



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
38

Box
14

Folder
916

Jewish Agency, Ziff, William B., 1947.

From: Chace Conley
20 East 35 Street
New York City
MU. 5-2629

For Release: Thursday, October 9

Note to Editor:

(Excerpts from the detailed analysis prepared by William B. Ziff, authority on international affairs and author of "The Rape of Palestine," on findings of the United Nations' Special Committee on Palestine.

The analysis will be included in a new edition of "The Rape of Palestine" to be published in London in October 1947.

The original "The Rape of Palestine" was banned by the British in Palestine.)

"If a state is sovereign over nothing and cannot institute any measures of economic self-protection or development, and is subject to the whim of a hostile partner and imperial supervisor, it is neither independent nor secure, but a puppet which is compelled in the natural course of events to be reduced to the extreme in national degradation and poverty." (Page 8 of Ziff analysis)

In a cutting analysis of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Palestine, William B. Ziff, author of "The Rape of Palestine," envisages such a fate as inevitable for a Jewish state in Palestine if the Committee's recommendations are effected.

#####

Envisaging the division of Palestine into an Arab State, a Jewish State and the City of Jerusalem, the three to be separated politically but joined in economic union, the majority report of the Committee would actually give the Arab State powers of life and death over the Jewish State, according to Ziff, since "nothing could be undertaken unless the Arab State agreed." (Pages 2, 6)

"Moreover," the analysis continues, "the separate enclave of Jerusalem also is a party to this remarkable arrangement. On all projects of economic development by one state which is construed to affect the other, there is to be no action except with the assent of both states and the City of Jerusalem. (Page 7)

"Here, obviously, is opened up the widest possible avenue for sabotage and trouble, with the Jewish community hogtied hand and foot, and subject at all times to the whim of associates whose hostility is acknowledged from the beginning." (Page 7)

#####

An extraordinary limitation on the rights of the proposed Jewish State, Ziff points out, is that which would allow only 150,000 Jews to enter the Jewish territory and then only at a "uniform monthly rate." (Pages 3, 4)

"If the Jewish State is to be a State," he asks, "why the limitation on its powers?" (Page 5)

#####

The Committee further provided for a continuance of the 70-year concession to the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Company which would levy on the Jews oppressive burdens and abuses far more coercive than those which the American Revolution was fought to correct, Ziff says. (Pages 7, 8)

#####

In effect and actuality, though Britain is "invited" to give up its Mandate control of Palestine, it is "self-evident," according to the Ziff analysis, that the Mandate would merely be "transferred from the defunct League of Nations to the new United Nations organization," with the British in control as before and "the identical anti-Semitic officials who had sabotaged the workings of the existing Mandate" remaining to implement "the transition period." (Pages 5, 16)

#####

The proposed UNSCOP report, according to Ziff, would subject the Jews to "perpetual ransom" payment, since the backward, agricultural and lethargic Arab State and the largely industrial Jewish State would have their revenues "divided equally between them, after some five to ten per cent has been subtracted for the maintenance of the enclave at Jerusalem." (Pages 7, 8)

#####

[1947]

344
From: Chace Conley
20 East 35 Street
New York City
MU. 5-2629

For Release: Thursday, October 9

NOTE TO EDITOR: (The following is a summary of the detailed analysis prepared by William B. Ziff, authority on international affairs and author of "The Rape of Palestine," on findings of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine. The full text of the Ziff analysis accompanies this summary.)

Foreseeing that heavy pressures would be exerted on President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall to commit the United States in support of the United Nations' attempt to partition Palestine, William B. Ziff, authority on international affairs, warns the American people against allowing such support.

"This piece of gratuitous buffonery" is the description Ziff applies to the highly publicized report compiled by the United Nations' Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP), which is being used in the present U. N. session to determine a final solution for the Holy Land problem.

Attacking the UNSCOP recommendations with a documented rebuttal, Ziff points out that "the beginning of the end would be on hand for the Jewish National Home" if American action, influenced by outside pressures, tries to place the provisions of the report into operation.

"It is evident," he concludes, "that this latest in the list of investigations and reports...is of no more worth than those which have preceded."

"Nowhere," he declares, "is there better shown the weakness and ineptitude of the United Nations, its structure of vain pretenses, its incompetence to deal with essential issues, and the subservient character of its representatives in dealing with the demands of the powerful, than in this Report...." (Page 10)

(more)

Unveiling the ambiguities strewn throughout the report, Ziff shows the recommendations to be "incongruous" and asserts they prove an utter incapacity on the part of the United Nations "either to visualize the problem or to act independently of the individual power interests which control that organization."

