



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
105

Box
36

Folder
270

Sack, Leo, 1945.

Sack

See Sack's letter
of Oct. 3, 1946

For Proposed meeting at Constitution Hall, Sunday April 15, 45 - Called off later because of Franklin Roosevelt's death

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR FERGUSON

The chief victim of the war in Europe, now happily drawing to a victorious termination for us and our allies, has been the Jew.

For more than twelve years Hitler has waged war against the Jew. This war began on the day the maniac Hitler and his Nazi hoodlums assumed power in Germany. For him it was a war of extermination. He announced his intention of exterminating the Jews of Europe. After his contemplated extermination of the Jews his conception of a Greater Germany which would rule the world for the next thousand years, included the reduction to a slave-state status of our several allies on the continent of Europe, and thence the United States and our neighbors on the continents of North and South America.

Happily, our allies in Europe are being liberated. They are regaining their independence and their right to live once again as free men and women. Happily, we on the American Hemispheres need no longer fear that the madman will bring his uniformed gangsters to our shores.

Unhappily, however, there is no rainbow in the skies for Hitler's first victims.

Unhappily, a new day has not yet dawned for our first Allies, the Jews. and unhappily, there is no relief in sight for that minority of the Jews of Europe who still survive after the most cruel, the most ruthless, the most diabolical and the most systematic program of mass extermination of a people in the world's history.

None of us know how many Jews are still alive in Europe. The percentage is low, all too low. The Jew has been virtually exterminated in Germany and in Poland and in the other occupied and satellite countries. In the Balkans the casualties among Jews is staggering.

Little by little, as parts of Europe are freed, the gruesome history of the plight of the Jew in Hitler-occupied areas comes to light. As the armies of liberation move across the continent of Europe, there comes to light also the plight of those wrecks of humanity who survived the Hitler scourge. These people, all reports agree, are broken in spirit and broken in body. All of them are broken economically. They have been stripped of the means of livelihood.

Few of them could, even if they would, take up life where it left off for them before the coming of Hitler. Already we know, in reports from the Balkans and in reports from France, that the deadly virus of anti-Semitism is so deeply planted that the Jew cannot rehabilitate himself as a people in Europe.

For those who have survived there must be a new day in a new land. These people literally must begin life anew. Any person who knows anything whatsoever about the world in which we live today knows that it is impossible for great numbers of Jews to resume their lives in the United States, in Canada, in the British Colonial possessions and in our Latin neighbor countries to the South. The immigration laws of this country and of all countries are so severe that economic selfishness, aside from blind unreasoning racial prejudices, will prevent the mass exodus of European Jews to any of these countries.

There is only one place on earth where the homeless Jew of Europe can go en masse and live once again as free men and women. There is only one place where these people will literally be welcomed with open arms.

That place is Palestine. And it is to Palestine, the land of their fathers, where the eyes of the unfortunate Jews of Europe are now turned.

Under these circumstances, one would think, in view of the conditions which prevail throughout the world, in view of the terrific price the Jew has paid to Hitler, in view of the enormous contribution which the Jews of Palestine made as Allies of the United Nations even though they have not been accorded the recognition due to valiant Allies, that the United States and Great Britain would be bending

every energy and giving all possible assistance to the re-creation of Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews and as a Jewish Commonwealth as has so long been contemplated. Unfortunately, this is not true.

Unfortunately, insofar as we are able to judge and the record shows, just the opposite is true.

Unfortunately, it appears that Great Britain, aided by the United States, is doing everything possible to prevent the realization of this age-old ambition to the fulfillment of this great humanitarian and political policy.

Unfortunately, there is every reason to believe that insofar as Britain and the United States is concerned, Palestine is, in truth and in fact, our forgotten Ally.

Unfortunately, it appears that Britain and the United States, regardless of what high officialdom of each nation may say to the contrary, are in a conspiracy not only to prevent the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth, but also to continue making the Jew a political football.

