



## 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  
106

Box  
37

Folder  
345

American Christian Palestine Committee, 1947.

AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE  
41 EAST 42nd STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

*Mr. H. Manson*

## MEMORANDUM

*To* American Christian Palestine Committee *Date* January 13, 1947  
Liaisons and Co-workers

*From* Dean Howard M. LeSourd

Attached is the third article prepared for use in the local press, religious periodicals or a radio broadcast which is being sent to key members of the American Christian Palestine Committee in various parts of the country acting as "press contacts" for the Committee.

As was the case a month ago, we are sending it to you trusting in your ability to establish the publicity contact needed.

We depend fully upon your cooperation in seeing that these articles reach the reading public.

HML:LM  
Enc.

# AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

41 EAST 42nd STREET

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

• MURRAY HILL 2-4917 •

## FOUNDERS AND HONORARY CHAIRMEN

Hon. Robert F. Wagner  
Rev. Dr. Henry A. Atkinson

## CO-CHAIRMEN

Hon. Owen Brewster  
Hon. James M. Mead  
Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling

## VICE-CHAIRMEN

William Green  
Eric A. Johnston  
Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia  
Hon. John W. McCormack  
Hon. Warren G. Magnuson  
Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.  
Dr. Daniel L. Marsh  
Bishop Francis J. McConnell  
Philip Murray  
Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde  
Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg  
Hon. Sumner Welles

## SECRETARY

Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas

## TREASURER

Dean Alfange

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Rev. Dr. Carl Hermann Voss  
*Chairman*  
Father George B. Ford  
Prof. Carl J. Friedrich  
Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes  
Prof. Eduard C. Lindeman  
Mrs. Walter Clay Lowdermilk  
Edgar Ansel Mowrer  
Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr  
Robert E. Smith  
Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Prof. James Luther Adams  
J. M. Blalock  
Dr. John W. Bradbury  
Hon. Oscar Chapman  
Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky  
Hon. John M. Coffee  
Rev. Dr. Clark Walker Cummings  
Rev. Dr. Albert E. Day  
Hon. Everett M. Dirksen  
Mrs. Walter Ferguson  
Hon. Daniel J. Flood  
Judge John Gutknecht  
Prof. S. Ralph Harlow  
Rev. David R. Hunter  
Dean Sidney Lovett  
Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk  
Prof. Halford E. Luccock  
Rev. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington  
Hon. Claude Pepper  
Hon. Frank A. Picard  
Miss Daphne Robert  
Rev. Dr. Harold Paul Sloan  
Hon. Elbert D. Thomas  
Prof. Paul Tillich  
Rev. Dr. Howard B. Warren  
Prof. Henry N. Wieman  
Dr. Mary E. Woolley

Dean Howard M. LeSourd  
*Director*  
Vasil D. Furnad  
*Extension Secretary*

January 13, 1947

Dear Member:

Herewith enclosed is another article dealing with the question of Palestine. We hope that through you it will reach a great number of interested readers.

Developments in Palestine have reached a stage where clear evaluation and forceful presentation of the issues involved are needed more than ever before.

Appreciating your cooperation, and with greetings, I am

Cordially yours,

*Howard M. LeSourd*

Dean Howard M. LeSourd  
Director

HML:LM  
Enc.



## A PASS TO TOMORROW

Developments in Palestine can no longer be treated merely as news from a troubled spot on earth. Something of tremendous importance and far reaching consequence is taking place in the Holy Land. Interest has given place to deep concern on the part of every student of world affairs. The principles upon which we hope to establish a better order of things for the future, are being put to the test in Palestine today.

Will the scales tip in favor of, or against, the fulfillment of international commitments? Will the rule of might over right be left unchallenged in the world of tomorrow? Will people be judged on the basis of race and numbers? How will the clash between Christian dictates and imperial interests be resolved? Will unilateral action in matters of international concern be allowed to continue? How long will strong-arm police methods, so reminiscent of fascism, prevail in the place of democratic treatment?

All of these alternatives are present in the Palestine situation. All of these questions stare us in the face.

Behind the political, strategic and economic aspects of the Palestine problem is a vast sea of human misery, only sketchily and occasionally reported. Take, for example, the hopelessness of the 200,000 Jewish men, women and children in the DP camps of Europe. Add to them a million or so Jews on that continent facing a rising tide of anti-Semitism. Consider then the plight of the free Palestinian settlers, like those citizens of Tel Aviv who only yesterday were rounded up by British troops, forced to run between two rows of soldiers and police, were beaten savagely, and then released by an officer who shouted: "Who gave orders to arrest these people? Take them back."

Remember the thousands of wretched people whose half-rotted vessels have been detoured from the shores of Palestine to a concentration camp



in Cyprus. Many of them bear the tattooed numbers of Nazi death camps upon their bodies. Recall that one who, turning toward an American observer and pointing to a friend, said: "My friend is a lucky man. He knows where his wife is buried. None of us do." Recall the fact that more than six million of his people were put to death during the war, and that one million and three-hundred thousand of them were children, useless for forced labor; that a whole Jewish family, in the sense of parents and children, is a miracle in Central Europe today.

Finally, consider the fact that there are thousands of homes in Palestine anxious and ready to welcome the European sufferers; that opportunities for creative work await them there, and that the Mandate under which Palestine is supposed to be governed, states that it is the obligation of the mandatory power to "secure the establishment of the Jewish national home" there.

There has rarely been a task so clearly outlined before the conscience of the civilized world, as the challenge that faces us in Palestine. This challenge is inescapable. If force, oppression, selfish interest and prejudice win in Palestine, they will continue to be victorious in every part of the world, including America. Evil fears no atomic bombs. It penetrates into the little things of which big nations are made. Our best accomplishments in the field of human and international relations hang in the balance. A world disinterested today will be a world disintegrating tomorrow.

\* \* \*



## MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Chapters of the  
American Christian Palestine Committee

Date January 14, 1947

From Dean Howard M. LeSourd

Subject: CHILDREN'S MEMORIAL FOREST

The first announcement of our project for the planting of a Children's Memorial Forest in Palestine in the vicinity of Nazareth reached you in the November issue of the Bulletin. Since that time, enthusiastic responses to this program have been pouring in. An imposing list of nationally known religious and civic leaders have acclaimed and endorsed the project, and plans have been laid for special events and coordinated activities to be implemented by our chapters throughout the country.

The responsibility for making the Children's Memorial Forest a reality must, however, fall on our local chapters. You alone can build the forest. Here, also, are the means through which each local American Christian Palestine Committee chapter can derive increased influence, respect and standing in local communal life.

A brochure colorfully detailing information about this project is on the presses at this moment and should reach you in about two weeks. We will mail the brochure to our membership throughout the country, to church groups and periodicals. However, we feel that wherever possible the brochures should be mailed from local chapter officers to churches and groups in its area, and individuals not on your membership list. Could you let us know how many brochures you will need for distribution to individuals, churches, Sunday schools, Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops, religious youth groups and clubs in your community? A postcard is enclosed for your immediate reply. We will send you upon request a sample covering letter to be mailed with the brochures to various groups.

Since we feel that this activity should be foremost on your program during the coming months, we would suggest that each chapter set up a special committee to promote this project. . . a committee which will be a working group and thoroughly representative. It should include women and youth as well as men. Special recognition for the purchase of large blocs of trees by individuals, schools, groups and cities are set forth in the brochure. The names and addresses of chairman and the entire committee should be sent to us so that we may communicate with them directly.