According to Ziff's analysis, the recommendations, stripped of concealing and "qualifying" verbiage, propose:

1. To destroy the entire base on which modern Zionism was founded. (Pages 2, 8)
2. To prevent for all time the establishment of a true Jewish State. (Pages 5, 5a) also (Pages 8, 15)
3. To return Palestine to medieval theocracy and government-by-effendi which victimizes the life of its Arab neighbors. (Page 10)
4. To take away from the hundreds of thousands of Jews stranded in Europe their right to go to Palestine. (Page 4)
5. To reduce the Jews to the position of "aboriginals on a reservation." (Page 5)
6. To mislead the American public into believing that "Britain has no designs on Palestine and intends to remove itself from there." (Pages 5, 16)
7. To set up an unworkable "qualified partition." (Pages 2,3)
8. To create an utterly impossible set of control provisions, including a Joint Economic Board, designed to frustrate the Jewish claims to a National Home. (Pages 5a, 6)
9. To stymie all economic development in both Arab and Jewish "states" by providing that "on all projects of economic development by one state which is construed to affect the other, there is to be no action except with the assent of both states and the City of Jerusalem." (Page 7)

The recommendations further propose:

10. To withhold future immigration into Palestine, including the 150,000 supposedly to be admitted within two years. (Pages 3, 4) also (Pages 5, 9)
11. To penalize the Jews for their progressiveness by forcing them to pay perpetual ransom to the backward Arab state and to "the army of anti-Semitic administrators in Palestine." (Pages 7, 8)

(more)

12. To legalize the anti-Jewish restrictions of the 1939 White Paper.
(Pages 12, 14)
13. To cover up the "illegal" British manipulation of the Mandate.
(Pages 10, 11)
14. To transfer the Mandate from the defunct League of Nations to the new United Nations organization "with the British in control as before" and "the identical anti-Semitic officials who had sabotaged the workings of the existing Mandate" remaining to implement "the transition period." (Page 5)
15. To perpetuate the myth of Arab rights and power of resistance.
(Page 13)
16. To create a set of rulings which, because of their equivocal language, "will be subject to such interpretations as the Mandatory in the future might wish to give it." (Page 4)
17. To circulate as "authoritative" the "worthless and biased findings" of the various Royal Commissions, and to ignore all authoritative findings from other sources. (Pages 12, 13) also (Pages 14, 15, 16)



#####

Ziff is author of: "The Rape of Palestine" (1938) (1946, new edition); and October
(1947) (London publication)
"The Coming Battle of Germany" (1942)
"The Gentlemen Talk of Peace" (1944)
"Two Worlds" (1946)

He is listed in Who's Who in America; International Who's Who; Who's Who in Transportation and Communications; Who's Who in Commerce and Industry; Encyclopedia Britannica Year Book (1945) and others.

He is an internationally known author, aviation expert, military strategist and authority on international affairs.

####

[October 1947?]

From: Chace Conley
20 East 35 Street
New York City
MU. 5-2629

FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND USE

(The following is an analysis by William B. Ziff, authority on international affairs, of the recent reported findings of the U.N. Special Committee on Palestine. The analysis is an advance copy of a chapter to be included in a forthcoming new edition of "The Rape of Palestine" which, since its original publication in 1938 has become a standard source book. (It was republished last year in One-World format by Argus Books, Inc.) "The Rape of Palestine" is a carefully annotated, factual account taken for the most part from meticulously kept British records. It was used as a source book by the League's Mandates Commission, and its value as an historical document of prime importance was reaffirmed by the opinions of American members of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine.)

THE COMMITTEE OF THE U.N. REPORTS

On September 1, 1947, the Special Committee on Palestine appointed by the United Nations made its report.

This was Number 27 in the long list of official investigations made of the situation since Britain assumed the Mandate.

Now once again history repeated itself. The gentlemen of the Jewish Agency looked at the well publicized highlights which seemed to provide for a Jewish State and Jewish immigration, and surveyed the proposal with a certain restrained elation.

The Hebrew underground at once rejected it as a further attempt to despoil the Jews. The Arabs, with a high sense of strategic motivation, cried out that the scales had been weighted against them by "Jewish influence."

Just what the Jewish Agency had to be jubilant about was difficult to see. From the Jewish view, certainly, there was little cause for rejoicing.

From the viewpoint of the world at large, the U. N. as a competent world body showed in this report an utter incapacity either to visualize the problem or to act independently of the individual power interests which control that organization.

Author's Note: All underscoring in this analysis of the U.N. Report is the author's.

(more)

The proposals consisted of a majority and a minority report. Both of these differed far less under careful examination than they appeared to on the surface.

The majority report was the one considered favorable to the Jewish viewpoint. It consisted of little more than a new and attenuated Mandate, and promoted a second partition which would further delimit the rights of the Jews and consign them to the status of a small racial enclave in a vast Arab sea.

Where the existing Mandate declared all of Palestine to be the Jewish National Home, giving Jews full rights of immigration, as well as automatic possession of waste and state lands, the new proposal places severe limits on their development in all directions. It is only in comparison with the terms of the illegal British White Paper, if one assumes this document to be unbreachable, that the U.N. proposal is even thinkable.

The new proposal destroys the entire base on which modern Zionism and the existing Mandate were founded. It declares the question of Palestine to be independent of the critical problem of Jewish homelessness, stating that "in appraisal of the Palestine problem it should be accepted as incontrovertible that any solution for Palestine cannot be considered as a solution of the Jewish problem in general."

The Plan is merely another camouflaged edition of the Grady-Morrison recommendations. According to its authors, it "envisages the division of Palestine into three parts: an Arab State, a Jewish State, and the City of Jerusalem."

Both the Arab and Jewish territories are laid out like a jigsaw puzzle, each in three sections linked together "by two points of intersection," like the body and wings of a butterfly.

The Jewish State consists of a narrow strip along the coast, another narrow strip joining it by a hairline in the northwest of Palestine, and the desert of the Negeb, which, judging from the description, will have to be reached through Arab territory.