No other interpretation of the events of the past few years can be placed on the publicly known attitude of the governments of Washington and of London and those governments as well as officials of those governments should hang their heads in shame. As a member of the United States Senate, I, for one, am thoroughly ashamed of that policy. Now, let us look at the facts for a moment.

The establishment of Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews with an eventual Commonwealth status is a political conception of the first World War. It was a joint creation of the then President of the United States, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, and the then head of the British Empire, Mr. David Lloyd George, who conducted negotiations in response to a world-wide demand that steps be taken to alleviate the plight of the suffering Jews of Europe by setting aside their centuries-old home, Palestine, as a national home for the Jews.

As a result of the negotiations between this Government and the British Government, there was promulgated on November 2, 1917, by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the late Arthur James Balfour, that has since become known as the Balfour Declaration. This declaration, although issued in the name of the British Government, was, insofar as I am able to ascertain, a declaration also of policy on the part of the Government of the United States, because President Wilson and our own Department of State were party to its promulgation. Let me read what the Balfour Declaration says. I quote:

"His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country."

The Balfour Declaration brought hope and happiness to millions of Jews throughout the world. To the homeless and oppressed it was the rainbow in the storm-covered sky of the Jewish world. Equally, it was hailed by Protestant and Catholic men and women of good will throughout the world. They were like you and me, in thinking that at long last, the age-old crime of a Christian civilization against the Jewish people was about to be righted.

After the World War, first at the Versailles Peace Conference, and then at subsequent international gatherings, steps were taken by the Allied and Associated Nations to carry into practical effect the principles of the Balfour Declaration. It is well to note here that in all these conversations by the spokesmen of the British Government and the spokesman of the American Government, and the other Allied Powers, it was intended that Palestine would be a homeland for the Jews in the fullest sense of the world.

It is well to note, too, that the spokesmen for the Arab world were apparently just as happy that this was coming to pass as were the spokesmen for the Jewish world. At the Versailles Conference there actually was entered into by the spokesmen for the Jews and spokesmen for the Arabs what can well be known as a treaty of peace and amity. There were exchanged letters by the then foremost champion of the Arab cause and a leading spokesman for the Zionist organization of America.

At the Versaille Conference the Mandatory policy was agreed upon in which certain nations were to be given spheres of influence. Now mark this -- England was given the Mandate for Palestine, and although the United States government did not become a participant of the League of Nations, it did reserve for itself the right to approve the Mandate over Palestine, having kept itself fully informed concerning the development of the Mandate.

Following the agreement on a mandatory policy a convention was negotiated by the then Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the British Secretary of State, whereby the United States approved the Mandate for Palestine. This convention was approved by the Senate of the United States on February 20, 1925. It was ratified by the President of the United States on March 2nd, and by Great Britain on March 28th. The ratifications were exchanged at London on December 3rd, and the convention was proclaimed by President Calvin Coolidge on December 5th, 1925. It thus became the law of the land insofar as the United States Government is concerned.

Prior to ratification of the Mandate by the United States and Great Britain, the Congress of the United States unanimously passed what has since become known as the Lodge resolution which resolved:

"That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy

places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."

Following the proclamation of the Mandate, Jews from all parts of Europe began moving into Palestine. Their coming converted a barren land into a literal Biblical land of "milk and honey." In the span of a quarter of a century since the end of the first World War, the Jewish community in Palestine grew from approximately 50,000 to approximately 600,000 people.

I have cited this record in detail because, unfortunately, the impression prevails all too widely, that Palestine is a Colonial possession of Britain. That is not so, even though the British Colonial office has, for a period of years, treated Palestine with less consideration than it gives to many of its Colonial possessions.

Palestine is as much a possession of the United States as it is of Britain. As a matter of fact, if Palestine was a possession of any country, it would logically be a possession of the American people because the great bulk of the tens of millions of dollars which have gone into the development of this barren country and the largest amount of the devoted planning has come from the American people. But the British Colonial Office -- contrary to the original policy of the British Government -- has proceeded on the theory that Palestine was not even entitled to the consideration accorded a Colonial possession, and so the bureaucrats of that ministry have done everything in their power to prevent the normal development of Palestine.