It will be of great help to you in promoting this project within your area if you can obtain the endorsement and support of religious and civic leaders in your community. This will lend prestige to your work as well as providing an excellent pivotal point for releases to the local press. We would suggest that this be one of the first tasks of the project committee. A list of national sponsors appears in the January Bulletin.

Material for use over local radio stations is being prepared in the form of transcriptions and live scripts. We suggest that the groundwork be laid



for the procurement of radio time during February and March. We also plan to supply you with a steady flow of news releases and feature stories pertaining to the project for placement in your local press.

According to present plans, the Children's Memorial Forest Project will be publicly launched at a meeting in Washington, D. C. during the last week in January or early in February. Negotiations are under way for a coast-to-coast radio broadcast of the meeting, with speeches by distinguished guests and a cut-in from Hollywood. As soon as plans become definite and the date is set, we will notify you promptly, so that you can publicize the broadcast in your community. This broadcast will be the go-ahead signal for our chapters all over the country.

It is most important that two distinct features of this project be constantly kept in mind: one is the constructive nature of this project -- this is no hollow memorial of stone and steel. . .the planting of trees is a paramount factor in revitalizing the soil of Palestine, so that it can provide a real home for an increasing number of surviving children. Secondly, may we repeat that our job is primarily one of education. . .and that we are more interested in the number of gifts than their size.

We are extremely anxious to receive your comments and suggestions. . .particularly with regard to any ideas you may have for promoting this project within your community. . .and welcome frequent reports as to your progress, so that we can inform other chapters of what you are doing.

The information on the enclosed card is essential: will you please make every effort to mail it to us by January 21st.

HML:LM



# AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

41 EAST 42nd STREET

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

• MURRAY HILL 2-4917 •

## FOUNDERS AND HONORARY CHAIRMEN

Hon. Robert F. Wagner  
Rev. Dr. Henry A. Atkinson

## CO-CHAIRMEN

Hon. Owen Brewster  
Hon. James M. Mead  
Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling

## VICE-CHAIRMEN

William Green  
Eric A. Johnston  
Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia  
Hon. John W. McCormack  
Hon. Warren G. Magnuson  
Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.  
Dr. Daniel L. Marsh  
Bishop Francis J. McConnell  
Phillip Murray  
Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde  
Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg  
Hon. Sumner Welles

## SECRETARY

Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas

## TREASURER

Dean Alfange

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Rev. Dr. Carl Hermann Voss  
*Chairman*  
Father George B. Ford  
Prof. Carl J. Friedrich  
Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes  
Prof. Eduard C. Lindeman  
Mrs. Walter Clay Lowdermilk  
Edgar Ansel Mowrer  
Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr  
Robert E. Smith  
Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Prof. James Luther Adams  
J. M. Blalock  
Dr. John W. Bradbury  
Hon. Oscar Chapman  
Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky  
Hon. John M. Coffee  
Rev. Dr. Clark Walker Cummings  
Rev. Dr. Albert E. Day  
Hon. Everett M. Dirksen  
Mrs. Walter Ferguson  
Hon. Daniel J. Flood  
Judge John Gutknecht  
Prof. S. Ralph Harlow  
Rev. David R. Hunter  
Dean Sidney Lovett  
Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk  
Prof. Halford E. Luccock  
Rev. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington  
Hon. Claude Pepper  
Hon. Frank A. Picard  
Miss Daphne Robert  
Rev. Dr. Harold Paul Sloan  
Hon. Elbert D. Thomas  
Prof. Paul Tillich  
Rev. Dr. Howard B. Warren  
Prof. Henry N. Wieman  
Dr. Mary E. Woolley

Dean Howard M. LeSourd  
*Director*

Vasil D. Furnad  
*Extension Secretary*

February 11, 1947

Dear Member:

One of the most vicious anti-Zionist articles that have appeared in any American periodicals is published in the February issue of The Atlantic Monthly, entitled "The Zionist Illusion". Its author, W. T. Stace, is so clever in twisting the facts and distorting Zionist aspirations that his statements may have wide influence among the uninitiated.

I trust you will find the time to write a few words to Mr. Edward Weeks, the Editor of The Atlantic Monthly, at 8 Arlington Street, Boston 16, Mass., protesting the opening of their columns to this untruthful and dangerous attack upon a great modern movement of redemption. It might be well to challenge some of the many misstatements contained in the article, excerpts of which are enclosed. Also enclosed is a refutation of the points raised therein.

You are one of the few to whom I am writing to call your attention to this opportunity of service in our common cause. Thank you very much for your continued co-operation.

Cordially yours,

*Howard M. LeSourd*

Howard M. LeSourd  
Director

HML:LM  
Encs.



Excerpts from "THE ZIONIST ILLUSION"

by

Prof. W. T. Stace

An article which appeared in the  
February 1947 issue of "The Atlantic Monthly"

So far as World War II had a moral issue, it concerned the question whether international relations are to be governed by force or by law. Law means the application of principles of justice to disputes. So the issue is really between force and justice.

Palestine is a case in point. Not only are Jews and Arabs inflamed by passions, which they call patriotism, but the greater nations concerned, who at least ought to be impartial, are making no attempt to judge the dispute between Jews and Arabs impartially. Instead each of them is concerned with self-interest, and they have made of the question either a struggle for national power or, worse still, a catch-bag for votes for a particular domestic party."

That one nation should by force or threats compel another nation to act contrary to its own will, or contrary to the wishes of the majority of its people, is "aggression." It is contrary to the principles of justice, democracy, and self-determination in their external or international application. That a minority within a nation should forcibly impose its will on the majority -- this is likewise aggression, but is generally called "tyranny." It is the negation of the principles of justice, democracy, and self-determination in their internal or domestic application.

The Arab case is, in essence, this. The Arabs constitute a large majority of the inhabitants of Palestine. This is not only true now, but it has been true since somewhere near the beginning of the Christian era --



that is to say, for nearly two thousand years. The Arabs in Palestine are opposed, rightly or wrongly, to any mass immigration of Jews. Therefore the majority of the inhabitants of Palestine are opposed to such a mass immigration. But according to the principle of self-determination, which is the accepted principle of international justice, the affairs of a country must be governed by the wishes of the majority of its inhabitants, and any attempt of an outside country to override by force the wishes of such a majority is "aggression."

We can see this principle more clearly if we apply it in a case nearer home. The majority of the inhabitants of the United States object to the mass immigration of non-Caucasian peoples, and they exclude such peoples by law. Suppose some outside nation were sufficiently powerful to try to force the United States to admit non-Caucasian immigrants in hundreds of thousands against our will. We should certainly regard this as an act of aggression, notwithstanding that a good case might be made out for saying that our objection to non-Caucasian peoples is "wrong." We must therefore allow to the majority of the inhabitants of Palestine the same right of determining such questions of right and wrong for themselves as we claim for the majority of the inhabitants of the United States.

Thus it will be seen that the Arab case rests squarely on the admitted principles of international justice. It is a direct application of them to Palestine. And the logic of the argument appears on the face of it conclusive and unanswerable. Let us see, however, what case the Zionists can make against it.

The Zionist case rests upon five main arguments.

