



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 II: Harold P. Manson File (Zionism Files), 1940-1949, undated.

Sub-series A: Main Manson File, 1940-1949.

Reel
101

Box
35

Folder
94

Palestine Resolution, 1943-1944.

October 6, 1943

Honorable Adolph J. Sabath
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C/

Dear Adolph:

I herewith give you a tentative form of resolution to be approved by our group. It should be either in the form of a bill which would have to have the signature of the President or in the form of a Concurrent Resolution which would be without the President's signature.

We should carefully canvass the situation and see whether or not the resolution should be offered in and passed by the Senate and then considered by the House or whether or not to offer it concurrently in the House and Senate. Then we must determine whose name shall be affixed to it. We should consider also whether it should have the names of a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

The tentative form follows:

Whereas, in 1917, the British Government promulgated the Balfour Declaration to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and

Whereas, on the 21st day of September, 1922, the Congress of the United States approved the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and

Whereas, on December 23, 1924, a convention was signed by the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Austen Chamberlain, and the then Secretary of State of the United States, Frank B. Kellogg, Article 15 and SubArticle 7 of Article 28 of which read as follows:

Article 15

The mandatory shall see that no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious beliefs.

SubArticle 7 of Article 28

Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as

recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States, and

Whereas, the British Government was designated by the League of Nations as a Mandated Power for Palestine and was thus declared a trustee for the interest of Jews in Palestine, and

Whereas, that Mandate together with the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people was approved by fifty-one nations, and

Whereas, in 1939 the British Colonial Office promulgated the MacDonald White Paper, limiting immigration of Jews into Palestine to 75,000 at the rate of 25,000 a year until the Spring of 1944 when such immigration shall be dependent upon the will of the Arab majority, and

Whereas, the aforesaid MacDonald White Paper was presented to the Permanent Mandates Commission for approval, which Commission refused to accept it and emphatically repudiated it as a violation of the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration, and

Whereas, former Prime Minister Lloyd George and Ramsay MacDonald likewise stated that the MacDonald White Paper was a violation of the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration and Prime Minister Winston Churchill characterized it as a "breach of faith" it is the sense of Congress

1. To reaffirm its approval of the Balfour Declaration
2. That the MacDonald White Paper be deemed a violation of the sanctity of covenants as well as a repudiation thereof.

3. The solemn covenant contained in the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine is founded on the inalienable right of the Jewish people, based on an unbroken historic connection, to reconstitute their national home in Palestine.

4. By international Convention of 1924, Great Britain may make no changes in the status of Palestine without the consent of the United States Government. The White Paper is a complete reversal of Palestine's status and is therefore a clear violation of Great Britain's covenant with the United States

5. It is repugnant to the concepts of the Four Freedoms that Palestine shall become the one land on earth, outside of Axis-dominated nations, where, by specific legislation, Jews are to be denied admission.

6. In the face of disasters that have befallen the Jews of Europe, it is unconscionable that they shall be deprived of the hope of eventually finding peace and freedom in the future Jewish Homeland.

The aforesaid is simply a rough draft and may be full of bugs that could be cleaned out after conference.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER

EMANUEL CELLER
10TH DISTRICT NEW YORK

MEMBER OF
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

WASHINGTON SECRETARIES:
BESSIE EFFRAT MARGARET BROOKS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK OFFICE:
1450 BROADWAY
NEW YORK CITY

1524 NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON

NEW YORK SECRETARIES:
JACOB GRALLA MARY DOUGHERTY

October 12, 1943

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver
Cleveland Temple
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Dr. Silver:

Enclosed please find copy of letter I sent to
Congressman Sabath in which you expressed interest.



Sincerely yours,

Emanuel Celler
EMANUEL CELLER

COPY FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Abel Wolman
Consulting Engineer
Baltimore, Md. 18

211 Latrobe Hall
The Johns Hopkins University

December 6, 1943

Mr. Emanuel Neumann
Commission on Palestine Surveys
521 Fifth Avenue, Room 1903
New York, N. Y.