Six years ago the Colonial office promulgated the infamous White Paper by which future immigration into Palestine was to be limited to 75,000 people. This tragic policy was a part of the then Chamberlain Government appeasement policy at a time when victims of Hitler still had an opportunity to get from under the Nazi yoke and go to a land where peace and freedom beckoned. They were prohibited by British policy at the time of their direst need from getting to the only place

on earth where they would be warmly welcomed. The White Paper was a complete reversal of the far-sighted policy of the United States and British Governments which intended to set Palestine up as a haven of refuge for unfortunate Jews.

During the life of the White Paper, hundreds of thousands and perhaps a million or more, Jewish lives were sacrificed to Hitler because these people had no place to go. Thus, in effect, during the life of the White Paper, the British Government was, ironically, an Ally of Hitler in his war of extermination of the Jews. And unfortunately, the United States Government was an Ally, too. This, we cannot forget.

The United States Government was an Ally of Britain in this policy because this government, in its treaty with Great Britain setting up the Mandate, included a provision which declared that no modification shall be made in the terms of the Mandate unless such modification had been assented to by the United States. Now the Mandate, which was included as part of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, contemplated unrestricted Jewish immigration to Palestine but the British Government, through its flagrant reversal of the policy of unrestricted immigration, made the Mandate a mere scrap of paper and the United States Government at no time voiced a protest against this flagrant violation of the treaty. The United States Government, like the British Government, apparently was wholly indifferent to the treaty and wholly indifferent to the tragic consequences in human lives. Not once in the six years since the White Paper policy was promulgated, has this government ever made a written protest insofar as is known. To all intents and purposes, therefore, the United States Government is a party to the nullification. The five-year period of the Mandate expired on April 1, 1944, and just a few days before the expiration of the Mandate period, President Roosevelt told Rabbi Wise and Rabbi Silver who called on him at the White House that "the United States Government has never given its approval to the White Paper of 1939."

And this, my friends, is the only public comment that is known on the part of our government to the wilfull violation by Great Britain of this solemn Mandate. When the Mandate expired a year ago, there still were 31,000 unused visas of the contemplated 75,000 which the British government had agreed to admit during the five-year period. As a sop to American public sentiment, the British Colonial Office decided to permit the utilization of the remaining visas. Most of these 31,000 have been utilized and there now remains but a few thousand more. Unless the White Paper is definitely set aside and unrestricted immigration resumed, we will be face to face next month with the unpleasant fact that the doors of Palestine have been closed to the people for whom it was intended forever to be open. The crisis in Palestine is just that near. And those Jews who are now in Palestine will, then, in effect, become part of a ghetto within an Arab world.

Thus, my friends, Great Britain, with the apparent acquiescence of the United States, is "fencing Palestine in." There never was a time, may I add, when the need of Palestine to receive the people for whom it was intended, is greater than at the present. Reports from throughout Europe emphasize the extent of Jewish homelessness and Jewish distress, and the need for a place where these victims of six years of the war in Europe can go in order that some of them may be rehabilitated.

The reports from government investigators and other agencies of the need to get these people out of Europe as quickly as is humanly possible, staggers the imagination. But despite all of this and despite the fact that hundreds of thousands now can be gotten out of Europe and brought into the bright spot of Palestine, official objection of the Mandatory Government continues to block this migration.

This continuous conspiracy, for that is what it is, shocks Christian conception. The role of the United States Government in this tragic development is shocking and it does not represent the attitude of the American people. Let me show you why.

Two great national political conventions last summer included platform provisions endorsing the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. During the development of the presidential campaign, President Roosevelt and the Republican candidate, Mr. Dewey, each strongly committed themselves to the execution of this platform declaration. As a matter of fact, President Roosevelt's statement on the subject read by Senator Wagner at the Zionist Convention at Atlantic City last October was one of the strongest pronouncements ever made by a public official on the subject.