1. The first argument is that Palestine was a Jewish land in ancient times. What force, if any, is there in this contention? The answer is clear. No nation has any right to the land it occupies except long possession. What



right have Americans to live in, occupy, and control these United States? No right whatsoever except the fact that they have actually lived here for two or three hundred years.

These considerations make it clear that the fact that Palestine was a Jewish land in ancient times cannot possibly give Jews a right of mass entry there now.

2. The second argument is that Palestine has for the Jews a peculiarly sacred religious significance. Can we admit religious feelings as giving any sort of claim to mass immigration into a country? Would we allow such a claim in any other case? Obviously not. Thailanders could not assert a right to migrate into India because they are Buddhists and India, where the Buddha was born and lived, has a special religious significance for them. And Britishers and Americans, who are Christians, could not claim a right of mass settlement in Palestine on the ground that it has for them, just as much as for the Jews, a deep religious significance.

3. The third Zionist argument is that the British Government in 1917 promised the Jews that they should have a national home in Palestine. A moral claim is here based on the general principle of the sanctity of promises. They think "promises ought to be fulfilled, and the recipients of promises have a moral right to demand their fulfillment. Therefore the Jews in this case have such a right."

This is a crude piece of ethical analysis. Wrong and unjust promises ought not to be carried out and give no rights to demand that they be executed. For instance, you cannot claim a moral right to enforce a promise to steal. And if you do, you are an accessory to the theft.

4. We now come to the question whether the homelessness of the Jews, to which we must add the frightful sufferings which they have undergone and are undergoing, the persecutions, the pogroms, and all the other horrors, can be



made the basis of a claim to mass immigration into Palestine. We may list this as the fourth Zionist contention.

No humane person can view these facts without profound feelings of pity and shame --- pity for the victims, shame for the cruelty and wickedness of our human kind. But we have to ask what moral claims can be founded upon it. There arises, most certainly, a claim to generous treatment by every country in the world. But just because the facts yield an equal claim against all civilized countries (except that the claim is stronger against those countries which have been most responsible for the sufferings), they cannot yield any special claim against Palestine. The claim is against England, America, Russia, France, and Palestine too (if Palestine is a humane and civilized country), but not more against Palestine than any other country.

5. The last argument commonly put forward for Zionism is the fact that Jewish immigrants into Palestine have already enormously improved the country, and that further immigration will result in further benefits to it. This fact is to be admitted, and it is unnecessary to go into any details here regarding the economic and cultural improvements made in Palestine by the Jews. They are well known. The question to be asked is whether they constitute a valid argument for Zionism.

The hole in the argument is that it can be used to justify almost any aggression whatever -- at any rate, any aggression by an advanced and highly civilized nation against a more backward one. Hitler might have argued that he would run France, England, and even America more efficiently than the present rulers of those countries. And the claim might not be entirely lacking in truth. He might have argued -- and indeed did -- that his conquests would in the end benefit the world.

Perhaps it was "wrong" for Caesar to subjugate the Gauls. But we can really regret that the Pax Romana civilized Europe? Perhaps we did "wrong"



to rob the Indians of their country. But would it have been "right" for a sprinkling of half-civilized people to exclude forever from the this vast continent those who were more competent than they were to make use of its opportunities?

The analysis of the case for Zionism and the case against it which has been given seems to me absolutely indisputable on any ground of logic. Minor mistakes may have been made in the presentation of the matter. And it is always possible to catch at sentences or expressions and find fault with them. But the logic of the case as a whole is too clear for any error in the general conclusion that, in the dispute between Jew and Arab, the Arab claim is correct and the Zionist claim is without any foundation. This is the inevitable conclusion to which an impartial judge would come.

It is often said that the Jews themselves hunger to go to Palestine and do not want, most of them, to go to other countries. True enough. But we must not suppose that this is any argument for the justice of the Zionist claim. Since when has it become a principle of justice that in a dispute regarding property or anything else the strong desire of one of the parties to have whatever is in dispute gives him a claim to it? What people want proves only that they want it, not that they are in justice entitled to have it.

The real cause of the reluctance of these countries to lower their immigration barriers lies elsewhere. When Mr. Bevin said that America was pressing Britain to allow more Jews into Palestine because we do not want to allow them into America, his remark was greeted with a howl of execration. Naturally, since the truth hit home and exposed our wickedness and hypocrisy! But his observation is just as true of the British Empire as it is of the United States. We have to face the plain truth, however unpleasant it may be, -- however shameful if you like, -- that none of the great nations want these refugees, and they



are therefore attempting to thrust them on a little Arab country. And the reason why America in particular tries to force the pace, while Britain hangs back, is simply that the Jewish vote is powerful in America while Arab influence is important to the British Empire.

\* \* \*





*Mr. H. Manson*

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL  
342 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

## MEMORANDUM

**To** Members of American Zionist Emergency Council **Date** February 27, 1947

**From** Benjamin Akzin

WRHS



Attached for your information is a copy of a communication sent by the Jewish Agency in London on February 13, 1947 to the British Government in reply to Mr. Bevin's proposal of February 7, 1947.

BA:RB  
Enc.



CONFIDENTIAL

REPLY OF THE JEWISH AGENCY TO HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT'S  
MEMORANDUM OF FEBRUARY 7TH, 1947.

1. The Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine has given careful consideration to the memorandum put forward by the representatives of His Majesty's Government on February 7th, 1947.
2. There are three vital interests which the Executive of the Jewish Agency seeks to preserve in any settlement that may be devised for the solution of the Palestine problem. These are:
  - A. Freedom of Jewish immigration into Palestine up to the country's economic absorptive capacity.
  - B. Freedom to settle on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes, and to develop the country's potentialities.
  - C. Freedom to develop the Jewish National Home to the position of a self-governing independent Jewish State.
3. The duty of the Mandatory Power to facilitate Jewish immigration and close settlement by Jews on the land is clearly defined in Article 6 of the Mandate.
4. The Royal Commission on Palestine (1937) stated that "unquestionably ... the primary purpose of the Mandate, as expressed in its Preamble and its articles, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home". The Preamble of the Mandate, after quoting the Balfour Declaration, states:

"Recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

These words express the intention of the Mandate to re-constitute an independent Jewish commonwealth such as existed in the past. A status of political independence was thus envisaged by the authors of the Mandate as the logical outcome of the mandatory process. (Report of the Royal Commission, pp. 24 - 25 - Cmd. 5479, 1937). This was clearly recognised and agreed to by the representatives of the Arab people, as is evident from the declarations of the Emir Feisal (Feisal-Weizmann Treaty published in The Times, 10th June, 1936), and of the Syrian Delegation to the Peace Conference (David Hunter Miller: "My Diary of the Peace Conference", Vol. XIV, pp.389-415).



5. The proposals contained in the memorandum are incompatible with all three basic purposes of the Mandate: Immigration, Land Settlement, and ultimate Statehood.

A. Immigration:

6. The memorandum of the 7th February provides for the immigration of 96,000 Jews at the rate of 4,000 a month over a period of two years. The Executive of the Jewish Agency begs to recall that twenty months have elapsed since the proposal to admit 100,000 Jews immediately was first submitted to His Majesty's Government. The Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry recommended their quickest possible transfer, and even the Morrison Plan, which the Jewish Agency regarded as unacceptable, provided for the entry of 100,000 within a year.