My dear Mr. Neumann:

I apologize for the delay in replying to your letter of November 9, but I have been down in the Tennessee Valley Authority during the period since its receipt.

I see no objection to the development of a session with the President, in which I should be glad to participate, if it could be arranged.

I am advised by certain individuals, close to the White House, that an effort to have such a session would not be inadvisable.

I look forward to hearing from you further.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

(signed) Abel Wolman

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN
Incorporated
1819 Broadway
New York

C O P Y

631 Boston Blvd. W.,
Detroit 2, Mich.,
December 17, 1943.

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver,
American Zionist Emergency Council,
41 East 42nd St.,
New York 17, N.Y.

Dear Doctor Silver:

May I express to you my deep thanks for your letter of congratulation. The position of leadership of a great organization, such as ours, is both a challenge and a responsibility. My strongest efforts will be directed toward the maintenance of the spirit of unity that has always been one of the chief objectives of the National Council of Jewish Women.

In behalf of our organization, I wish to extend our appreciation for your thoughtful comments on the Resolution on Palestine, as adopted by our delegate body at our Seventeenth Triennial Convention, and for your friendly offer of cooperation.

Cordiall yours,

MGW/ML

Mrs. Joseph M. Welt,
NATIONAL PRESIDENT.

CS
12/24/43

Exhibit 100

Copy

December 17, 1943

Mr. Henry Montor
American Zionist Emergency Council
342 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Montor:

It is indeed regrettable that Rabbi Silver did not come to Washington this week. I had been informed by Rabbi Feuer, who spoke to Rabbi Silver on the telephone, that he would come to Washington to spend two days, namely, Tuesday and Wednesday. Accordingly, I made preparations for Dr. Silver to meet with Congressman Joseph Martin of Massachusetts, Minority Leader. Moreover, at my suggestion, Martin was prepared to invite a few of the key men of his party to meet with Dr. Silver, preferably at a luncheon.

Joe Martin is sympathetic and ready to cooperate with us and will support a resolution if and when introduced. However, he, like other members of Congress I met, requested the text of such a resolution.

While it is true that the minority party is always more generous, nevertheless, in this instance it is more than that. Congressman Martin regards the approval of the Jewish National Home by the United States as a Republican policy, in view of the fact that the original Palestine Resolution was adopted by a Republican Congress, under Republican leadership. It was Martin's view that the Republicans have much more to offer us than the party in power. One may agree, or disagree with it. However, it is interesting.

Senator Lodge was ready to invite to a luncheon, at which Rabbi Silver was to be the guest, the following Senators: Buckley of Delaware, Milliken from Colorado, Hawks from New Jersey, and Robertson from Wyoming. However, as you know, it had to be cancelled.

It may be of interest to know that it was the opinion of Senator Lodge that these four would be on our side. He was also of the opinion that Senator Johnson of California would support a resolution. Senator Johnson is ill and practically incapacitated. He very seldom attends the sessions of the Senate. However, he does put in an appearance occasionally when matters of great importance appear on the calendar.

In substance, Senator Johnson said that he supported the Lodge Resolution and would support another one. However, he did not commit himself to vote for any resolution without seeing the text. The

same is true about the above named senators.

As you know, Senator White of Maine is, in principle, with us. Again, in his case, as in others, he would like to see the resolution first as well as to know the opinion of the State Department.

It is my belief that Congressman Martin, as one of the leaders of the Republican Party, would influence Senator White as well as most of the Republican Senators and members of the House.

I sincerely hope that it will be possible for Dr. Silver to come to Washington in order to make these contacts.

Dr. Feuer made me conversant with the proceedings at the Cleveland Conference last Sunday. I understand it was an impressive assembly.

I should like to make a few suggestions relative to tactics, so to speak. The time has come when we can no longer speak in general terms; we must get down to particulars. As far as general terms are concerned, I venture to say that the membership of both the House and Senate are mainly in sympathy with our cause. It is another way of saying that they are in favor in principle. However, as you well know, there is a tremendous distance between being in favor in principle and being in favor of the concrete. Hence, in my opinion, it is imperative that our leadership should arrive at an agreement with reference to the text of a resolution to be introduced, if and when it becomes advisable.