I am told that when it was read at Atlantic City, men and women, some of whom are here tonight, unashamedly cried for joy.

They believed the President and they thought, therefore, that at long last with Mr. Roosevelt's aid, after he was re-elected, Palestine would in truth and in fact become a Jewish State. It was advance notice of the culmination of many years of devoted efforts on the part of the living and centuries of longing by those who have gone before.

Is it any wonder these people, grown men and women, cried for joy?

That the Jews of the United States tried to show their appreciation of Mr. Roosevelt's words was shown, let me remind you, in the election returns from every metropolitan area in the nation. The overwhelming Jewish vote for Mr. Roosevelt unquestionably influenced the election result in every closely contested state including my own state of Michigan. Let me read to you what Mr. Roosevelt said in his letter to Senator Wagner:

"Please express my satisfaction that, in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the Four Freedoms, the Democratic Party at its July Convention this year included the following plank in its platform:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.

"Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating

this policy as soon as practicable. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization."

Is there any wonder that men and women openly wept? Is there any wonder that the Zionists voted for Roosevelt?

During the campaign, according to a document printed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, 397 Congressmen and 77 United States Senators pledged themselves to passage of the Congressional Declaration favoring the Jewish Commonwealth. In addition, scores of several legislatures, several governors of states; and many municipal city councils, and religious organizations throughout the country urged immediate establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.

There can be no question whatsoever therefore, of the attitude of the American people. American, Protestant, Catholic and Jew, all of us, have been deeply aroused over the tragedy of the Jew, and we are anxious for a speedy solution of this problem.

Following the election, consideration of the Palestine Resolution was given by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Resolution was favorably reported by the House Committee and was scheduled for overwhelmingly favorable action by the Senate Committee until Secretary of State Stettinius, acting under direct orders from President Roosevelt, intervened. As a consequence of Mr. Stettinius's specific statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that President Roosevelt objected to passage of the Resolution, the measure was laid aside by the Senate Committee and its passage was blocked in the House of Representatives. And this, at a time, my friends, when the verdict in both branches of the Congress unquestionably would have been overwhelming, if not unanimous, in favor of the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.

Now we must ask, and rightfully so, what occurred between the elections and the end of November when this matter was considered in both branches of Congress to cause such a right-about-face on the part of the Executive branch of the government. We were advised at the Capitol that the President preferred to handle the matter in his own way and objected to Congressional interference. On the basis of this advice, leaders in the Congress as well as among leaders of the Zionist organizations of America, acquiesced in the President's views.

Let us look at what has since occurred. The Jews had every reason to believe that in the light of the sentiment of the American people and the known wishes of the Congress, as well as the two great political parties, and his own personal pronouncement on the subject, that President Roosevelt would take up the problem of the Jews at his conference with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin at Yalta.

Perhaps he did, but we don't know this. We do know, however, that on his way back from Yalta, the President stopped near the Suez to confer with King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, foremost of the Arab opponents of the Jewish Homeland in Palestine. He even sent a United States destroyer to Saudi Arabia to bring Ibn Saud to the conference. When he got back to Washington, all that Mr. Roosevelt had to say concerning Palestine was that he learned more in five minutes about the Jewish problem from Ibn Saud than he would have learned in months of correspondence.

Is there any wonder that this off-hand observation shocked Jewish and Christian sensibilities?