7. The memorandum further provides that after the first two years it shall be open to the High Commissioner, in consultation with his Advisory Council, composed of Arab as well as of Jewish representatives, to determine whether immigration should at all continue, even into the Jewish areas, and if so at what rate. This provision replaces the positive injunction of the Mandate to "facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions", which injunction, as laid down by the Council of the League of Nations, signified that immigration is to proceed up to the economic absorptive capacity of the country.

B. Land Settlement:

8. The obligation of the Mandatory Power to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land is not limited to any area of Palestine, but applies to the whole country. The elementary principle of equality before the law requires that all citizens shall have equal rights of access and settlement in all parts of their country. To discriminate against any citizen on grounds of racial or national origin is repugnant both to the Mandate and to democratic principles. It is especially incongruous to discriminate against Jews in the right of access and settlement in the country designated by history and international law as the Jewish National Home.

9. It is for these reasons that the Jewish Agency has always protested strongly against the Land Ordinance of 1940, which discriminated against Jews in their National Home by allowing them free right of purchase and settlement in no more than five per cent. of Western Palestine (332,160 acres out of 6,504,000 acres). This legislation was officially condemned by the Labour Party.

10. The memorandum now submitted by His Majesty's Government provides for the perpetuation of this discriminatory legislation over the major part of the country. Paragraph 11 reads:



"Control over transfers of land, including the power to amend the existing Land Transfer Regulations, would be conferred on the local authorities."

The local authorities in question are to be established in areas where Arabs and Jews form a substantial majority (Paragraph 7). It follows that in the bulk of the country, the Arab local authorities would be free to prevent the transfer of land to Jews.

11. The effect of the enactment on prospects of Jewish development and of land reclamation in Palestine may be illustrated by two examples:

(i) Galilee: Under the Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916 this area was to have formed part of the French Mandated territory. It was only after the issue of the Balfour Declaration that the British Government laid claim to it, on the ground that its inclusion within the British Mandate was essential for the establishment of the Jewish National Home, and it was in deference to the claim so motivated that France eventually ceded Galilee to British Mandatory rule. If all the derelict areas of mountainous Galilee were reclaimed and properly cultivated, the territory could be made to support a far larger population. For this reason, and also for historical reasons, the Royal Commission in 1937 advocated its inclusion in the Jewish State. The effect of Paragraph 7 of His Majesty's Government's new proposals would be to close that area to new Jewish settlement.

(ii) The Negev: This area, comprising the Beersheba sub-district, is sparsely inhabited and almost entirely derelict. The effect of the Government's proposals would be to deny the Jews access to the largest undeveloped and underpopulated tract of land in the country, and thus to perpetuate the stagnation in which it has lain for centuries past.

#### C. Constitution and Statehood:

12. The memorandum envisages a trusteeship period of five years during which the provisions of the Mandate relative to Jewish immigration and land settlement would be superseded by the restrictive and discriminatory enactments of paragraphs 7 and 11. After five years, the intention is to confer independence on Palestine as a unitary State. Thus, when the Jewish population reaches some 700,000 to 800,000, it would come under the domination of the Arab majority, whereupon Jewish immigration would cease.

13. The Executive of the Jewish Agency can in no way agree that this measure is in accordance either with the purpose or the provisions of the Mandate. A clear and purposeful distinction was made between the constitutional principles of the Palestine Mandate and those of other Mandates of the same category. Thus, Article 1 of the Mandate for Syria and the Lebanon reads:



"The Mandatory shall frame, within a period of three years from the coming into force of this Mandate, an organic law for Syria and the Lebanon ....

"The Mandatory shall ..... enact measures to facilitate the progressive development of Syria and the Lebanon as independent States ....."

The Draft Mandate for Mesopotamia, as submitted by Mr. Balfour on December 7th, 1920, to the Secretariat-General of the League of Nations for the approval of the Council of the League of Nations, reads as follows:

"Article 1. The Mandatory will frame ..... an organic Law for Mesopotamia .... It shall contain provisions designed to facilitate the progressive development of Mesopotamia as an independent State ...."

It will be observed that instead of the term "independent State" used here, the Palestine Mandate provided only for the development of "self-governing institutions". This careful distinction is clear evidence that the primary purpose of the Palestine Mandate was not the establishment of an independent State but, as emphasized by the Royal Commission, the establishment of a Jewish National Home.

The Balfour Declaration which was embodied in the Mandate safeguards the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities. Had a minority position been envisaged for the Jews, it is their rights and not those of the Arabs which would have required such safeguards.

14. To condemn the Jewish National Home to the position of a permanent minority would not merely be contrary to the clear intention of the Mandate; the denial of statehood and independence to the Jewish people even in its homeland would constitute a grave historic injustice. On the other hand, if the Arabs of Palestine found themselves in a minority, their position would not similarly affect the Arab people as a whole, since it enjoys independence and sovereignty in a number of countries covering an area vastly greater than Palestine.

15. Paragraph 12 of the memorandum, which provides for the supersession of the Jewish Agency by the Jewish members of the Advisory Council in all communications with the Mandatory Administration, is repugnant to the Mandate, which in Article 4 recognizes the Jewish people as a whole, and not only the Jews of Palestine, as a partner in the establishment of the Jewish National Home.



16. For all these reasons, the Jewish Agency cannot accept the proposals contained in the memorandum as a basis for further discussion and will find itself constrained to oppose the conclusion of the trusteeship agreement envisaged in the memorandum.

17. While unable to negotiate on the basis of these proposals, the Jewish Agency on its part made, in the course of the recent discussions, the following alternative suggestions for the solution of the problem:

(a) That, in accordance with the original intentions of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, large-scale Jewish immigration and settlement should be effected, with the result that Palestine would become a Jewish State, i.e. a free democratic State with a Jewish majority, in which all citizens, irrespective of race or creed, would enjoy complete equality of rights with all proper safeguards for religious, cultural and linguistic needs.

(b) That if, for any reason, His Majesty's Government is not prepared at this stage to adopt a decision as to the ultimate status of Palestine and would prefer for the time being to continue the mandatory regime, the Jewish Agency would urge that the execution of the Mandate should be true to its letter and spirit, viz. that Jewish immigration be regulated up to the full extent of the country's economic absorptive capacity, that close settlement of Jews on the land be encouraged, and that no part of the country be closed to Jewish land purchase and settlement. The Jewish Agency would then also urge the promotion and development of municipal self-government and education autonomy, and the establishment of functional boards for industrial relations, trade and industry, public health, etc.

(c) That, in the event of a final settlement being required immediately, the Jewish Agency would be ready, as stated by the Executive in its letter to His Majesty's Government of August 16th, 1946, and again in the recent talks, to consider a compromise scheme for the setting up of a "viable Jewish State in an adequate area of Palestine". If the proposed State would, on examination, be found viable and its area adequate, the Executive would recommend the acceptance of the scheme. The State should have complete control over immigration and development and be represented in the United Nations. Such a State, too, would be based on complete equality for all citizens with the necessary safeguards for religious, cultural and linguistic needs.

18. The Executive of the Jewish Agency regrets to state that all these suggestions were rejected by the British Delegation.



19. So long as a satisfactory agreement on the future of Palestine is not reached, the Jewish Agency is bound to maintain the rights of the Jewish people to return to its historic homeland and reconstitute there its National Home, to the full extent envisaged in the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate.

- - -X- - - - -

London,  
13. 2. 1947.





