



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

77

Box

27

Folder

1672

United Nations, Security Council, 1949.

Western Reserve Historical Society

10825 East Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio 44106
(216) 721-5722
wrhs.org

American Jewish Archives

3101 Clifton Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
(513) 487-3000
AmericanJewishArchives.org

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL

342 MADISON AVENUE

• TELEPHONE MURRAY HILL 2-1160

• NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Cable Address: AMZIONIST

NO. 15

December 13, 1949

To the Local Committees
of the AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL:

The decision of the United Nations on Jerusalem, rendered on Friday, December 9, comes as a shocking disappointment. What was said during the discussions holds good: the scheme is not only unjust and unfair -- it is unworkable. It will be impossible for any appointee of the Trusteeship Council to take authority in Jerusalem without the cooperation of its inhabitants. That cooperation will be withheld by both Jews and Arabs.

The AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL is grateful for the support given to our cause by the American delegation headed by Senator Austin, directed by Secretary of State Acheson, and guided by President Truman.

The assurances given by President Truman have been faithfully kept. We are confident that the position taken by the American delegation in the UN Assembly will be maintained with integrity, vigor and effectiveness in the Trusteeship Council.

Our local committees are advised to remain in their mobilized positions. They are asked to maintain their calm, not to allow themselves to be rushed into hasty statements or actions, and to await directions from the AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL, which are now under consideration and will be sent to you within the next ten days.

It is advisable for you and your communities to express your gratitude for the help and cooperation of all who gave aid in this struggle. This should include newspaper editors, columnists, radio stations and commentators, local officials, Representatives and Senators, and especially all our liberal and Christian friends and contacts in civic, academic, labor, and religious circles. Make every effort to continue the high level of your relationship with all of these contacts, cultivating new ones wherever possible.

 CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America • Hashomer Hatzair • Labor Zionist Organization of America-Poale Zion
Mizrachi Organization of America • United Zionist Labor Party (Achdut Avodah-Poale Zion) • Zionist Organization of America
Zionists-Revisionists of America

It is one thing to adopt a formal resolution in the Assembly of the United Nations. It is quite another matter to enforce a wholly unrealistic, unjust decision, animated by political and religious power ambitions, against the highest interests of the whole population of Jerusalem and the State of Israel.

Jerusalem remains Jewish.

Cordially yours,

Louis Lipsky

Louis Lipsky
Chairman

LL:SR



12/15/49

U.N. WILL RECONSIDER ITS DECISION TO INTERNATIONALIZE JERUSALEM, DR. SILVER PREDICTS

NEW YORK, Dec. 14. (JTA) -- The prediction that the United Nations will before long realize that its decision to place Jerusalem under international trusteeship was a mistake and that it will proceed to reconsider its action, was made here today in a statement issued by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. "This will not be a new experience for the United Nations in connection with its handling of everything connected with the Palestine problem," he said.

"Friends of the United Nations," Rabbi Silver declared, "hope that that reconsideration will come speedily before resistance to any attempt to impose a universally unwelcome regime develops. Such attempts are doomed to failure from the very start, and will only serve to exacerbate a situation already very grave and very tense."

Senator Herbert H. Lehman last night termed the United Nations decision providing for the establishment of an internationalized Jerusalem an "unjust and unworkable" action and urged correction of this "grievous mistake." Sen. Lehman spoke at a special convocation called by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America at which Israel Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett was presented with an honorary degree of Doctor of Hebrew Letters.

Mr. Sharett declared at the convocation that "all eyes are now focused on Jerusalem and we pray that our state will fulfill its great mission, that we shall achieve a life of peace and security and that we shall, in turn, secure the peace of the Holy Places that are contained within her walls, and shall be established in our times as the capital of the state of Israel and the spiritual center of the Jewish people."

Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, said in a statement that the Council expressed its "complete and unqualified solidarity with the Jews of Israel in whatever steps they may take to defend the integrity and centrality of Jerusalem as their national capital."