The independent sector of Jerusalem, with its heavy Jewish majority, is to be under a separate administration. This is allegedly because of the necessity for safeguarding the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites, and maintaining the peace between the various religious factions.*

*If the reasoning behind this action can be accepted in good faith, it is contradicted in another section of the Committee's Report, stating the "history of Jerusalem, during the Ottoman regime, as under the Mandate, shows that religious peace has been maintained in the city because the government was anxious and had the power to prevent controversies involving religious interests from developing into bitter strife and disaster." If the Moslem Turkish Government could keep the peace it is fair to ask, why would not a Jewish authority?

Nevertheless we find that the City of Jerusalem is to include more than the present municipality of Jerusalem. Attached to it, under the rule of a separate international regime, are to be surrounding villages and towns, reaching from Abu Dir on the east, Bethlehem on the south, Ein Karim on the west, to Shu-fat on the north. Obviously all of these villages cannot be Holy Places.

Jerusalem is to be ruled by a governor, who according to the proposal, shall be neither Arab nor Jew, and presumably will represent the Mandatory power. This Governor, as the chief administrative official, will be responsible "for the conduct of the administration of the city."

But he also has powers with relation to any Holy Place or site "in any part of Palestine, other than Jerusalem." "He alone is to determine whether the provisions of the constitution of the Arab and Jewish States," dealing with "religious rights... are being properly applied and respected." He also is empowered "to make decisions on the basis of existing rights in cases of disputes..."

The Governor possesses an army of his own, although this is euphemistically disguised as a police unit, and has absolute powers of intervention at any time he pleases, since all disputes in Palestine can be translated to fall within the cover of "religious disputes."

The opportunities for trouble are magnified by the fact that there has been included within the Jewish "state," the Arab port of Jaffa, which presumably will have a sub-autonomy of its own, and thereby become an enclave within an enclave.

At the end of a provisional period the Jews are to be granted "independence" and to become a "state." The length of the provisional period apparently is two years; but the language is fairly ambiguous, stating at one point that it should not exceed a very few years.

If the alleged ambiguities and "qualifying" phrases of the present Mandate are complained of as providing a source of limitless conflict and difficulty, the new proposal presents far greater room for specious interpretation. One notices, for example, the significant limitation placed on the central right of the proposed Jewish state -- that of control of its own immigration -- a provision which must be read also with reference to the various qualifying statements strewn throughout the recommendation.

If the Committee's Report rolls through the Assembly intact, without the usual whittling and hedging, 150,000 Jews would be allowed to enter the Jewish territory during the so-called "transitional period." However, these cannot come in immediately, but at a "uniform monthly rate." Moreover, it is specifically stated that 30,000 are to be admitted on "humanitarian grounds" placing an inferential limitation whose importance must be noted.

For practical purposes the association of the Jewish state with the problem of the DP's and with the original purposes of Zionism, thus is limited in the basic charter of the country to 30,000. The balance of the immigration, while provided for, is qualified by a number of factors implicit in the language used throughout. These refer to the "absorptive capacity" of the country, and, more important, to the right of Arabs to be in opposition to any considerable Jewish immigration.

As an example, the Committee states among the fundamental premises for its "solution," a series of propositions involving:

1. "Palestine cannot be considered as a solution of the Jewish problem in general."
2. "Serious account must be taken of the certain resentment and vigorous opposition of the Arabs throughout the middle East to any attempt to solve at their expense the Jewish problem" (i.e. to any considerable Jewish immigration into Palestine).
3. "It is recognized that partition has been strongly opposed by the Arabs, but it is felt that opposition will be lessened by a solution which definitively fixes the extent of territory to be allotted to the Jews with its implicit limitation on immigration."

The use of the word "implicit," again is ambiguous. It may be construed to refer to the natural limitations of the territory, or to the limitations implicitly imposed by the total solution and based on the so-called good of Palestine as a whole, i.e. the natural rights of the Arabs to maintain their present numerical proportion in the whole of Palestine.

It is to be noted that nothing specific is said about the right of the Jewish "state" to accept immigration after the transitional period, whereas it is specifically stated in defense of the proposed solution, that the Jewish immigration provided for is both "limited and controlled."

The language at best is equivocal and subject to such interpretation as the Mandatory, in future, might wish to give it. Though the transition period presumably is for two years, nevertheless it is taken into account that this might not be the case. If it extends over the two year period, "Jewish immigration shall be allowed at the rate of 60,000 per year." The Jews naively have taken this to mean unlimited immigration at the rate of 60,000 per year, following the initial 150,000. A proper reading of this proposition, however, would appear to make it apply only against the 150,000 quota provided for, in the event the Mandatory finds it cannot allow this total number to enter within the two years suggested.

In any case, whether intentional or by oversight, there is no statement which would indicate the right of the Jews at any time to accept immigration beyond the 150,000 provided in the proposal. That this interpretation is not far-fetched may be seen from other limitations on the "sovereignty" of the Jewish State, which will be discussed later.