It would seem to be advisable that the text of this resolution be forwarded to key men throughout the country for the purpose of advising them that a Jewish committee approach its congressmen and senators, while they are at home during Christmas vacation. This will be of much greater value as compared to discussion in the general. The time has come when our legislators in Washington should be confronted by us with specific demands and called upon to do a specific thing.

I am persuaded, and I hope I am wrong, that we have nothing to expect from the State Department and nothing to hope for. The very contemplation of introduction of a resolution in the United States Congress is predicated on the conviction that the office of the Secretary of State is hostile to our cause and is giving comfort to our enemies.

So long as Mr. Murray has jurisdiction over Palestine in the State Department, and so long as Colonel Hoskins is the spokesman of the Secretary of State in London with regard to Palestine, one has no right to entertain any optimism with reference to the attitude of the United States towards the Jewish National Home. It follows, therefore, that we must resort to action by the United States Congress, and in particular, by the United States Senate - and an action which would be legally binding on those who are charged with the conduct of our foreign affairs, including the President of the United States.

Of course, the element of safety accompanies non-action. However, real achievement always involves boldness of imagination and daring in action.

THIS IS AN ELECTION YEAR!

While it is absolutely true that no one can absolutely guarantee the

outcome in advance, nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to assume that, if we do mobilize our forces and exert direct pressure on every congressman and senator, that we have a right to anticipate success. At any rate, a pending resolution can always be withdrawn, should it at any time become advisable. In the talk of Dr. Silver with President Roosevelt, should it come to pass, Dr. Silver's position would be strengthened a great deal by the fact that a Palestine resolution is already pending in the Senate, and the fact that the Zionists are mobilizing their forces would give our spokesman an additional advantage. Even President Roosevelt is inclined to be realistic in an election year.

I am disturbed by the delay, for even under ideal conditions, a meeting between President Roosevelt and Dr. Silver may not take place until the latter part of January, since the President is overwhelmed with manifold problems. The present sessions of Congress cannot last much longer than May, 1944. Since this is an election year, both parties will be anxious to close the session of Congress as soon as possible in order to enable them to devote time to the preparation of their respective National Conventions. In fact, many a congressman and a senator will go to their respective homes for the purpose of attempting to line up local politics, as early as March. In many of the states, the campaign for delegates to both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions will then already be in progress. Moreover, the legislative calendar is overcrowded. The tendency in an election year is to eliminate as much work as possible. It should therefore appear obvious that a delay, even of one month, at this time may be dangerous. Hence, I would suggest, the inadvisability of waiting with the introduction of the Palestine resolution until after the contemplated conference with the President. Again, I emphasize that Congress then will lack the temporal opportunity to deal with our Palestine resolution, because of the multitude of work and the brevity of the session.

A resolution, after being filed, may be withdrawn at any time; a resolution cannot be filed at any time.

I should like to make a few observations with reference to the text of such a resolution. It is my considered judgment that the resolution should contain the following basic elements:

1. The incorporation of the first Palestine Resolution by reference, and its reaffirmation.
2. A reference to the terrible plight of the Jewish people in Europe and particularly to their tragic homelessness.
3. A demand for complete freedom of Jewish immigration into Palestine under the control of the Jewish Agency, and the unlimited opportunity for land purchase and colonization.
4. To the end that in due time Palestine shall be reconstituted as a Jewish Commonwealth.