*Mr. H. Hanson*

## MEMORANDUM

To Members of the Executive Council,  
Advisory Council, and Speakers

Date March 4, 1947

From Dean Howard M. LeSourd, Director

Many of you have received a letter from the Rev. L. Humphrey Walz protesting the publication of the Arab War Effort. Two members of our committee have answered Mr. Walz and forwarded their letters to this office. With their permission, we have made copies of these answers and are forwarding them to you. We know that you will be interested in the views of both Dr. Carl Hermann Voss and the Rev. Karl Chworowsky. We believe that the Arab War Effort has filled a void in the minds of many.

As you know, we are concerned with presenting the truth about the Palestine question and it is our conviction that a publication like the Arab War Effort meets a great need. If you wish to distribute more copies of the Arab War Effort, write to our office and we shall make them available.

As always we are grateful to you for the aid and counsel you so generously give to the work of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

HML:VCS

Encs.



C  
O  
P  
Y

SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
96th Street near Central Park West  
New York City

- - - - -

Rev. L. Humphrey Walz, Minister

February 11, 1947

Dear Carl:

When I first read the pamphlet "The Arab War Effort" which you and your colleagues of the American Christian Palestine Committee have published, I could not help being aware of its effort to pass a half-truth as a whole-truth. There was no attempt, for instance, to convey such appreciation of Arab collaboration with the Allies as was voiced by such competent men as Eisenhower, Marshall, Alexander and Montgomery.

Typical is your omission from the Egyptian section of the attitude expressed by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons, February 27, 1945, "We did not press the Egyptian Government at any time to come into the war, and indeed upon more than one occasion in the past our advice has been to the contrary," a statement which he illustrates factually.

Unfortunately, as Stephen Leacock has reminded us, half-truths are like half-bricks,-they are of little use in construction, but handy for destructive hurling.

I know you did not hurl your pamphlet with the expectation that it would land where it would accomplish the great damage it has, and I write you personally in the hope that you will do something concrete to repair that damage.

Your pamphlet has been transmitted by newsmen to the Near, Middle and Far East where its republication has incensed millions of Arabs and their sympathizers against America and the Christian Church, for the title "American Christian Committee" hides the fact of your Zionist, non-Christian financial arrangement and staffing.

I do not wish to deprive you of your freedom of the press, in spite of the degree of your pamphlet's inflammatory anti-Semitism (not forgetting that the Arabs are Semites). However, I do feel that honesty should require either that you publicize a balanced report or, at least, indicate clearly to the Oriental world that your group speaks only as a small collection of American Christian individuals and has no official American or churchly backing.

I am sorry that this letter to a fellow-Christian is necessarily of so blunt a nature, but please believe it would not be so if I did not trust your Christian sincerity.

Sincerely,

LHW:se

(Signed) L. Humphrey Walz



American Christian Palestine Committee  
41 East 42nd Street  
New York 17, N. Y.

C O P Y

March 3, 1947

The Rev. L. Humphrey Walz  
Second Presbyterian Church  
3 West 95th Street  
New York 25, N. Y.

Dear Humphrey:

On behalf of the many members of the Executive Council and Advisory Council of the American Christian Palestine Committee who have forwarded to me their copies of your letter to them and have asked me to answer your letter for them, may I say that your letter left us puzzled as to what it was at which you were aiming?

What is it with which you are really concerned? The accuracy of the document? Or the advisability of publishing it?

You need not be concerned about the former, for the accuracy has been carefully tested. As for the latter item, it did not seem to us "inadvisable" and we therefore published the Arab War Effort. How can the book be a "half-truth," or filled, as you contend, with half-truths, if every point made in the text is borne out by the British Intelligence documents at the back of the book?

The Churchill quotation concerning Egypt's "neutrality" which you mention must be understood in the following light: the British desperately needed Arab co-operation during the crucial period of the war in the Middle East, but could not depend on it. Anyone acquainted with the inroads fascist propaganda had made in the Middle East preceding the war, understands that well. After the battle of El-Alemein in 1942 (when the Jewish volunteers of Palestine helped turn the tide of battle as van Paassen describes so splendidly in the Forgotten Ally), the issue was clearly decided in the Middle East. The British no longer needed nor desired Arab aid. It was then that the British, with an eye on post war needs, began to speak of the Arabs in the flattering terms which the Arab states did not deserve. The quotation which really describes the Arab relationship to the war is not the one you cite from Churchill's speech, but is the observation credited to an Englishman, Glubb Pasha, Commander of the Transjordan Arab Legion; it is given in full on page six of the Arab War Effort:

"The British of course always knew we were going to win the war, but at the time of these operations every Arab was perfectly convinced that Britain was finished for ever, and that it could only be a question of weeks before Germany took over Arabia. The Iraqis were perfectly sure of this or they would not have declared war on us...

"In brief, during the six weeks before the fall of Baghdad, every Arab was convinced that we were done for. Every Arab force previously organized by us mutinied and refused to fight for us, or faded away in desertions. The men of the Arab Legion alone not only stood firmly by us, but played a most active, energetic and valuable part in our little campaign."



Incidentally, many of us cannot forget that Churchill also lauded Franco in a speech in the House of Commons. That tribute to the "defender of Christian civilization" speaks for itself. The same might be said for Churchill's comment on an Egypt which was, at best, indifferent and apathetic when the Nazi legions under Rommel were at the gates of Alexandria.

There is, of course, a difference of opinion as to the amount of "damage" done by this brochure. It is our belief that a documented account such as the Arab War Effort can do immeasurable good, for the veil before many peoples' eyes will now be torn away; they will perceive what are the facts of political life in the Middle East. If this document has been, as you contend, transmitted word by word to the Middle East, then that is all to the good. Perhaps the men who lead the various Arab states, -- men who are, in most cases, not democratically elected or chosen by the people -- will realize that the world is catching up on them and is now aware of their duplicity. If there should ensue, as you implied, an Arab massacre, it will occur not because of any pamphlet which the American Christian Palestine Committee may issue. Rather is there a likelihood that it may come to pass because of the machinations of such notorious war criminals and miscreants as the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el Husseini, and his associate, Fawzi Kaukji, both of whom the British allowed to escape to havens of refuge in the Middle East where these former Nazi agents might conspire against the Jews of Palestine and fulminate against the democratic development of the Zionists in Palestine. Tell me, Humphrey, are you completely blind to what the British are doing in the Middle East?

Your slur that the American Christian Palestine Committee hides the fact of "Zionist non-Christian financial arrangement and staffing" is too mean and too low even to answer, but I will ask you these questions: Where now is the "Christian sincerity" which you protest so winsomely in your closing paragraph? Time and again I have asked for donations from Christians, from men who like yourself profess what I presume is a genuine concern about the future of European Jewry; but, I am sorry to say the contributions have been meager and all too few. Fortunately our Jewish friends, in accord with their traditional generosity, are willing to aid. But until the Christian conscience is awakened, we shall have to rely -- albeit reluctantly -- on contributions from our Jewish friends as well.

The American Christian Palestine Committee is not just a "small collection of Christian individuals," as you will readily see, if and when you read the pamphlet Christian Voice for a Jewish Palestine which I am sending to you under separate cover. A sizeable and considerable portion of Christian sentiment favors a Jewish Palestine. "Official" church support on an issue like this is, after all, not the most important consideration. First of all such support is difficult to secure when questions are as involved and complex as is the Zionist issue. You know well enough that not all Christians agree even on such basic Christian imperatives as racial equality or the abolition of the poll tax. Naturally we do not yet command within the Christian community the unity and unanimity which Zionism does from an overwhelming majority of the Jewish people. But the Christian support we do have is significant and convincing.