Mr. Roosevelt told Dr. Wise the other day that he has not changed his position in reference to Palestine and that he stands where he has in the past. This can mean a great deal and let us hope in all good will that it does mean a great deal. On the other hand, in the light of the tragic indifference by our government during the past few years and Mr. Roosevelt's activities, including his conference with Ibn Saud and his gratuitous comment thereon which so outraged Jewish sensibilities, it may mean nothing. Let us hope, however, that it is not

double talk. Let us also hope that since he says he has not changed his mind that he recall what he told the Zionist Convention at Atlantic City, to wit: that "efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy (that is the Jewish Commonwealth policy) as soon as practicable." In the British House of Commons on February 27th, Mr. Churchill expressed the hope that "when the war is over, good arrangements can be made for securing the peace and progress of the Arab world, and generally of the Middle East." He admitted that no solution had been found to the problem of the Arab world and the Jewish people in Palestine. Thus, it seems, my friends, that both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill are willing to let the Jewish tragedy drift along. Both seem indifferent to speeding the solution.

In the meanwhile, the United Nations are soon to meet in San Francisco and each of the Arab countries, most of whom were openly opposed to Britain at one time or another during the war, have been invited to participate in the establishment of a better world to come.

At the time when the British General Montgomery was fighting with his back to the Suez, the only Ally that Great Britain and the United Nations had in the entire Middle East, was the little country of Palestine, which sent approximately 50,000 men and women to the armed and welfare forces. In addition, every farmer and every manufacturer in Palestine was producing and making every necessity of war from marmalade to munitions.

In Cairo, while Montgomery was being pushed toward the Suez, and Hitler was visualizing his own dream of Berlin to Baghdad, certain officials of the Egyptian government are known to have already planned their reception for the German General Rommel. But the memories of man are short. Now, all has been forgotten and forgiven insofar as the Arab enemies are concerned.

But also, all has been forgotten insofar as the Jew is concerned. Mr. Churchill once remarked when the days were darkest for Britain, that when the eventual victory came, Britain would not forget its friends in its hour of need.

Now it seems Mr. Churchill has a convenient memory, and he is forgetting the Jews and is rewarding the Arabs.

The whole story, my fellow citizens, is a shameful one. The tragedy of the Jew from Hitler's advent to power is unbelievable, and is quite unbelievable that the subsequent policy of the British government and the United States government could have been, and is, so callous and so indifferent.

This policy is a great reflection of the Christian precepts of our governments. It is cruel, and I repeat, unbelievably tragic. I know that it does not represent the sentiments of the American people.



Sack

See Sack's letter
5/ Oct 3, 46

1720 - 16th St., N. W.,
Washington, D. C.
June 22, 1945

Hon. James F. Byrnes,
The Shoreham Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Justice:

In accordance with our conversation yesterday evening, I am enclosing several pamphlets and pieces of printed matter concerning Palestine and the need for the fulfillment of the promise to the Jews of the world, made during the first World War by David Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson through what is now known as the Balfour Declaration, that Palestine be established as a Jewish National Homeland.

These publications -- and I do hope you will have time to read them in the order that I have marked them -- will, I am sure, prove informative and interesting.

- (1) "The Facts About Palestine"
- (2) "The Promise of Palestine"

These two booklets briefly tell the story of the historic background of Palestine and the contribution of the United States Government to the establishment of the proposed Jewish Commonwealth.

(3) A House Document published by the Foreign Affairs Committee which contains statements from President Roosevelt as well as 77 Senators and 318 Representatives and many others endorsing the Homeland.

This booklet also contains the platform pledges of the 1944 Democratic and Republican Conventions.

(4) Another House Document from the Foreign Affairs Committee prepared with the aid of the State Department which includes the Convention between the United States and Great Britain concerning the Palestine Mandate. This booklet also includes the historic speech of Mr. Winston Churchill opposing the British White Paper illegally restricting Jewish immigration into the very area which was set aside as a haven of refuge for the oppressed Jews of Europe.

Hon. James F. Byrnes

(5) The text of a splendid speech by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the Jewish Agency in Palestine, which analyzes briefly the Jewish situation today.

(6) The Memoranda submitted by the Jewish Agency to the recent United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

And lastly, because you, like so many others, unquestionably may have been confused by conflicting Arab claims, I am marking the testimony of Dr. Emanuel Neumann, one of the foremost authorities in the United States on Arab-Jewish relationship. This testimony was given to the House Foreign Affairs Committee last spring and it is very, very illuminating.

