency would be heard by the Working Committee.



The Working Committee on Jerusalem

CHAIRMAN
Vice-Chairman

Mr. Benjamin Gerig (US)
Sir Alan Burns (UK)

Australia
China
France
Mexico

Allan H. Leomes - W. D. Forsyth
Liu Chieh - Lin Mousheng
Roger Garreau
Raoul Noriega

Drafting Groups of Experts

FIRST GROUP: (to handle the sections of the statute dealing with the Governor and administrative staff, security measures, administration of justice, Holy Places, special powers of Governor regarding Holy Places, relations with Arab and Jewish States, official languages, special objectives and external relations).

Felix Vanthiers	(France)
Leslie H. Gibson	(United Kingdom)
William I. Cargo	(United States)

Secretariat:

Peter Anker
Cecil Rankin
Constantin Stavropoulos
Henri Vigier (with regard to Holy Places)
Paul Mohn

SECOND GROUP: (to handle the sections dealing with local autonomy, legislative organizations, freedom of transit and visits, control of residents, citizenship, freedom of citizens, economic union and economic regime, financial and fiscal provisions).

Henri Laurentie or	Guy Menod (France)
Jan Watt	(United Kingdom)
William Yeomans	(United States)
Leslie H. Gibson	(United Kingdom) and E.J. Richard Heyward (Australia) also available for consultation

Secretariat:

Jaroslav Cebe-Habersky
Paul Cremona
Marc Schreiber or Constantin Stavropoulos
John N. Reedman
Paul Mohn

#