May I suggest, Humphrey, that you turn once more to the Arab War Effort and read again the forword written on behalf of the American Christian Palestine Committee by Dean Alfange? This states the case succinctly and admirably. I gather that your letter was given wide circulation. I shall see to it that my answer to you is circulated just as widely, and that Dr. Karl Chworowsky's answer to you is included along with my letter.

I am sorry that I must disagree with you, but I do so with the same candor and earnestness which characterize your letter to me.

Sincerely,

CHV:CS

(Signed) Carl Hermann Voss  
Chairman, Executive Council



C  
O  
P  
Y

Dr. Karl M. Chworosky  
165 East 19 Street  
Brooklyn, New York

February 20, 1947

The Rev. L. Humphrey Walz  
3 West 95 Street  
New York 25, N. Y.

My dear Mr. Walz:

I have your letter of February 11th, and shall take the liberty of answering as bluntly as you have written.

Your objection to "The Arab War Effort" as "a half-truth" makes little sense. The pamphlet was written as a "brief for the prosecution", as an indictment of the Arab World; since when does the prosecution assume the obligations of the defense? As you well know, the defense of the Arab World is not lacking either in volume or in intensity, and surely it does not lack the participation of large numbers of Christians who, forgetful of their age-old debt to the Jew, now join in crucifying Jesus again in the persecution of his displaced and homeless brethren. Incidentally, if you and your pro-Arab fellow-travelers have no better defense of the Arab's role in World War II than the Churchill statement you quote, or the perfunctory statements of men like Eisenhower, Marshall, Alexander, and Montgomery, I suggest you rest your case before you lose it by default. And remember also, that Churchill praised Franco too, What a travesty on the Four Freedoms and the anti-Fascist professions of his government!

As regards your charge against the "Zionist, non-Christian financial arrangement and staffing" of the American Christian Palestine Committee, may I ask just what you expect us to do, since men like yourself seem quite willing to sit solidly and indifferently by while millions of Jews wait in vain for justice and succor? Since not enough so-called "Christians" are willing to help us in our thoroughly Christian and humanitarian work, we are grateful indeed to accept Zionist financial support until that time when, by the grace of God, the cold hearts of a "Christian world" may have thawed and their callous indifference may have changed into a measure of mercy and goodwill. We are no more ashamed of this temporary and emergency arrangement than was the American Christian Refugee Committee ashamed a few years ago to accept the tidy sum of \$250,000 from the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. And if the Christian World, as you intimate, is not behind our effort in attempting to create a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine where the hapless victims of "Christian" inhumanity and indifference may find haven and security, please charge that fact "against" the Christian world and "for" our effort.

I am glad you are so generous as not to deprive me of my freedom of the press; although for the life of me I don't quite see how you or anyone else could do that. As for your fears that because of our pro-Zionist activities the western Christian world may be threatened with the growl and bite of "a big, bad Arab wolf", do rest your heart and mind in peace. There is no such danger, nor is there the slightest threat of "a big, bad Jewish wolf" preparing, from a Jewish State in Palestine, to swallow whole and at one gulp the Arab world.



I find it difficult to understand the sudden sentimental interest of so many Christian clergymen and lay-people in the cause of the Arab. Can it be that they hope thereby "to win more Arabs for Christ," and that they do not gag at employing certain Hitler techniques, against the Jew in order to win his Semitic brother? Or may even "God Oil" play a larger role with the churches than appears on the surface? The whole thing smells awfully "fishy" to me. After all, need I tell you, a Christian minister, to whom the Christian world owes most, to Jew or Arab? And may not Zionism offer an opportunity to the Christian world to make a small down-payment on this age-old debt? And if these suggestions mean nothing to you, pray, tell me, just what solution to the problem of the homeless and displaced Jew have you in mind? We Christian Zionists are entitled to more than carping criticism and continual harangue from those who have never ventured one constructive suggestion as to the question of Palestine and Jewish aspiration to return there. We CAN say this much for ourselves, we are at least earnestly trying to save human lives and to redeem human destinies; and just what are you fellows doing besides joining with the Arab who has land and resources to spare and today is satisfied to play the role of the dog in the manger?

As for your reference to anti-Semitism towards the close of your letter, may I say that the term "anti-Semitism" has never been used except in the sense of "anti-Jewish", never in that of "anti-Arab." Read Messrs. Gobineau, Chamberlain, Hitler et al.

If sometime you should care to debate this issue with me in public, please be assured of my willing and eager acceptance of the challenge. I shall be happy to cross swords with you, and am certain you would make a brave and skillful opponent.

I am, my dear Mr. Walz,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Karl M. Chwadowsky



# American Zionist Emergency Council

## CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America  
Mizrachi Organization of America  
Poale Zion-Zeire Zion of America  
Zionist Organization of America

342 MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.  
Murray Hill 2-1160

*AHS*

*Muph*

July 10, 1947

## SPECIAL DELIVERY

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver  
c/o Dr. Greenberg  
R.F.D. #1  
Northport, Long Island.

Dear Dr. Silver:

The enclosed is a copy of a letter recently received by the American Christian Palestine Committee from the British Information Services. Upon my advice, Dr. LeSourd replied to them as per the enclosed.

I think that will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

*Bakzin*

Benjamin Akzin

EA/lb

Encl



Reference for reply  
OV 03/Gen.

(COPY)

Telephone  
CI 6-5100

BRITISH INFORMATION SERVICES

30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA

NEW YORK 20, N. Y.

June 24, 1947

Dear Sirs:

A correspondent has written regarding five publications which he wishes to acquire and which, he states, are referred to in "The Arab War Effort" apparently issued by your committee. The publications referred to are:

1. Military handbook - General service of Intelligence, GHQ M.E. June 1941, Syrian Political Parties. (This handbook was issued by troops invading Syria in 1941).
2. A short History of Enemy Subversive Activity in Iraq 1935-1941. Defence Security Office C.I.C.I. Iraq Baghdad S.410/1, April 11, 1945. (Sections were quoted directly from "British Reports").
3. The Ex-Huflti's Role in the Iraqi Revolt General Service of Intelligence 1/12/41.
4. Telafer Parachute Expedition (Defence Security Office C.I.C.I. Iraq Report 1, Baghdad S. 405-1-1, December 9, 1944).
5. Telafer Parachute Expedition Report 2, Defence Security Office C.I.C.I. Iraq Baghdad S. 405/1/2, December 19, 1944.

We have been unable to identify these documents as having been published by the British Government and we should therefore like to know if you have copies and if they may be consulted at your offices.

Yours very truly.

(sgl) W. C. Dalgoutte

W. C. Dalgoutte  
Librarian

The American Christian Palestine  
Committee,

41 East 42nd Street  
New York 17, N.Y.

WCD/paf



July 9, 1947

Mr. W. C. Dalgoutte, Librarian  
British Information Services  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York 20, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Dalgoutte:

I wish to acknowledge receipt  
of your inquiry of June 24th. In reply, I may  
state that authentic copies of the documents  
referred to therein were lent to the American  
Christian Palestine Committee on the understanding  
that they would be returned after study and use.  
In accordance with that understanding, the documents  
in question have since been returned and are no longer  
in our possession.