At first sight the above may seem as if I am burdening you with an awful lot of homework but actually the subject is of such great importance I am anxious that you shall have a thorough knowledge of the justice to the Jewish claims.

During our conversation you referred to differences of opinion concerning Palestine. I assume you also had in mind the well-publicized opposition of a limited group of extremely wealthy Jews. Proportionately, this opposition is just about in the same ratio of the voting strength of the Democratic and Republican parties in your home state of South Carolina. It is an actual fact that an overwhelming majority -- in excess of 90% -- of the Jews of the United States are sincerely devoted to the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine as the surest means of solving the terrible tragedy of the Jews of Europe. Likewise, most of us are convinced that once Palestine is established as a Jewish Commonwealth, anti-Semitism will disappear in the United States and throughout the world.

With my great appreciation I am, as always,

Very sincerely yours,

Lee R. Sack

LRS/mp
Encl.

Sack

MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATIONS BY LEO R. SACK ON NOVEMBER 14TH
FOLLOWING THE MORE THAN TWO HOUR MEETING IN THE SENATE COM-
MITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

1945

When the Committee adjourned about 12:40 P. M. on Wednesday, November 14, Senators were in a great hurry to get away, not only because the Senate was in session upstairs but also because many of them were anxious to get to the special unveiling of President Truman's painting in Leslie Biffle's office and then attend the luncheon which had been arranged for the President. For this reason Senators were very brief in their comments on developments within the Committee.

Senator Taft, who left before the other Senators, told me that there had been a confused report on the President's attitude. Senator Connally, for example, was quoted as telling the Committee that "Truman said passage of the Resolution will tie his hands." But Senator Taft quoted Senator Barkley, who arrived at the meeting shortly before 12 o'clock because he had been in conference with the President and other Democratic leaders at the White House, as not confirming Connally's interpretation of the President's attitude. "All that Truman said," according to Barkley, "was that it would be less embarrassing to him if we waited until Attlee got out of the country." Barkley's questioning of the accuracy of Connally's report was very annoying to the Texas Senator.

Taft told me that the Committee seemed anxious ~~that~~ to amend the text of the original resolution in order to link the preamble with the decision by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to appoint a joint commission to investigate all of the ramifications of the Palestine question and the problem of Jewish migration. For this reason, Taft said a vote had been postponed. Senator Taft was of the opinion that the Committee would accept the resolution with this amendment.

Subsequently I saw Senator LaFollette who was quite annoyed at the delay within the Committee. LaFollette, however, had a luncheon engagement with his host waiting near the committee entrance, and all that he told me at the moment was

that the Resolution was being referred to a committee of five Senators for amendment, with instructions to this committee to confer also with Secretary of State Byrnes.

Next I saw Senator Guffey and Senator Wagner who came out of the committee room together. Wagner seemed distressed as well as anxious to get upstairs where he was to participate in a pending debate on a housing bill. He said that Joe would tell me all about it. At the outset Senator Guffey told me, "we had the votes to pass it today and we will pass it next week." Then Guffey went on to explain that Tom Connally vigorously objected to action today and had insisted that the matter be referred to a special subcommittee which he would appoint. Guffey seemed to think that the subcommittee would not be a friendly one but he was happy because it was specifically agreed within the committee that although not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee Senator Taft would be consulted on the draft of the amended resolution. Guffey repeated, "We had the votes to pass it today but we did not want to make a show-down fight." Then Guffey went to the luncheon with the President.

Next I saw Wagner who was hot and bothered, and impatient, not only because of what I since learned was a rather rough session within the committee, but also because he was scheduled to be recognized in the Senate speedily in reference to the housing bill. Wagner more or less confirmed what Guffey said, and seemed to think that the Resolution would be passed on Monday.

Up to this point none of the reports were adequate in my opinion, and none of them were sufficiently detailed. For the next hour, however, it was impossible to see any Senators because all who knew about the story were tied up in the luncheon for the President.