It seems fair, at this point, to ask: If the Jewish state is intended to be a state in truth, why the significant limitations on its powers? Why can it not invite into its borders from the beginning, as many potential citizens as it desires? And also, why at the "uniform monthly rate?" There was no uniform rate connected with such broad solutions as that involved in the mass exchange of populations resulting from the Graeco-Turkish Agreement of 1922. Here an attempt was really made to solve the problem, whereas now the justifiable suspicion may exist that behind this facade of words is another attempt by the anti-Jewish administrators to gain time. In addition to the DP's usually referred to, there are close to a million Jews living under the most oppressive conditions in Moslem lands. If the Moslems and Arabs as a whole are a party to the situation, why are not the Jews resident in these lands party to it? And why the "transition period" with all the limitations imposed by it? The Jews are a modern progressive people, well able to handle their own affairs. They do not need to be treated as aboriginals on a reservation.

Here is a series of questions which lead at once to the parent question: Who is to guarantee that the Mandatory, under the new arrangement, will allow even the 150,000 immigrants to enter? The Mandatory flouted the provisions of the existing Mandate. Why will it be more faithful with reference to the terms of the new one?

Is there not reason, in fact, to fear the worst, that here will be a new point of departure by which further Jewish development will be made impossible and the present area finally turned into a poverty-stricken ghetto, held down by force exactly as were the ghettos of Poland and the Russian Pale?

Though Britain is "invited" to give up the Mandate, it is self-evident that the Mandate instead is to be transferred from the defunct League of Nations to the new United Nations Organization. The British will continue as before. The identical anti-Semitic officials who had sabotaged the workings of the existing Mandate, will remain to implement the "new transition period."*

* What may be expected may be seen in a statement recently issued to the world press by a spokesman for the Foreign Office, who charged that the Jewish children in Europe were being kidnaped by the Zionists and shipped as illegal immigrants to Palestine. He quite solemnly informed the world that "Britain is preparing to take international steps to stop this inhuman traffic." The events which took place immediately after the U. N. Committee's Report in respect to the clubbing and forcible disembarkation at Hamburg of the 4400 passengers of the immigrant ship EXODUS 1947, provides, also, a grim warning for the future.

What all this comes to is summed up by the foreign correspondent for the New York Herald-Tribune, writing from Jerusalem on the day the Report was issued:

"British circles in Jerusalem," he comments, "who have never made a secret of their pro-Arab bias, and who from the beginning regarded the U. N. Committee with contempt, state the whole plan is 'totally unacceptable.'" Yet these will be the men who will be expected to implement the program.

The Report, in fact, agrees that the success of the Mandatory during the transitional period "in creating the proper atmosphere and in carrying out the necessary preparations for the assumption of independence, will influence greatly the effectiveness of the final solution to be applied." The Mandatory, in short, can either make or wreck the deal.

It is with this in mind that we come to another set of curious control provisions. The two states are not to be separate and independent at all, despite the initial language of the proposal.

They are not to have any individual control over their own essential services and processes. This is to be applied collectively. Here we come to an amazing absurdity in view of the Committee's basic premise for instituting partition, that the Arabs and Jews cannot work together and that their several objectives are totally irreconcilable.*

It does not want a partition, but only "a qualified partition, subject to such measures and limitations as are considered essential to the future economic and social well being of both states." This is due to the "limited area and resources of Palestine" which make it essential that "the economic unity of the country...be observed."

Therefore an "economic association" is to be made by means of a treaty between the states. This will provide for a common customs system, common currency, and a common system of transport and communications. Interstate highways, postal, telephone and telegraphic services, as well as the ports of Haifa and Jaffa are to be operated in common.

* The Committee frankly formulates its entire pattern on the reasoning of the Palestine White Paper of 1939. It observes: "In its own statement of policy issued simultaneously with the Report of the Royal Commission, the Mandatory power has found itself driven to the conclusion that there is an irreconcilable conflict between the aspirations of the Arabs and those of the Jews in Palestine." It is "in the light of this background of deepening conflict, intensified by the events of the succeeding ten years," that the Committee feels it proper to view the workings of the Mandate in Palestine.

As between two hostile peoples who hate each other so bitterly that they must be separated at all costs, this would seem to demand quite a trick in legerdemain. The way the Committee proposes to do it is through the establishment of a Joint Economic Board, "which shall consist of three representatives of each of the two states" and three foreign members. The latter ostensibly are to be appointed by the United Nations, but in practice will undoubtedly be under the control of the Mandatory stationed in Jerusalem.

The functions of the Joint Economic Board are to be absolute, since it will be in its power "to organize and administer, either directly or by delegation, the objectives of the economic union."

In addition to the common services described above, the Joint Economic Board is to have full charge of "joint economic development, especially in respect to irrigation, land reclamation and soil conservation." This provision immediately brings to mind the present British limitation on irrigation, especially designed to prevent the development of the Negeb. Thus at the pleasure of the actual ruling power of the two states, the Negeb would remain a desert, even if the British elected to give it up, which is extremely doubtful.*

What does all this mean?**

Obviously if the Committee's claim that an undying hostility exists between Arabs and Jews can be considered valid, the Arab State, with or without the instigation of the Mandatory, would hold powers of life and death over the Jewish State. Nothing could be undertaken unless the Arab State agreed, since the Arab State, presumably (still following the Committee's reasoning), would be both agricultural and a puppet of the surrounding Arab States. The Jews would find themselves in a strait jacket on everything which related to their essential economy.