I am certain that, given the full  
cooperation of the proper departments of the British  
Government, you will have no difficulty in securing  
access to the originals.

Yours very truly,

Howard M. LeSourd  
Director



# A Christian Looks at Palestine

HOWARD M. LESOURD



*An address delivered at  
the Commonwealth Club,  
San Francisco, July 1, 1947*





**Howard M. LeSourd was for ten years Dean of the Graduate School of Boston University. On leave from the University, he served as director of the American Christian Palestine Committee from 1944 to the fall of 1947, when he returned to Boston University as Dean of its newly organized School of Public Relations.**



**F**OR CENTURIES, Christians have been helping to create and perpetuate the Jewish problem. Now, for the first time in history, they have a real opportunity to help solve it, for the Jewish problem is basically a Christian problem.

\* The curse of the Jews, since their expulsion from Palestine two thousand years ago, has been their national homelessness, leading to their abnormal economic and social position everywhere, and to all the complexities growing out of this. Their return to Palestine now is the first step in their struggle for normalcy, dignity, and security the world round. No serious student of anti-Semitism can escape the fact that in all countries where anti-Semitism has resulted in robbery, expulsion and murder, it was their vulnerable status that made the Jews both scapegoats and prey. The French and Belgians with national governments behind them were made Nazi slaves. but the Jews and Gypsies were exterminated . . .

During and at the end of the First World War, all nations agreed that Palestine should be resettled by the Jews. Not a word of protest was raised anywhere—even the Arabs, through their spokesmen, approved. Today, when the desperate need of the Jews for Palestine has been clearly and unmistakably proved, when the Jews have demonstrated their desire, willingness and ability to develop Palestine into a country that can make an incalculable contribution to the welfare of the world, powerful forces oppose the carrying



out of the unbiased judgment rendered by the civilized world twenty-five years ago.

**F**OR BACKGROUND purposes, and a quick review of essential facts, let us trace the history of the Palestine issue that now lies in the lap of the United Nations.

Modern political Zionism began fifty years ago with the publication by Theodor Herzl of a little book called *The Jewish State*. Actually, Zionism in its essential sense of dedication to the rebuilding of the Jewish National Home, is as old as the dispersion itself and never lost its hold on the minds and hearts of the overwhelming majority of the Jewish people. Throughout the centuries it was, however, a dream and a goal, and not a program of practical action. It was not until the anti-Semitic trial of Dreyfus, that Herzl and a small group of aroused Jews were convinced that there would be no dignity and no security for Jewish people everywhere unless and until a Jewish State was reconstructed in the ancient Homeland of Palestine. They then formulated a program of political and economic action.

Little progress was made during the next twenty years, but a quiet process of education among Jews themselves and with the heads of world governments was carried on effectively. When the Middle East fell into the control of the Allied Armies during World War I, Great Britain issued in 1917 what is known as the Balfour Declaration, in recog-



nition of Jewish contributions to the war effort and of their need and rights in Palestine. Full and thoughtful consideration of the rights and dignities of Arabs was also included. This document was issued with the consent and approval of the Allied Nations, including the United States Government.

It is a short document and reads as follows:

His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors 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 Jews in any other country.

The wording is simple, the meaning on the face of it perfectly clear. The interpretations at the time by Lloyd George, Lord Balfour and Woodrow Wilson show that they accepted it as anyone would understand it; namely, that a nation was to be set up in Palestine with a Jewish majority, but that Arab and Christian minorities were to be protected in their civil and religious rights, while Jewish citizenship in other countries was not to be jeopardized by the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth. All the long and diligent efforts of a variety of antagonists have never been able to rob this historic document of its simple, original meaning.

International legal validity was given to the Balfour



Declaration five years after its issuance, when it was embodied in the preamble to the Mandate for Palestine, approved by fifty-two nations. To make specific the intent of the Balfour Declaration, Britain, the Mandatory Power, was commissioned by the Mandate to do three things:

1. Facilitate immigration of Jews into Palestine.
2. Encourage their close settlement on the land.
3. "Place the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home".

What could be clearer? The commitments could well have been carried out, had Great Britain treated Palestine as the mandated territory it is rather than as a colony. The mere fact that Palestine was put under the administration of the Colonial Office served at once to doom any Trusteeship commitments to nullification.

But with world approval of their heritage, the Jews went to work. They took over not new virgin territory, but a wasted land, worn out, neglected, barren. They came with a love of the land, and began planting trees, draining swamps, breaking up the hard stony ground, rebuilding the terraces on hillsides, digging irrigation channels, washing salty lowlands, fertilizing the soil, and setting out orchards. And the miracle has happened—the country is again taking on life and productivity and beauty. Now, in perhaps the most



backward section of the inhabited world, there is hope for the future. Cities are being built, industries established; education, health, prosperity are now abroad in a land that formerly had only ignorance and superstition, disease and filth, poverty and degradation.

**I**T IS this development that the British have sought to curb. They seem to fear the loss of a strategic position on their lifeline; jeopardizing of the Middle East oil resources available to them; possible industrial competition in the Middle East market; weakening of their Empire position in the Middle East and throughout the world.

Neither the Zionists nor the Christian supporters of Zionism wish to harm Britain. We believe that Britain's attitude toward Palestine is based on unreasonable fear—that this fear has so blinded her that she cannot see that her best interests lie in fulfilment of her commitments under the Mandate. A strong Jewish State in Palestine would do more to help British interest in the Middle East than all her futile, cringing appeasement of Arab feudalism.

But let us get on with the story. In 1939, with war clouds hanging low over Europe and the world, Mr. Neville Chamberlain had tried to appease Hitler at Munich and failed. He then sought to buy the friendship and support of the Arabs by sacrificing the Jews through the infamous White Paper of 1939 which nullified the Mandate's provi-



sions by limiting land purchase to six per cent of Palestine and by allowing just enough more immigrants—some 75,000—to keep the Jewish population frozen at about one-third the total population of Palestine. The Mandates Commission of the League of Nations declared the White Paper out of harmony with the Mandate and thus illegal and unenforceable. But Britain paid no more attention to the League than did Japan, Italy or Germany.

The war was soon on. The Arab leaders lined up with the Axis. Despite the pathetic attempts now being made to demonstrate that their sympathies were always with the United Nations, documentary evidence proves that the Arab leaders were pro-Hitler and pro-Mussolini. The Jews of Palestine, however, defined their attitude in the slogan, "We will fight the war as though there were no White Paper. We will fight the White Paper as though there were no war." A magnificent contribution was made by them in work behind the lines and on the battlefields at Alamein, North Africa and Europe. Far too much British energy is now being spent on minimizing the war contribution of the Jews and apologizing for so-called Arab neutrality.

During the war the illegal British White Paper of 1939 was the means of preventing hundreds of thousands of European Jews from escaping to safety in Palestine. The British justified their action in closing Palestine as a war measure. When the war was over and the toll of murdered



Jews added up, the inconceivable total of six million staggered the world. The Jews were beside themselves with grief and frustration; they felt that now that the war was over, the White Paper, which, on the face of it, was a war-time appeasement measure—and a futile one, at that—would be abrogated and the remnants of the European Jewish communities would be permitted to go to Palestine. It is not difficult to imagine their horror and anger when they were told that the White Paper policy stands, prolonging the misery, anguish and death of Jews in Europe.