Subsequently I saw Senator LaFollette. He had more time then and he told me that the chief reason for delay this morning other than the desire to amend the Resolution was the physical presence of Prime Minister Attlee in the United States. The Senators felt, he said, that it would have been a mark of discourtesy to have

passed legislation critical of Britain while Mr. Attlee was a guest in the country. "We could have voted out the Resolution this morning" La Follette said, "but it would have been a divided vote. I think it was better that we delayed action so that we could have as much unanimity as possible. I believe the postponement will accomplish this. Bob Taft agreed to the change and while Wagner was reluctant, he too agreed. I also think the change should be made."

"I wanted Jim Byrnes to come up this morning and I told the Committee that I was damn tired of these dilatory tactics. I said that this is the same sort of thing we had last year. At my insistence Tom telephoned Byrnes and while I did not hear what Byrnes said, Tom reported that he could not come down because he was tied up at a conference with the Secretaries of War and Navy." (I later learned that this was true.)

Senator La Follette told me that if when the Committee convenes next Monday the dilatory tactics are still pursued he intended to do all in his power to force a favorable report. He expressed the opinion that "we have the votes". Then Senator La Follette expressed his horror and his amazement, as well as his lack of understanding of a governmental policy which has been so indifferent to the tragic plight of the Jewish people in Europe throughout these years. He could not understand, he said, why Mr. Roosevelt, who rode into office election after election on Jewish votes from New York City and other metropolitan areas, had been so utterly callous not only to Jewish suffering, but to forthright personal as well as party pledges to the Zionist cause.

For the sake of this record and for the future, let me note here that throughout the entire period of dependency of this Resolution, dating back to the fall of 1943, Senator La Follette has been a sincere and straightforward supporter of our cause. In the past two years I have always found him willing and eager to cooperate, and forthright and honest. In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rooms in December, 1944, when the Zionist Organization split because the Administration was giving us the double-cross Senator La Follette stood like a rock of Gibraltar for our cause. Along with Senator

Bennett Clark he was most vigorous in his denunciation in the Committee and to Mr. Stettinius' face of Administration double-talk and dilatory tactics. During the several roll calls last December La Follette always voted for our Resolution. And on the final roll call on December 11th when the Administration succeeded in forcing delay, La Follette was one of the eight Senators who stood pat. I do hope that in the Senatorial elections in Wisconsin next fall that Wisconsin Jews will be well-acquainted with the story of La Follette and will stand by him as the Ohio Jews stood by Bob Taft, because it is more apparent than ever that the sincere friends that the Zionists have in the United States Senate must be bound to us with hoops of steel. Otherwise our cause will flounder on the rocks of double talk such as we got first from Roosevelt and more tragically from the British Labor Government. And now to continue with my memorandum.

I saw Senator Vandenberg. He was vehement in his denunciation of the Administration. He insisted, "You are getting the same sort of double cross that you get from Roosevelt last fall. While this Administration tells you one thing they are going behind your back and doing just the opposite. I wish I could talk to Dr. Silver to tell him some things that he should know. That Committee has no intention of passing a friendly resolution. In addition to the "Whereas" they are not going to let the word, "they" stand."

When I suggested that the words, "the Jews" then might be substituted for "they" Vandenberg replied, "This would be even worse."

It seemed to me then that Mr. Vandenberg was reverting to his cautious, compromising attitude of last year when he suggested a final draft that was satisfactory to Dr. Silver and others, and then went into the Committee room and voted against it. So I suggested to Mr. Vandenberg that he tell Dr. Silver over the telephone the things he had in mind, in view of the fact that Dr. Silver was tied up with conflicting engagements this week and could not come to Washington. This Vandenberg refused to do, saying he would not discuss it over the telephone. Then I suggested that the Senator

call one of the young ladies from his office and dictate to her a full and complete memorandum of his views for Dr. Silver's benefit and I would see that the memorandum was delivered to Dr. Silver immediately. This Vandenberg also refused to do insisting that he would not discuss the matter except across a desk from Dr. Silver.