The national administrative board of the Mizrachi Organization of America, at an extraordinary session last night, issued a statement declaring it "greeted with rejoicing announcement of the decisive action of the Israel Cabinet in establishing Jerusalem in fact as capital of Israel."

MEMORANDUM

"The Day" called on Saturday, December 10th, and requested a statement from me on the U.N. Resolution for the internationalization of Jerusalem. I sent them the following message:

The United Nations could not implement its partition resolution of 1947. The Jews of Palestine had to implement it with their blood against the Arab states who defied the U.N. and waged war upon Israel.

Now the U.N. is proposing to set up an international regime for Jerusalem against the wishes both of the government of Israel and the one Arab government which actually has its forces in Jerusalem and intends to stay there.

How does the U.N. propose to implement its decision? What moral authority can there be behind a decision which totally disregards the expressed wishes of all the inhabitants of the area which it has proposed to internationalize?

I am persuaded that the U.N. will before long realize that a mistake has been made and will proceed to ~~reverse~~ ^{reconsider} its action. This will not be a new experience for the U.N. in connection with its handling of everything connected with the Palestine problem.

Friends of the U.N. hope that reconsideration will come speedily before resistance to any attempts to impose a universally unwelcome regime develops. Such attempts are doomed to failure from the very start, and will only serve to exacerbate a situation already very grave and very tense.

The Jerusalem Story

BY LILLIE SHULTZ

Lake Success, December 9

THE United Nations today acknowledged the Vatican as its sixtieth member with the power to dictate its action regardless of reality, practicality, or justice. This is the meaning of the decision of the General Assembly, which turned the clock back two years by ruling that a permanent international regime should be established in Jerusalem on the basis of the 1947 resolution. Twelve Latin American countries, together with the Arab states, the Soviet bloc, and European countries with large Catholic populations, combined on a roll-call vote to create a triumph for the Vatican steam-roller. The count was thirty-eight to fourteen with seven abstentions. Had the vote been by secret ballot, the outcome would have been different. This was the view of the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, whose country, Iran, voted in the affirmative.

The Vatican's interest in internationalization is based on its determination to make Jerusalem a second Rome. It sees in Jerusalem a gateway to the promotion of its interests in the Middle East and Asia. Although in 1947 the Vatican's custodian of the Holy Places sought only international guaranties for the Holy Places and assured access to them, Rome's attitude has changed. Two papal encyclicals issued in 1948 and 1949 called for internationalization. Roman Catholic pressure on the United States government has been insistent. On November 18 of this year Catholic cardinals and bishops published a statement demanding internationalization and opposing both the Conciliation Commission's plan and the proposal for an international curatorship under the United Nations, to provide supervision and protection of the Holy Places throughout Palestine.

For months the Vatican has pressed Israel to agree to complete internationalization. Its agents have intimated that Israeli resistance would produce two penalties: (1) deterioration of Catholic-Jewish relations throughout the world; (2) Catholic influence to retard an early settlement between Israel and the Arab world. The overtones of this threat were audible even in the Assembly debate. Charles Malik, Lebanon's delegate and the Vatican's principal representative, warned the United Nations many times that failure to act would mean that the

whole of Jerusalem would shortly be in the hands of Israel. Time and again he suggested a squeeze play to the Christian world, declaring that Islam was now offering to share Jerusalem with the Christians, as it had not done for a thousand years. It was short-sighted, he implied, to think that Israel would indefinitely be the dominant factor in this situation.

EVEN those who voted for it admit that the decision to internationalize Jerusalem cannot be implemented, that any attempt to do so would touch off a new conflict which might destroy the Holy Places instead of protecting them.