* It is well known that Britain intends to continue using the Negeb as a military base. The Jews undoubtedly, therefore, will be excluded and confined to the small ghetto strip of coastal plain.

** Each of the states binds itself "to put into effect the decisions of the Joint Economic Board," which undoubtedly will be backed by the policing force at the disposal of the Mandatory power in Jerusalem.

Moreover, the separate enclave of Jerusalem also is a party to this remarkable arrangement. On all projects of economic development by one state which is construed to affect the other, there is to be no action except with the assent of both states and the City of Jerusalem.

Here, obviously, is opened up the widest possible avenue for sabotage and trouble, with the Jewish community hogtied hand and foot, and subject at all times to the whim of associates whose hostility is acknowledged from the beginning.

How anyone can attempt to make sense out of this proposal, if the proposal indeed is intended to be an honest one, is difficult to see.

Just how much trouble the Jews would be in is indicated by another portion of this scheme. The Jews are to pay perpetual ransom. The Arab State is backward, agricultural and lethargic. The Jewish State will be largely industrial. Yet the revenues of the two states are to be divided equally between them, after some five to ten per cent has been subtracted for the maintenance of the enclave at Jerusalem.

No bones are made of the reasoning back of this, for the Report says with disingenuous frankness: "A partitioned Arab state in Palestine would have some difficulty in raising sufficient revenue to keep up its present standard of public services." In short, the impoverished and stricken Jews themselves struggling desperately to make a place for themselves out of the raw material of the desert, are to foot the bill.

A further ransom is to be required in the shape of "pensions, compensations and gratuities" to be paid to the army of anti-Semitic administrators who have already been responsible for so much mischief in the Holy Land.

"Commercial concessions heretofore granted in respect to any part of Palestine shall continue to be valid according to their terms..." The nature of some of these so-called "concessions" may be judged from the terms of a 70-year concession granted to the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Company.

Under this remarkable agreement, the company is to be free of all taxes, direct or indirect. Its imports are to be duty free; it need not observe labor laws, and may import foreign labor irrespective of existing immigration restrictions.

On demand of the Company, the Government is to expropriate privately-owned land. The Company is to receive Government-owned stone and timber free for building purposes. It is to have special port facilities and railway rates. It may own and construct at its own pleasure (tax free) every manner of utility, ranging from roads and airfields to railway, streetcar and telephone lines, pipe lines and electric power plants.

Here indeed is a set of the most oppressive burdens ever levied against a people. Certainly no people has ever accepted such a proposition voluntarily. The American Revolution was fought to correct abuses far less coercive than these, which the U. N. Committee asks the Assembly to give the respectability of "international sanction."

On the question of revenue, the Committee figures that the income from the Jewish state will be £4,878,000 a year, apart from customs, and that of the Arab state £1,560,000. The income from the City of Jerusalem (coming largely from Jews) would be another £1,098,000. The revenue from "customs and other joint services", in which the overwhelming share would be Jewish would be £11,996,000. This amount, says the Report urbanely, would be "available for distribution between the two states and the City of Jerusalem."

Not satisfied with these levies, by which the Jewish state is to work in perpetuity for the Mandatory and the Arab state, the Committee recommends that since the Arab state "will not be in a position to undertake considerable development expenditure, sympathetic consideration should be given to its claims for assistance from international institutions in the way of loans." Presumably, the United States is to be asked to put this up.

Here is one of the most bizarre fantasies ever soberly proposed by anyone in the history of political literature. Its very basis of "political division and economic unity" is completely devoid of sense. The fundamental base of modern politics is economics.

If a state is sovereign over nothing, and cannot institute any measures of economic self-protection or development, has no control over its domestic and foreign relations, and is subject to the whim of a hostile partner and imperial supervisor, it is neither independent nor secure, but a puppet which is compelled in the natural course of events to be reduced to the extreme in national degradation and poverty.*

Moreover, boring through the somewhat confusing and ambiguous language of the report, it appears clear that the Jewish enclave cannot become a state unless the Arab enclave also becomes a state and agrees to enter into the common setup. If the Arabs are either unable to fit into this program, or unwilling to do so, the Jewish state cannot exist. This piece of sleight of hand, the Commission attempts to perform by piously calling on both sides "to get together," despite the fact that the Commission already has separated them because they could not get together.

* In defense of its position the Committee attempts to justify the scheme with a statement at total variance with the previous contentions on which the scheme itself is based. It states: "There is a considerable body of opinion in both groups (Arab and Jewish) which seeks the course of cooperation."

It is worthy of note, too, that the Committee's Report recommends the abrogation of the present restrictive land laws in the proposed Jewish state, so that anyone can buy land, Jews and Arabs alike. However, the same provision apparently does not apply to the territories of the so-called Arab State where a significant silence is maintained.

Apparently, the Jewish citizens of the Arab State may not buy land, but Arabs may do so in the Jewish State. How does the Committee reconcile this with its stipulation that the constitutions of both states guarantee "to all persons equal and non-discriminatory rights?"

The Minority Report, in which Britain through Pakistan, its Mohammedan Indian puppet, and Russia through Yugoslavia, both have a foot, does not differ too much in essential principle from that offered by the majority. It is simply franker in its restriction of Jews and disdains the roundabout means employed by its sister report.