I have deliberately omitted reference to the Balfour Declaration and to the Mandate, as well as to the White Paper, for the reason that these are documents issued by foreign governments and the United States is not a signatory. This is in harmony with the established rules of international law. Moreover, it will serve no useful purpose for us in placing the Congress of the United States in a position where it will be called upon to condemn the acts or the conduct of a friendly ally like Great Britain; Congress may be reluctant

to attempt to interpret the terms of the Mandate and the soundness of their application by the Mandatory. A resolution containing the four elements I suggested will serve our purpose admirably, saying the things we want Congress to say, but it will say them in positive terms, rather than negative. A reaffirmation of the Lodge Palestine Resolution is indeed a reaffirmation of the Balfour Declaration. A demand for freedom of immigration and freedom of land purchase and colonization is certainly a condemnation of the British White Paper of May, 1939. Then, finally, defining our goal to be the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine constitutes a very satisfactory definition of the purpose of the Jewish National Home.

Thus, through such a resolution the Congress of the United States will, of course, radically disagree with the policies pursued by the Mandatory in Palestine, without being disagreeable.

A reference to the Convention of 1925 between the United States and Great Britain, with reference to Palestine, seems to me ill-advised. The Secretary of State more than once interpreted this Convention to be nothing more than a treaty dealing with the commercial and economic interests of the United States, and that the terms of this document have no application to matters political. Whether or not one is in agreement with this interpretation, it is clear that an argumentative matter of this kind, if included, will not enhance the resolution.

Of course, the resolution, if and when introduced, should be accompanied by a "Brief" that will contain every argument in our favor, including reference to the Convention of 1925, and all other arguments. We may well present in that brief an indictment against the Mandatory and point out its many flagrant violations of the provisions of the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration. However, arguments, however valid, have no place in the resolution itself, for the reasons supra.

I should be glad to prepare a draft of such a resolution, if requested to do so.

Meanwhile, our enemies sleep not and slumber not. Colonel Hoskins' thesis that any action favorable to the Jews in Palestine will endanger the lives of the American soldiers stationed in the Near East has taken roots, since it was not resisted. I regard Colonel Hoskins as our uncompromising opponent - an attitude which he entertained for many years ante-dating this war.

I have no confidence in the rumors that Colonel Hoskins has reversed his position in another "Report" and that he is in favor of Jewish immigration into Palestine. These rumors, in my judgment, have no foundation in fact. They are dangerously misleading. The leopard does not change his spots, and Colonel Hoskins has not changed from a pro-Arab protagonist to a friend of the Jewish National Home.

Both the Iraq and the Egyptian Legations are agencies for the purpose of fostering and promoting opposition to a Jewish Palestine. Our Department of State is giving them encouragement. I understand that a Naval attaché has been added to the official family of the Iraq Legation. If it is remembered that Iraq does not even possess a fleet of canoes, then the last addition is indeed a paradoxical one. Personnel in each of the aforesaid legations has been tripled and quadrupled for one purpose only - to engage in activities for the purpose of undermining the Jewish position in Palestine.

The Arabs are represented in Washington unofficially by a wealthy and educated Arab, by the name of Maloof. He is an able and resourceful person,

and has what is commonly called "good connections". You will recall that he was the host of the Arab princes of Saudi Arabia at a reception given by the Arab colony. I met him. I know members of his family who reside in Boston, and who are active in the Arab cause.

The year 1944 will be decisive in the history of the world, and particularly in the history of the Jewish people. We cannot compete with the Arabs in many a field in which they excel. Certainly we cannot compete with oil. There is one trump that we do possess and which can be utilized for our purpose - direct political action in the Congress of the United States through the immediate introduction of a resolution, supra.

With reference to the forthcoming conference of Rabbi Silver and President Roosevelt, may I venture to make some suggestions. These observations might be superfluous. Nevertheless, I should like to offer them. Any promise made through the employment of pleasing words and niceties of expression will have no value, even when made by the President of the United States, as a substitute for a resolution in the United States Congress. We have a right to expect a definite and clear statement from the President of the United States, which should embrace the four points referred to above, and particularly, an unequivocal statement favoring unlimited Jewish immigration and the right of the Jewish people to purchase land in Palestine, and so forth. Such a declaration, in order to possess any validity, should be accompanied by some concrete acts:

- a. The recall of Colonel Hoskins from London and his complete elimination from the civil, economic, and political affairs of Palestine, as well as the Near East.
- b. The exclusion of Palestine from the jurisdiction of Mr. Murray's department.
- c. The elimination of Jews from membership in the various commissions dealing with the Near East in London, Cairo, and other places should cease.
- d. Our diplomatic and consular representatives in the Near East should refrain from collaborating with the enemies of a Jewish Palestine - a pernicious practice in which all of them, particularly the Office of the Consul General in Jerusalem, are presently engaged.