On Tuesday the Trusteeship Council begins a series of meetings to draft a statute. It remains to be seen whether by using the Coué method suggested by Malik—namely, to will it—the Trusteeship Council can carry out the decision, lacking both the force and the funds to run a city-state against the will of its populations. What is expected to happen is the speedy drafting of a statute, an effort to get the acceptance of both parties, and if this meets with failure a report to that effect. That the council's effort will fail is clearly indicated. Mayor Auster of Jewish Jerusalem has announced that the community will ignore the decision and embark upon civil disobedience if internationalization is attempted. King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan has reiterated that the Old City will be taken from him over his dead body. There is no reason to believe either position will be abandoned, especially since neither authority is a member of the United Nations. Israel, having been divested of authority, will not take part in the discussions of the Trusteeship Council even if invited to do so.

In the end a special session of the Assembly will probably be held—a session which may meet with a more decisive *fait accompli* either in the form of an agreement between Israel and Jordan or of stiffening resistance to the U. N. by two communities whose proffered pledges to safeguard the Holy Places through agreements with the U. N. have been ignored.

The stage for the empty triumph of the Vatican was set by an alliance, based on interests quite unrelated to the protection of the Holy Places, among Australia,

Lebanon, and the Soviet Union. Lebanon and the Arab states were motivated by their hatred of Israel and their jealousy lest Jordan alone reap the fruits of the Palestine war. The Soviet attitude was dictated by a desire to prevent Britain from regaining a permanent foothold in the area through its puppet, Jordan, even if it meant creating continuous turmoil there. Australia, leader in the effort to establish partition, hoped by its insistence on the 1947 resolution to assure victory for the Labor government from an electorate which is 25 per cent Roman Catholic, a hope which proved to be vain.

FROM the first it was clear in the Ad Hoc Committee that there was a basic conflict between two opposing principles—that of territorial internationalization and that of curatorship or functional internationalization, a name coined to describe U. N. supervision limited to the Holy Places. When the session opened, the Ad Hoc Committee had before it the following proposals: (1) that of the Conciliation Commission, (2) that of Israel, offering an agreement to the U. N. to assure protection of the Holy Places and free access to them, (3) an Australian plan calling for the enlargement of the Conciliation Commission from three to seven members, with a year in which to report a plan which would more nearly meet the conditions of the 1947 Jerusalem resolution. The Soviet Union proposed a series of amendments to the Australian plan the effect of which was to restore the draft statute drawn up in 1947 by the Trusteeship Council. In a twelve-page series of amendments the Lebanese proposed a new draft statute based on the trusteeship version which the Arab states had opposed and the Trusteeship Council had abandoned as obsolete in July, 1948.

None of these resolutions or amendments commanded a majority. Nor did any of them offer a rallying point to the Vatican.

This was the situation when a subcommittee of seventeen was established which should try to reconcile the proposals and report back to the Ad Hoc body in three days. No majority for any of the proposals was considered possible, and it was expected that a new plan would have to be found, in all probability a compromise limited to supervision of the Holy Places. The Soviet Union had announced that it considered the Australian proposal a halfway measure which it could not support. There was reason to believe that if the Soviet amendments were lost in the subcommittee, Russia would vote against the Australian proposal. But a surprising development occurred. The Lebanese and the Australians capitulated to the Russian point of view. All the Soviet amendments were defeated. But the Lebanese dropped their own proposals and submitted an amendment based on the Russian proposals with the addition of a single sentence. The Soviet Union accepted the Lebanese

amendment as a substitute for its own. The Australian delegation also accepted this amendment, which called for the Trusteeship Council to complete a statute based on the 1947 text. The result was that the subcommittee voted for what was called an Australian resolution but was actually a Russian concept cloaked in the language of Lebanon. This was the most important victory won by the U. S. S. R. in the history of the United Nations. Small wonder it exploited such an unexpected windfall.

The name of Australia gave respectability to a resolution which had been voted down when proposed by the Soviet Union. But even more important, the union of Russia, Lebanon, and Australia produced a resolution tailored to the Vatican design.