The Minority Report, moreover, also talks stentoriously of human rights and freedoms, which must be "guarded." It, too, repeats the line of needed "essential economic and social unity." It, too, devotes considerable expression to the alleged fact that the aspirations of the Jews and Arabs are irreconcilable. It, too, would give the Jews a state, but within the framework of an "independent federal state of Palestine. It, too, would continue the British Mandate during the so-called "transitional period," and it, too, seeks "a dynamic solution," "independence," and "an end to the Mandate."

Exactly as is the case with the Majority Report, it expresses deep sympathy for the distressed European Jews, but discards the idea that Palestine "is to be considered in any sense as a means of solving the problem of world Jewry."

Moreover, it, too, contemplates the possibility of some Jewish immigration into the Jewish area, "in such numbers as not to exceed the absorptive capacity of the Jewish state, having due regard for the rights of the population then present within that state and for their anticipated natural rate of increase."

It, too, considers Palestine a poor and limited country, exactly as did the members who prepared the Majority Report.

It is interesting to read in the Minority statement a quite frank and logical appraisal of the weaknesses of its sister report. It remarks candidly that the majority proposal will not work, describing it as "a union under artificial arrangements designed to achieve essential economic and social unity after first creating political and geographic disunity."

The real objective of both reports may be read in paragraph nine of the Minority recommendations: "The federal state solution would permit the development of patterns of government and social organization in Palestine which would be more harmonious with the governmental and social patterns in the neighboring states." In short, Palestine is to be returned to the medieval theocracy and government-by-effendi which distinguishes the life of its Arab neighbors.

How did this manifestly unworkable and oppressive scheme come about? And how could a body of presumably intelligent men in an enlightened century of progress, offer so obviously an unfair and ruinous proposal?

Where the inspiration and source of this scheme was, may be judged throughout the body of the Commission's Report. It simply accepted the Government's contentions as authoritative, as witness a technical note prepared by the Secretariat, which observes that "though the partition proposed by the members of this Committee differs in some important respects from the Provincial Autonomy Plan of the British Government, the area of the proposed Arab state is not very different in the two cases, and in regard to actual resources, the differences are not very marked."

Throughout the Report, the Commission whitewashed the Administration and sonorously repeated all the stereotyped charges and attitudes developed by a generation of British anti-Semitic rule, though at the same time it patted the Jews on the back as being good fellows after all. It obviously attempted to be all things to all men, appeasing the strong and letting the weak shift for themselves.

Beneath all the fine phraseology shone not the spirit of authority and justice, but that of the sycophant and politician. In principle, it left the situation exactly where it was before, though giving an appearance of reasoned settlement and plausibility.

Nowhere is there better shown the weakness and ineptitude of the United Nations, its structure of vain pretenses, its incompetence to deal with essential issues, its almost total lack of independent authority, and the subservient character of its representatives in dealing with the demands of the powerful, than in this Report.

To see all this in its full quality, the Report itself must be examined independent of the pious nature of its "conclusions." It begins with the astonishing observation that "the problem of Palestine is not one the solution of which will emerge from an accumulation of detailed information."

It asserts that the problem is not one of facts but "mainly one of human relationships and political rights." What is meant by this? How can any fair and rational conclusion be arrived at without reference to detailed information? Is not everything else guess and bias?

Whenever it came down to a question of the role played by the Mandatory, the Committee acted for all the world as if it were treading on hot coals. There is no mention of official misconduct or of possible dereliction of duty on the part of the Mandatory, despite the vast accumulation which exists on the record.

Implicit in the language of the Report throughout is the recognition that the British are a power and that they are presumably backed by collusive alliance with the American State Department, whereas the Jews are of no consequence and need not be taken seriously into account.

The gentlemen of the Committee dutifully "recorded their appreciation of the assistance in the furnishing of information necessary to their full understanding of the situation in Palestine, as well as the attentions to their personal convenience in carrying out their enquiry so freely given them by H. E. Sir Alan Cunningham, the High Commissioner of Palestine, and the officials of the Palestine Administration."¹¹ It makes another bow to the anti-Jewish Government of the Lebanon "for its unstinted hospitality." But no further acknowledgements are expressed to anyone--certainly not to Jewish sources.

It circumspectly observes that its own authority is almost purely rhetorical, and that when H. M. Government gave the inquiry over to the United Nations, it by no means handed that body a blank check; and that "an authoritative representative of the United Kingdom had stated at the time that whatever the recommendations of the United Nations, the United Kingdom was not prepared at this stage to say that it would accept these recommendations." *

Though the Report maintains a great air of impartiality, its actual tenor and context play up all circumstances contrary to the Jewish claim, and give little weight to the great mass of evidence which supports it.

There is no hesitation at a complete distortion of known facts, or at referring for authority to documents and opinions which have long since been discredited. Augustly, the Report informs its readers that there are only limited water supplies available for immigration. It grudgingly admits that Jewish experts have given higher figures, but these are not detailed, while the Government figures are.

* Querying Sir Alexander Cadogan on the subject, that gentleman replied: "I cannot imagine His Majesty's Government carrying out a policy of which it does not approve." To this the Committee adds disingenuously, that "this did not mean that the Government would not accept the recommendation of the Assembly, but only that it would not carry out a decision it felt to be wrong."