What I am endeavoring to say is that unless statements and promises by the President and Secretary of State are accompanied by concrete deeds, such as I suggested above, the promises and statements, however nicely phrased, will constitute empty words.

I hope to see you soon.

Respectfully yours,

Eliahu D. Stone
Eliahu D. Stone

EDS;njt

*Dear Dr. Silver: - I thought that the enclosed memorandum might be of interest to you. S/Re
Eliahu*

M E M O R A N D U M

December 20, 1943

TO: Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

FROM: Rabbi Leon I. Feuer

Mr. Abe Waldauer, of Memphis, has written in, requesting us to make contact with Mr. Will Gerber, United States District Attorney in Memphis. Mr. Gerber is contemplating a visit to Washington on January 5th or 6th, and Mr. Waldauer had a plan whereby Mr. Gerber was to contact Senators McKellar and Stewart and get them to accompany him to an interview with the Secretary of State. This is the plan which Mr. Waldauer wanted to discuss with you in Cleveland, but didn't get a chance to see you.

You will note that I wrote both Mr. Waldauer and Mr. Gerber that it would be all right for Mr. Gerber to make his contact with the Senators, but that I wanted to clear with you before they made any visit to the State Department.

Please let me know what you think of this.

LIF;njt
Enc. 2

L.I.F.
[Signature]

December 21, 1943

Mr. Elihu D. Stone
3 Powellton Rd.
Dorchester, Mass.

My dear Mr. Stone:

Thank you for sending me a copy of the letter which you addressed to Mr. Montor. I am sorry that I could not come to Washington last week. Pressing matters in New York forced me to change my plans, but I hope to be in Washington on the 10th and 11th of January and I shall be very happy to meet with those people with whom you think I should meet.

I agree with you fully that a resolution should be introduced as soon as possible, preferably right after the holiday season. I called Washington this morning to talk to you about it, but I was told that you had left for Boston. I spoke to Rabbi Feuer and suggested to him that he incorporate the four ideas which you suggest in your letter in a tentative draft resolution to be sent out to our community contact people so that they will have something concrete about which to talk to their Congressmen and Senators who will be home for the holidays. This is not to be the actual resolution, but merely a statement of the ideas that are to be included in the final draft. This communication to the community contact people should go out this week, and I believe that Rabbi Feuer will attend to it when he is in New York tomorrow.

In the meantime, I would suggest that you work on the exact text of the resolution which you have in mind, in cooperation perhaps with some expert draftsman who attends to such things. Mr. Shulman and Judge Rothenberg presented a draft of the resolution at the last meeting of the Emergency Council. It was too long and too argumentative. I agree with you that the resolution should be brief and should avoid unnecessary complications.

With all good wishes for a happy Chanukah, I remain

Most cordially yours,

AHS:BK

December 23, 1943

Mr. Elihu D. Stone
80 Federal Street
Boston, Mass.

My dear Mr. Stone:

I am enclosing herewith the draft of a resolution which I drew. Rabbi Silver suggested that I send you a copy for criticism and for comparison with the draft which you yourself drew. Will you look it over and send it back to me with your suggestions to the office in New York where I will be the early part of next week?

When are you planning to return to Washington? We are going ahead with the campaign on our resolution and it will be important for all of us to be on the spot and to be working as the campaign gets under way.

I hope that this letter finds you fully recovered from your cold. With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

LIF:K

Dictated but not signed by Rabbi Feuer.