During his protest, Vandenberg was severe in his denunciations of alleged ineptness on the part of Senator Wagner whom, he said, had annoyed members of the Committee.

I repeated this conversation immediately to Dr. Silver but later in the afternoon I began to have my doubts, both as to the significance of Vandenberg's Jeremiahs as well as to the sincerity of his warnings. I recall^{ed} that the draft of the Resolution now pending before the Committee was written by several Senators including Vandenberg, and that it was intended to, and so regarded at the time, cover objections raised within the Committee last December.

(On Wednesday, while talking to Senator Hatch I gathered that no question had been raised in the Committee in reference to the phraseology that "they may reconstitute Palestine", etc. Senator Hatch also indicated to me that the Committee did not take too seriously Senator Connally's blusterings against Wagner.)

Later in the afternoon I again conferred with Guffey and Wagner, and both seemed to think that the Resolution, which ^{unless} ~~will be~~ brought in by the subcommittee on Monday, ^{is} ~~will be~~ acceptable ~~or else~~ it will not pass.

A final word; at this writing there are two developments which look good from our standpoint. One is that Senator Barkley is reported to be firmly entrenched on our side, so much so that because of his insistence on our Resolution he got in the hair yesterday of Senator Connally. Barkley can be, if he stands pat, a tower of great strength and support to us. The other favorable sign is that Guffey and Wagner each are showing far more fight and knowledge of the subject than they displayed last year. For example, a memorandum which I had prepared for them yesterday morning based on the compromise agreement of the day before, was used by them in the Committee, and Guffey told me he made "good use of it."

December 13, 1945

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver
19810 Shaker Boulevard
Shaker Heights
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Dr. Silver:

I am awfully sorry you were not here yesterday when the baby was born. An hour before the formal announcement was made, I told Emmanuel and Mr. Tulin, who had come down, that it was going to be a boy. The 17 to 1 vote would indicate that it is an eight-pounder!

I am enclosing for your archives a couple of copies of the Wagner report to the Senate. It is not as vigorous as I wanted it to be but I was out-talked by Akzin, and Delman (who is acting for Wagner), and Wagner, too, on the theory that if the report was too vigorous, Connally would become more belligerent than he is. Perhaps. Anyway, Wagner showed him the report last night before it was filed, and he didn't like that either. And he insists that he is going to go through with his opposition, because the President is opposed, but he did tell me on yesterday, and he also told Wagner, that his opposition will not include more than a brief statement of the opposition of the President.

At this moment you are flying home. All of us will be very happy to see you and I hope you will have a happy landing. Cheerio.

Sincerely yours,

LRS:ew/pp
Encls.

P.S. For your further information, I am enclosing, first, a speech in the Senate by Senator Brewster in which he exposes British duplicity in the Middle East. Incidentally, the New

Dr. Silver

December 13, 1945

York Times carried a column of this. I was particularly pleased, may I add, with the entire operation because Senator Brewster responded on about thirty minutes' notice, we, of course, furnishing him with the basic material; and, second, the letter which Senators Wagner and Taft sent to the President which was occasioned by a nasty David Stern statement from the White House. Emanuel Neumann is the chief author of this letter, with Dr. Akzin getting credit for several assists. Leo was in the out-field getting it inserted in the Congressional Record by Wagner, distributed to the press, and printed, and also authoring a letter to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee with a request that they please study the enclosure before the meeting of the Committee which occurred on yesterday. I am also enclosing for your files page 12063 from this morning's Congressional Record, showing officially that the Palestine resolution has been approved by the Senate Committee.

For your further information, Senator George was advised by the Committee Clerk that his colleagues had voted at a ratio of 17 to 1 in favor of the resolution, and he was asked how he wished to be recorded. He was not present at the meeting. "Absent", was the reply. He continues a die-hard. "Our President, right or wrong", says he.

L.R.S.