It follows the old Government line that Palestine is "exceedingly poor" in natural resources, leading to the obvious conclusion that industrial development is impossible, except as it is artificially stimulated by fanatical Zionists.*

The whole trend is to show that the "absorptive capacity" of the country is extremely limited, thus parroting observations which even the Government itself had been forced to abandon years ago. The Committee discusses the yardstick of economic absorptive capacity, as if the Government's position were based on unimpeachable good faith.

It also recognizes the validity of the Government's later conclusions that now "political and psychological factors should be taken into account" due to Arab recalcitrance. The Committee, therefore, found that to establish a Jewish majority in Palestine "would involve an apparent violation of what was the governing principle of Article XXII of the Covenant."

The Report states that Jewish economic achievement has been largely due "to war demands" and fully expects "a period of economic depreciation and unemployment" to follow.**

That the Jews have performed remarkable feats of development in the Holy Land the Committee concedes, but adds: "The fact remains, however, that there may be serious question as to the economic soundness of much of this achievement, owing to the reliance on gift capital and the political motivation behind many of the development schemes, with little regard for economic considerations."

Thus, the Committee discovers that the absorptive capacity is really highly limited, and may not be sufficient for the people who are already in the country. To prove its point the Committee, still pursuing its fine air of impartiality, records that there are in Palestine 1,203,000 Arabs and only 608,225 Jews, figures which are patently false and based on the Government's invention.*** The Committee then states that the Arabs have increased to this large figure from 550,000 less than a generation ago, and that this vast gain was due "almost entirely to natural increase of births over deaths."****

* The Committee entirely overlooks the fact that the great industrial countries of Britain, Holland and Belgium possess no substantial mineral resources and yet have been successful in maintaining viable civilizations.

** Mention is made of the wartime contribution of the "people of Palestine" but there is no suggestion that this was in almost all respects Jewish, and that almost every member of the present Arab Higher Committee served at the time as an agitator on the Axis side.

*** The figure on Jews changes several times in the Report as it was issued to American correspondents from Lake Success.

**** The Report does not explain away the fact that no such phenomenal increase is noticed in any of the nearby Arab countries, or that the population of adjoining Transjordan has remained stationary over this period.

All of this makes for a most dynamic situation, according to the Committee. By 1960, "assuming no immigration to take place," the Jews will increase to 664,000 and the non-Jews to 1,730,000, by inference cramming the country to the gunwales. The Committee, therefore, came to the inferential conclusion that the relative position of the Jews not only should be considered in relation to their present number in Palestine, but also with regard to the superior philoprogenitiveness of their Arab neighbors.

The great area of the Negeb is referred to as a "desert," which the members of the Committee seemed to believe can support no more than a scattering of Bedouins and villagers. The Arab States, which have not the slightest legal standing under the Mandate, are treated as a collective party to the issue, whereas the Jewish people, who are specifically mentioned as the beneficiaries of that document, are everywhere considered extraneous to the problem.

The circumstances of the visit to the Displaced Persons Camps, originally central to the entire inquiry, almost smack of comic opera. The Committee, says the Report, was divided on the question of principle involved in such a visit. Some members expressed the view that the visit was unnecessary since it was common knowledge that the people in the camps wanted to go to Palestine.

"Others," continues the Report blandly, "felt that the Committee should inspect the camps because it was obliged by its terms of reference to do so." The whole mood in which this inquiry was made is capsulated in the next remark: "A number of members indicated that they would not oppose a visit."

Early in the deliberations, the Committee records that the view as expressed by two members, was that "it was improper to connect the Displaced Persons and the Jewish problem as a whole with the problem of Palestine," thus prejudging the entire affair without the slightest pretense to examining the evidence or weighing the legal and human questions involved.

Throughout, the Report accepts the worthless and biased findings of the various Royal Commissions as authoritative. As a result, its findings are loaded with innumerable half-truths and distortions of fact, all destructive to the position of the Jews under the Mandate, though these remarks are invariably sugar-coated with polite and even occasional complimentary references to Jewish achievements.

The sorely beset Jewish Underground is dismissed in a few words as "terrorists," whereas the pro-Axis ruffians of the Arab Higher Committee are held to be directly representative of the Arab community.

"All of the political parties (Arab)," it comments, "present a 'common front' and their leaders sit together on the Arab Higher Committee." Instead of condemning the Arab Higher Committee for its arrogant refusal to cooperate in the investigation, the U. N. Commission treated with these men as if they were a great power who somehow had to be conciliated, even at the loss of everyone's self-respect.

The strictures of the 1939 White Paper are repeated as if they were entirely justified. Mention is made of the fact that under its terms, in ninety-five per cent of the area of Palestine, "the transfer of land to Jews by Palestine Arabs was either prohibited or required the sanction of the Government."

Apparently the Committee saw nothing unusual in the discriminatory character of this legislation, since it offers no comment. Later, however, it observes: "that Jews would displace the Arabs from the land were restrictions not imposed, would seem inevitable...the attraction of Jewish capital would be an inducement to many Arabs to dispose of their lands. Some displacement of this nature has already occurred."

Thus, the Committee seems to believe that there is nothing to be condemned in a practice which prevents one-third of the population from buying land in ninety-five per cent of the country.