December 24, 1943

Rabbi Leon I. Feuer
Collingwood Avenue Temple
Collingwood and Acklin Avenues
Toledo, Ohio

My dear Leon:

With reference to Mr. Gerber's visit to Washington - I agree with you that it would be a fine thing for him to contact Senators McKeller and Stewart and talk to them about the resolutions which we propose to introduce. I do not think that he should call on Mr. Hull. As you probably know, we are planning an official visit to Mr. Hull which Mr. Rosenman has suggested, and which we hope to make after the holidays. I would suggest that you write to Mr. Gerber suggesting to him that for the time being a visit to Mr. Hull be postponed, but that he should by all means contact the Senators.

With all good wishes, I remain

Very cordially yours,

AHS:BK

December 24, 1943

Mr. Elihu D. Stone
80 Federal Street
Boston, Mass.

My dear Mr. Stone:

In all probability we shall wish to introduce our resolution as soon as Congress reconvenes. In all probability a brief resolution similar to yours or Feuer's draft will be introduced. I would appreciate it if you would let me know the names of eight or ten Senators and eight or ten Congressmen who should be invited to sponsor such a resolution. We might wish to contact them before January 10.

With all good wishes, I remain

Very cordially yours,

AHS:BK

ELIHU D. STONE

ATTORNEY AT LAW

44 SCHOOL STREET

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

December 24, 1943

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver
The Temple
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Dr. Silver

I assume that you have already received the text of the proposed resolution relative to Palestine, which I forwarded to Montor.

You will note the within resolution lacks the usual characteristics of similar resolutions adopted at Zionist conventions. The reason for it is obvious. An act of the United States Congress is substantive in character and not adjective.

The enclosed resolution contains six paragraphs covering six distinct points.

First: It directly reaffirms and it incorporates the first Palestine resolution by reference.

Second: It defines ^{the} logically ~~the~~ implications of the policy promulgated in the first one. You will note that this paragraph, in which reference is made to "the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine", is a quotation from the Preamble of the Mandate. Hence, it is not advisable to make any alterations in the language.

Third: Succint reference is made to the tragedy of Jewish homelessness. It expresses the United States' concern in the problem of Jewish homelessness and therefore in the problem of Jewish immigration. This proposition logically leads up to the points that follow.

Fourth and fifth: It clearly demands the freedom of Jewish immigration into Palestine and the freedom of purchasing and acquiring land in Palestine by Jews.

I am in doubt whether or not the reference to the "Jewish Agency for Palestine" will be acceptable for

December 24, 1943

-2-

the reason that the Jewish Agency for Palestine is exclusively a creature of the Palestine Mandate. In view of the fact that the United States is not officially a party to the Mandate nor a signatory to any of the instruments associated with the Mandate, it is questionable whether or not the designation "Jewish Agency for Palestine" will be satisfactory. At any rate, it is advisable for the present to employ this term and if it becomes necessary later on, a substitution will be found.

Sixth: This paragraph is indeed the climax. It constitutes the teeth of the resolution. It makes it obligatory on the Government of the United States to translate the objective of this resolution into the reality of action. For obvious reasons I used the term "Government of the United States" instead of using the term "President of the United States" or "Secretary of State". It is not advisable to particularize, in my judgment. It is quite possible that subsequent to the introduction to this resolution the Committee on Foreign Relations may include some qualifying terms such as, "as soon as practicable" or the term "when practicable". However, it is not in our interests to include terms of limitation.

You will note the resolution is closed with a climax--the Jewish Commonwealth. Without being guilty of vanity, I may be pardoned in stating that the inclusion of the term Commonwealth comes as a logical sequence and in a most palatable manner. I know that there is a difference of opinion with reference to the inclusion in the resolution of the term "Jewish Commonwealth". It is my conviction that the omission of the term "Jewish Commonwealth" would place the Zionist leadership, and particularly yourself, in an awkward position. Certainly after the struggle at the American Jewish Conference and the fight which was so brilliantly put up under your leadership, it would be paradoxical for us not to include a demand for the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. Both friends and enemies would accuse us of being maximalists before Jews and minimalists before non-Jews.