It is a fact that neither in the subcommittee nor in the Ad Hoc Committee nor in the plenary session itself was any resolution discussed other than one which sought to restore in 1950 a situation which had existed in 1947. This failure was due to the procedural stranglehold won by the proponents of the successful plan. An attempt by the delegations of the Netherlands and Peru to bring about a free discussion of the principles which should form the basis of a practical solution was defeated in the subcommittee by a tie vote.

In the Ad Hoc Committee the sponsors of the so-called Australian resolution realized that victory depended upon having their proposal voted upon first. They succeeded in this, even though the Ad Hoc Committee, as the master of its own procedure, could by vote have reversed the decision. It is a fact that the Ad Hoc Committee, a few days earlier, would have returned a majority for the Swedish-Netherlands proposal, based on the curatorship idea, had it been put to a vote first, since a majority of the delegates were eager not to have to vote *against* internationalization but would have felt free to vote *for* a practical plan. But no one moved a reversal of this procedure, even though the delegations of the Netherlands and Canada suggested it informally.

THE victory for the so-called Australian resolution by the vote of thirty-five to thirteen with eleven abstentions was an overwhelming surprise to both its backers and its opponents. It was brought about as a result of the direct intervention of the Vatican. Shortly before the afternoon session on December 7 the delegates of all the Catholic countries received virtually identical instructions to vote for it. Papal Nuncios in every capital made vigorous representations and received assurances of support. The Bolivian and Cuban delegates, who had proposed resolutions diametrically opposed to the Australian plan, were compelled to vote for the latter. Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica, intending to vote "no," were instructed to vote "yes." Mexico, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Panama, and the Philippines, whose delegates saw the absurdity

of the Australian resolution, were in the abstention column, as were Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and India.

A shift of six votes could have prevented the Australian resolution from achieving the necessary two-thirds' majority in the plenary session. The Vatican steam-roller prevented this. Learning that the Philippines was about to shift from abstention to "no," Cardinal Spellman wired the President of the Philippines requesting an affirmative vote. Cardinal Spellman won. The delegate of one of the Benelux countries, seeking a change of instructions, was informed: "Sorry, the Cardinal insists you vote 'yes.'" Chile, under the same pressure, changed its negative vote to an abstention. Haiti, which had voted "no" in the Ad Hoc Committee, was pushed into the "yes" column, as was Venezuela, which had previously abstained. Mexico, instructed to vote affirmatively, abstained on all the paragraph votes, but when it was clear that the resolution would pass, followed its instructions. Countries like the Netherlands and New Zealand with large Catholic electorates, though opposed to the resolution, abstained. Other delegates voted in favor of the resolution for a variety of reasons: China, in retaliation against Israel for voting with the United States on the Chinese question (!), Greece because Israel had abstained in the vote calling for sanctions on Albania. New Delhi, in deference to India's large Moslem population, instructed its delegation, which was itself opposed to the resolution, to vote for it.

One of the most cynical acts was that of France. France repudiated the report it had signed as a member of the Conciliation Commission by casting its vote for the Australian proposal. It was lured by the hope of a return to power in the Middle East held before it by Ambassador Malik. Had France given up its historical rights in the city? he demanded on November 28. Were the government and people of France willing to answer the charge before history that they had failed to seize a unique opportunity to gain peacefully what had been the goal of a thousand years of fighting? France took the bait. Privately Ambassador Chauvel admitted that the resolution was very bad, that the Trusteeship Council could not possibly implement it, and that in the end a special session would have to be called.