Indeed, the whitewash of the Administration is complete and unequivocal. The Committee finds that the Administration has done a praiseworthy job considering the "difficulties" it has had to face.

It observes that the "1939 White Paper's restrictions on Jewish immigration and land settlement were plainly designed to protect Arab rights as understood by the Mandatory power."

The fact that "the Government's responsibilities have been primarily directed to the Arabs," since the Jews maintain their own community health and education services, does not strike the Committee as strange. Rather it complains that the Government has not done enough for the Arabs, thus following the conventional Administration line.

Thus, the Jews, who receive nothing from the Government, are penalized by the Committee for their progressiveness, while the Arabs, who are the sole beneficiaries of the tax monies, are held forth as the legitimate complainant.

The Report quotes the 1937 Royal Commission as its authority for the observation that "the Mandatory has so far fully implemented its obligation to facilitate the establishment of a National Home for the Jewish people in Palestine. The present difficult circumstances," it remarks, "should not distort the perspective of solid achievement arising from the joint efforts of the Jewish community and the Administration in laying the foundations of the National Home."

This piece of gratuitous buffoonery underscores many other similar distortions on which space limitations must prevent discussion. The Report does not hesitate to repeat the Government's savage indictment of the Jewish people to the effect that they claim the right to violence, "and have supported by an organized campaign of lawlessness, murder and sabotage, their contention, that whatever other interests might be concerned, nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of a Jewish state."

Nor may the Committee's superficial and biased analysis of events leading to the Mandate itself be dismissed lightly. The Report selects isolated sentences from the Mandate and its Preamble, to distort its meaning, and to prove that the Mandate enjoins the Mandatory power to maintain a balance of obligations to Arabs and Jews rather than to "recreate the Jewish National Home," as its language specifically provides. Much belaboring is done along this point, with every obscure historical reference allegedly made on behalf of the Arabs dramatically brought into view.

Once again the usual quibbling and compromising over the meaning of the words "Jewish National Home" makes its appearance. "It is clear to us," observes the Commission, "that the words 'the establishment in Palestine of the National Home' were the outcome of a compromise between those ministers who contemplated the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State and those who did not." (The fact of the matter is, as is shown elsewhere in this volume, there is not on the historical record any subject on which everyone connected with the issue has so universally agreed as were the parties to the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, on the reestablishment of a viable Jewish state in Palestine.)

Even the Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry is baldly misrepresented to constitute a full appreciation of the Government's difficulties, and approval of its course. Nowhere is it even suggested that every American member condemned the Palestine Government's actions without qualification.

Winston Churchill is quoted at length as having made "the authoritative interpretation of the Mandate to the effect that 'the terms of the Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole shall be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a Home should be formed in Palestine.' " In short, the matter is one of dual obligation to Arabs and Jews, with the weight of interpretation falling in favor of the former. ~~The Committee paid no attention to~~ Mr. Churchill's statement in Commons apropos of the White Paper of 1939, with whose policy the Committee infers Mr. Churchill is in complete accord.

Mr. Churchill's actual statement on the policy of the White Paper reads as follows: "I feel bound to vote against the proposals of His Majesty's Government.

As one intimately responsible and concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the whole world, set aside for reasons of administrative convenience...

"I regret very much that the conditions which were obtained under the Mandate have been violated by the Government's proposals. I select one point upon which there is clearly and plainly a breach and a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration--the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in five years' time by the decision of an Arab majority. I am astonished that the Government should have lent itself to this sudden default--a default which will shock the moral conscience of the world.

"To whom was the pledge of the Balfour Declaration made? It was not made to the Jews of Palestine; it was not made to those who were actually living in Palestine. It was made to world Jewry, and in particular to the Zionist associations. It was on this pledge that we received important help in the war, and after the war we received from the Allied and associate powers the Mandate for Palestine. This pledge of a Home...was not made to the Jews in Palestine, but to the Jews outside Palestine ...to that vast, unhappy mass of scattered, persecuted, wandering Jews whose intense, unchanging, unconquerable desire has been for a National Home. This is the pledge which was given, and this is the pledge we are now asked to break...The Jews have made the desert bloom like a rose. They have done magnificent work. They have formed a great city on the barren soil. The Jews, so far from being persecuted, have the Arabs for their friends. They (the Arabs) have crowded into the country; they wish to work side by side. Now, we are asked to decree that all this is to stop: all this is to come to an end."

It is evident that this latest in the list of investigations and reports which the experts in the Foreign Office have conjured up to becloud the issue, is of no more worth than those which have preceded.

If, miraculously, it were placed into operation, the beginning of the end would be on hand, for the Jewish National Home. To believe anything else, would be to believe that the previous bad faith of British administrators would suddenly be altered, that Britain has no designs on Palestine and intends to remove itself from there, which is a patent absurdity; and that the United Nations somehow, has stronger powers and better principles than the late League of Nations, which is simply untrue.

(more)

To accept the new proposals the Jews would also have to accept the thesis that all of their difficulties have arisen from the political chauvinism and logic of the Arab fellaheen, Bedouins, and effendis (an impossible conception) rather than through the calculated opposition of the Mandatory Power itself.

If it is accepted that not the Arabs, but the Mandatory Power itself, is the real opponent to Jewish settlement, the situation under the U. N. proposal becomes hopeless.

#####