I respectfully suggest the advisability of calling a special meeting of the Emergency Committee as soon as it is convenient, for the purpose of presenting the resolution for their consideration and approval.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the Connally Resolution which was adopted recently by the United States Senate. A study of the records indicates that the various Committees on Foreign Relations use various forms and styles. I followed the form and the style of the within Connally Resolution.

December 24, 1943

-3-

I am conscious of the fact that there are among us "experts" who may find fault with the form. I am therefore enclosing the Connally Resolution for the purpose of showing that the present Committee on Foreign Relations regards the form as used in my resolution as satisfactory.

You may always rely on my loyalty and cooperation. If for some reason or other you should wish me to come to Cleveland, I should be glad to comply with your request.

You will pardon me for emphasizing to you again the fact that time is of the essence. We cannot wait; we must not wait. In view of all the circumstances, a resolution should be introduced. There is no alternative. We have nothing to lose. I should appreciate hearing from you.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

Elihu D. Stone

ELIHU D. STONE

WRHS



EDS:ir
Enc.

COPY

UNITED CEMENT, LIME AND GYPSUM WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION

CHICAGO ILL.

December 30, 1943

Mr. Adolph Held, Chairman,
Jewish Labor Committee
175 East Broadway
New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir and Brother:

I acknowledge the receipt of your favor of December 28, 1943.

In accordance with the request contained therein, we have addressed our Resolution to Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, with a copy to President Green; copy is also being mailed to you, although not shown on the original.

Trusting that our action will have its proper effect, and wishing your organization continued success, I remain

Fraternally yours,

c/s Wm. Schoenberg
General President

cc to Mr. William Green

C
O
P
Y

THE ARIZONA DAILY STAR
State Consolidated Publishing Company

Tucson, Arizona

March 28, 1944.

The Editors,
The New Republic,
40 East 49th Street,
New York.

Gentlemen:

I have just noticed in your issue of March 20th the article entitled "Danger in the Near East."

When you say: "Actually these resolutions do no more than repeat the expression of the United States Congress in 1922," I cannot help wondering whether you have read the two resolutions.

I have taken the trouble to read both resolutions. The one adopted in 1922 is, as you say, an expression of gratuitous advice to the British about the Jews.

The Wagner-Taft resolution now before Congress goes much further. It reads: "That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures..." The word "shall" denotes compulsion. The two words "appropriate measures," when used by governments can mean anything up to and including war.

The resolution continues: "That the doors to Palestine shall be open for free entry of Jews." There again the word "shall" denotes compulsion, while the words, "free entry of Jews" denote unlimited entry of Jews, regardless of their status, whether they are refugees or not. The resolution concludes by stating that this "shall" be done "that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

If it is going to be a free and democratic commonwealth, why must the word "Jewish" be used? If it is going to be a Jewish commonwealth, are we American people going to force the Jews upon unwilling Arabs?

2. The New Republic.

The difference between this Wagner-Taft resolution and the resolution of 1922 that said merely that we favored the establishment of a Jewish homeland, provided that the rights of other people in Palestine were not disturbed, is thus the difference between a resolution of sympathy and a binding obligation under-written by all of the people and wealth of the United States

Do the American people realize the difference between the two resolutions?

As a working editor, I have gone so far as to explain the difference to the people of our community, and I should say that the people of this section are militantly opposed to the power of our government being used for such an extreme purpose.

As a working editor, in contact with the people, I would say that it is just such trickery that arouses the distrust of the American people and foments the growth of isolationism.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) WILLIAM R. MATHEWS,
Editor and Publisher.

Copied
4/21/44
BI



[undated]

RESOLUTION ON PALESTINE OF THE COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN
TRIENNIAL CONVENTION IN CHICAGO

The convention adopted the following recommendations of the board of directors on the Palestine question:

"1. We record ourselves in favor of and urge the immediate abrogation of the White Paper of 1939. 2. We record ourselves in favor of the unrestricted immigration of Jews into Palestine. 3, We record ourselves in favor of the uninterrupted and continued upbuilding of Palestine in the spirit of the Balfour Declaration."