The fight against the Australian resolution was carried by the delegations of Sweden and the Netherlands, with sporadic assistance from Uruguay, Guatemala, the United States, and Britain, and with tentative gestures by Bolivia and Cuba. But the chief burden rested on the shoulders of Israel. It was virtually alone in reminding the U. N. of the impossibility of turning the clock back, in pointing out that the men who were offering themselves as the protectors of the Holy Places were the same who had led the attack on them. Even the presence

of Jordan as a recognized spokesman, only because its forces had seized and held the Holy Places, failed to arouse the delegates to the absurdity of their plan. And certainly they paid no attention to the thrice iterated declarations of Jordan that it would not accept internationalization. The Conciliation Commission staff, on whose work \$850,000 was spent, and which strongly opposed the plan, was never consulted, nor was its proposal considered. Neither was General Riley, chief of the U. N. Armistice Commission, asked to give any advice, although he had been recalled to be on hand for this purpose.

LARGE responsibility for the final decision must be borne by the United States. To be sure, John Ross, the American representative, expressed vigorous opposition to the Australian proposal. But American action did not go beyond this. The delegation failed to offer a constructive proposal acceptable to both parties which could be a rallying point for votes. Although it twice expressed "satisfaction" with the Swedish proposal, it never accepted it as a substitute for the Conciliation Commission plan, to which the United States firmly adhered even when no chance remained of the plan's adoption.

Israel, sitting for the first time in a full session of the Assembly, can be forgiven for not realizing that procedures can determine the outcome of a discussion. But the American delegation cannot be excused. The lack of leadership by the United States was made more evident when in the Ad Hoc Committee, having heard what had gone on in the subcommittee, it failed to move for a decision which would have allowed consideration of other proposals. Had a proposal been made on December 5 assuring a different order of precedence in the voting, the Swedish-Netherlands proposal could have won a majority, since the Vatican steam-roller had not yet gone into action.

Although the Australians insist that the American delegation worked hard to defeat their proposal both in the Ad Hoc Committee and in the plenary session, this is difficult to credit. Nor is it easy to understand how, in a real test of influence as between the Vatican and the United States, countries like Liberia, Burma, Haiti, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Greece could have rejected the American position.

At four o'clock on Friday, December 9, an important member of the United States government told the writer that after a discussion with the State Department he was convinced the department was making no real effort to influence a single vote. Behind this attitude is the personal animus against Israel harbored by the left-overs of the Loy Henderson-Lovett period, whose machinations in every previous debate had been circumvented by the President. Secondly, there is the

consideration that the current defeat on Jerusalem offers the State Department leverage to be used with Israel at some not too distant period to win concessions on other issues. Since the Jerusalem problem is bound to come up again, an attempt will doubtless be made to get these concessions in exchange for real support on Jerusalem.

Lending credence to this view was the American attitude on the question of financing internationalization. In the Budget Committee the American delegate, John Sherman Cooper, asked pertinent questions. Had the committee taken into account that its appropriations might not be sufficient in the event of opposition by Jordan and Israel? Had the Conciliation Commission been consulted? Answers to both questions were in the negative. Yet Cooper voted to recommend the figure of \$8,150,000, which was based on a so-called "normal" situation. This was explained as purely a technical vote, having no political significance. In the plenary session John Ross, opposing internationalization, referred to its probably enormous cost and to the fact that Israeli expenditures in Jerusalem were four times the amount proposed to be allocated by the U. N. Yet when the appropriations came to a vote in the final session, the United States delegation was the only one opposed to the

resolution which voted for the appropriation, and this in the knowledge that it would have to contribute 40 per cent.

When, in the last moments of yesterday's session, it appeared that Vatican pressure would assure victory for the Australian resolution, a belated effort was made by the delegations of Uruguay and Denmark to obtain postponement of the decision and to call a special session. The United States backed the proposal with its vote. Had it openly sponsored it, taken the floor to seek support, the outcome might have been different. Voting for the resolution in silence was not enough to secure its passage.

If a special session of the United Nations is held, the most that will emerge is a plan for protection of and freedom of access to the Holy Places. The present decision strikes hard at the prestige of the United Nations. It raises questions far exceeding in importance the ultimate solution of the Jerusalem question. Having once acknowledged the dominance of the Vatican, what assurance is there of freedom of discussion and decision by the international body on other issues in which the Vatican has an interest? The immediate problem the U. N. faces is to destroy the Vatican's power of coercion.

For additional copies of this reprint write to
The Nation Associates, 20 Vesey Street, New York 7, N. Y.



BEN GURION ORDERS FORMER GERMAN HOSPITAL IN JERUSALEM CONVERTED INTO HIS OFFICE

JERUSALEM, Dec. 14. (JTA) -- Premier David Ben Gurion was reported tonight to have ordered the former German Hospital here, situated in the "Street of the Prophets" and a five-minute walk from the Old City walls, to be converted for his temporary offices.

At the inauguration of an industrial center, where he was granted the "freedom" of the city by Mayor Daniel Auster, the Premier declared that "Jerusalem is not only the capital of the Israel world and of world Jewry, but it aspires to become the spiritual capital of the entire world, as envisaged by the Prophets. Israel," he continued, "faces a supreme test on the economic front, without under-estimating the political struggle arising from the Government's move to Jerusalem, but we hope that justice will prevail, despite the opposition of this strange union of Arabs, Catholics and Communists."

SPECIAL U.N. ASSEMBLY TO RECONSIDER JERUSALEM ISSUE MAY BE CONVENED IN MARCH

LAKE SUCCESS, Dec. 14. (JTA) -- The opinion that a special United Nations General Assembly session will be necessary next spring for the purpose of reconsidering the Jerusalem issue became more widespread among diplomats here today as it became obvious that the U.N. Trusteeship Council will not be able to enforce the decision to place Jerusalem under international trusteeship.

Ambassador Roger Garreau, president of the Trusteeship Council, today indicated that there was a strong possibility that the U.N. General Assembly would be convened probably late in March to deal again with the Jerusalem problem. He hinted that the Council would make great modifications in the plan for the internationalization of Jerusalem. However, the prevailing opinion here is that even if the plan is amended it is doubtful if the Trusteeship Council can carry it out in view of the opposition of Israel and Transjordan.

Representatives of the United States and Britain do not hesitate to express their opinion that many of the necessary revisions of the internationalization plan, including diplomatic bargaining, could best be done outside the Trusteeship Council, which will meet here in secret session tomorrow morning and regularly thereafter until December 23 to exchange views on general principles concerning the Jerusalem question.

SECRETARY OF STATE SAYS U.S. WILL COOPERATE WITH TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL ON JERUSALEM

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14. (JTA) -- Secretary of State Dean Acheson said today that the United States will cooperate constructively with the United Nations Trusteeship Council on the Jerusalem internationalization issue although this government voted against internationalization. He made the statement in response to a question at his press conference today.

Mr. Acheson said the American representative on the Trusteeship Council will be instructed to participate in efforts to draft a statute covering the internationalization of Jerusalem. A reporter asked Mr. Acheson if he thought the U.N. could enforce internationalization. The Secretary replied that he did not think he should be asked to draw such a conclusion.

IRAQI ROYAL DECREE ANNOUNCES ACCEPTANCE OF RESIGNATION OF HEAD OF JEWISH COMMUNITY

LONDON, Dec. 14. (JTA) -- The Baghdad radio, monitored here, today reported that a royal decree had been issued accepting the resignation of Rabbi Sassoon Khuduri from the presidency of the Jewish community of Baghdad.

here he, so to speak, talked to every tree and shrub, where he painstakingly toiled on soil and enriched and broadened his "sixth" sense, that of imagination, which he daily transformed into his humanly portraited cartoons. It was there where, according to his admission, he tried to find a solution of things mystifying his philosophical mind.

Hal's life was a circle and everyone who was in that circle was his friend. He was a humanitarian and personally I have honored him as one of my best advisers and teachers. His life with all of its virtues will remain a shining example of what a man's goal should be.

I am certain of the fact that when Jan. 1 arrives, many of Hal's friends and acquaintances will think of his accomplishments and will pay silent tribute to the simplest man—the farmer from Aurora.

JOHN F. KRATKY.

11305 Glenboro Drive.

Jerusalem Seizure Hit

Editor Plain Dealer—Sir: There must be many Jews in America who awakened, on this past Christmas morning with heavy hearts and belabored minds. I am one of these Jews.

As a native born American, living in this great land and keenly appreciating the many advantages that Providence has visited upon me and mine as a member of a minority faith in a predominantly Christian country, I joined wholeheartedly with my Christian friends and neighbors in the happiness and joy that symbolizes the Christmas spirit. At least for a short period in the year, it creates a feeling of good will and fellowship amongst all people.

My heart is heavy, however, and my mind confused because of what I hear and read of the actions of other Jews in other places in the world, and especially in the state of Israel.

I feel no kinship with these people other than that based upon the knowledge I have that my parents and all my progenitors for centuries past, and I too, since infancy, had been taught to worship my God and to interpret the teachings of His sages and prophets in the same manner and upon the same humane and moral standards that they worship and interpret. This results in me being called a Jew, just as they are.

I feel no kinship with these people based upon any nationalistic identity and recognize them solely as members of another nation established for the same reasons and upon the same basis of hope for their future, and that of their land as has inspired many other groups of people in past history to throw off shackles of restraint both mental and physical, and create new and free nations. I join with all people in wishing and hoping for their ultimate success and prosperity.

My mind is belabored because I have lived through two catastrophic world wars. I have been naive enough to believe that civilized humanity is finally sated with war and devastation and hungers for peace and contentment.

I have once seen the destruction of this hope for permanent peace on earth when selfish national interest scuttled the League of Nations. My hopes and ideals were again revived with the establishment of the United Nations and its seeming success, in spite of its many weaknesses.

Now, again, I see the probable destruction of this great humanitarian effort, and by whom! Again by a group with selfish national interests, yet a group which owes its present existence in major part to the honorable action of the very institution it so boldly flaunts and could destroy by indirectness.

The people of Israel, all Jews, well knowing the present impotence of the United Nations and its findings, or to make belligerent members conform to its determinations have chosen this Christmas

season to sieze the city of Jerusalem, and make this ancient center the capital of their newly created state.

While it is historically true that Jerusalem was the seat of ancient Judea, and the capital of the then constituted people of Israel, yet they have had no active sovereignty there for nearly 2,000 years. With the birth of Christendom, this historic city became the sacred religious center for many other religious groups in the world. It and its environs have just as many sacred places for these groups as it has for the Jews.

From the economic or political aspect, the city of Jerusalem has little if any national or international value. Of its present population of about 200,000 persons, less than 5,000 are Jews who have lived there for longer than 25 years. The remaining population is made up of divergent groups with varied religious affiliations, but who have inhabited the area for centuries.

To the state of Israel, it has only an emotional urge, and one based upon an attempt to again reconstruct the kingdom of Judea upon a modern plan.

I join in the hope that this ancient city, holding sentimental and emotional urges for all civilized humanity, be internationalized and placed under the control of the United Nations. It seems to me to come with poor grace and with no valid justification for the Jewish state of Israel to take unto itself the sole possession and control of this city. There were born the moral, religious and emotional values that all people hope to attain on earth. They only follow different paths on their respective routes to this accomplishment.

I hope too, that those many Americans who gave of their hearts and minds to help create this new state of Israel will again exert the same zeal and ardor in persuading these people to abandon their selfish interest, lest the responsibility for the destruction of man's present hope for peace by and through the United Nations, and the creation of World War III with its attendant destruction of all mankind be laid at their doorstep.

It may seem strange for me, a Jew, to write this, but I cannot restrain the emotional urge to do so.

A. W. HALMAN.

Citizens Building.