The restraints imposed by Britain on Jewish immigration continued to stand even after President Truman's request of last Fall for 100,000 Palestine certificates for displaced Jews in the American zone. Last May again Britain turned down the unanimous recommendations of the joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, among which recommendations the request for immediate issuance of 100,000 immigration certificates was prominent.

And the Jews who had suffered under Hitler and now under Bevin began, with the only remaining weapons at their disposal, to try to force open the gates of Palestine. The small, irresponsible Irgun and Stern gang went beserk. We do not condone violence, but with the blood of patriots in our veins, we can at least understand resistance to illegal government.

Britain, feeling too weak to fulfill her legal commitments,



and too involved to reach any outright solution of the problem, has appealed to the United Nations—not to take Palestine off her hands, but for recommendations. . . . This Eleven Nation Inquiry Committee of the United Nations is the nineteenth study of the Palestine problem. Each new investigation has served as an excuse for further delay. Since Britain rejected the plans for settlement of the problem, advanced by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, we can only predict that if the recommendations of the United Nations do not suit her, she will probably reject these also. "Heads I win, tails you lose," is still apparently her policy in Palestine.

**M**Y SUBJECT today is "A Christian Looks at Palestine." Naturally I speak for myself and for the organization of Christians of which I have the honor to be Director. But I think I speak also for a host of other Christians who subscribe to the fundamental principles that should be applied in a Christian appraisal of the Palestine issue. Let me mention briefly six:—

*First*, Christian convictions about Palestine should be in harmony with Christian tradition. Christianity is an outgrowth of Judaism. Jesus was a Jew. The Holy Book of the Jews is part of our Holy Bible. Their shrines are our shrines. Their aspirations based on Old Testament prophecies are naturally a part of Christian conviction also. Any



other attitude seems a perversion based on acquired prejudices.

Someone has said that "people learn prejudices at their mother's knee and other joints." But my interest in and support of Zionism was learned at my mother's knee as she told me Bible stories. When she came to those sections dealing with the Fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion, she would add, "And the world will never be the sort of place it ought to be until the Jews return to Palestine." Many great Christian leaders trace their concern about a Jewish Palestine to just such early religious instruction.

The argument that Palestine is a Holy Land, especially holy to Christianity, is often used to explain why Jews should not be permitted to come to that country in large numbers. I cannot understand this point of view. If it is not inconsistent with our Christian feelings toward Palestine to have it inhabited by a Moslem majority, why should it be any more inconsistent with our feelings to have it inhabited by a Jewish majority to whom we are spiritually so closely related?

Tradition and sentiment naturally lead us to desire a Jewish Palestine, but there are more practical basic reasons. My second principle belongs to that category.

**Second,** Christians believe in progress, happiness, health, education and prosperity. Surely no one doubts that the



coming of the Jews to Palestine has brought all of these blessings both to Jews and Arabs. A miracle of re-development of the neglected, worn out land has been taking place, and the "desert is blossoming" with abundant harvests in the small area in which Jews are permitted to settle.

It is said that mass immigration of Jews would destroy the character of the country, which is so essential to its holiness. Since when is it a tenet of Christianity that a semi-desert condition, poverty and disease are necessary for the exercise of holiness? In the days of Jesus, Palestine is generally supposed to have had a population of between four and five million. Why is it essential for the preservation of this holiness that Palestine today should have a population of less than two million, and that the terraces which graced the hillsides should remain broken, and the forests which His eyes saw should never be replanted?

The Jews have built beautiful cities, established essential industries, provided hospitals and sanitation service, set up schools, made the whole country happier and healthier and wiser than before. In other words, the Jews are creating the fundamentals of civilization and providing a pattern for the development of the whole of the Middle East. Christians must of necessity support such humanitarian aspects of this movement or be false to their faith.

**Third,** Christians believe in the sanctity of law—interna-



tional law. The Zionists have the law on their side and their position is legally unassailable. Apologists for Britain's disrespect for her international commitments excuse her on the basis that the commitments were bad. Professor Stace of Princeton goes so far as to say that the Mandate is stealing from Arabs and a "promise to steal ought not to be kept." How can one accuse the League of Nations, which expressed the collective conscience of the world, of stealing, especially when it gave the Arabs freedom in six Arab states, reserving for the Jews only one per cent of the Middle East territory which the Allies had freed from Turkey? Were fifty-two nations wrong and Britain alone right? And is Palestine, in spite of all the tradition, history and faith connected with it, to become just another Arab State?

British action in the Middle East can be justly compared to that of a Trustee who was given in trust the sum of, say, \$45,000. After he held the Trust Fund for a time, he decided to give \$35,000 to some people who had already inherited over \$1,000,000. This was done without court consent, but the one to whom the trust was left, anxious to get some of the money, agreed to this misappropriation with the understanding that the remaining \$10,000 should in due time be his. But the Trustee would not permit the real legatee to fulfill the requirements of the inheritance. Instead, he held the money tightly for himself. He finally proposed that the owner might use \$1,500 under the Trustee's control,

provided that \$3,500 be given to the same group that received the previous \$35,000 misappropriation, and that he, the Trustee, be permitted to take \$5,000 as his permanent possession. When this was refused, the Trustee would turn over nothing.

If such a case were put before a court in any country, the Trustee would be relieved and jailed. But all one needs to do to get a perfect parallel is to name the Trustee Britain, and the legatee, the Jews, and to change dollars to square miles of territory, remembering that the Palestinian Mandate originally included Transjordan. The deal proposed was the Morrison plan, agreed to last summer by our State Department representative, Mr. Grady, but rejected by President Truman.

Surely, a Government that promises to give away a trust against the ruling of the court, as in the case of the White Paper of 1939, is not a Government that should be trusted.

**Fourth,** Christians believe in being just, kind and humane. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." The humanitarian aspect of this problem is both overwhelming and familiar. Two hundred and fifty thousand Jews are still living in DP camps in Europe; 15,000 are behind barbed wire enclosures on Cyprus; 1,250,000 starved, sick, mentally depressed European Jews are still looking for some hope of rehabilitation. And the only hope for most of



them is Palestine. How long will the Christian conscience of the world permit this continued torture! Delay, delay—is all these people have experienced and heard from those to whom the world entrusted their national homeland. Sympathy is occasionally expressed, but no action has been forthcoming.

As Christians we should protest not only against the inhumanity of inaction, but the concurrent brutalization of Christians. Christians cannot be party to, or lookers-on at, injustice and maltreatment without suffering moral deterioration. Justice to the Jews now would bring a needed spiritual uplift to Christians the world over. For the basic tenet of Christianity is respect for human personality. As long as the Jews are not given the dignity and security that is their right, just so long will the dignity and security of all mankind be in jeopardy. Our generation has learned by bitter experience that the security and dignity of even privileged people are bound up inextricably with the security and dignity of submerged individuals and small groups all over the world.

*Fifth,* Christians believe in democracy. As a matter of fact, all the basic principles of democracy are deeply rooted in the Hebraic-Christian tradition. We should support a Jewish Palestine because there democracy finds expression in the Middle East. Those who oppose a Jewish Palestine are lending support to Governments and landowners who op-

pose every principle we hold dear. There is no freedom of religion in Moslem-controlled lands; there is no effort to uplift the masses; there is no program of education and health. The forces that oppose Zionist aspirations in Palestine, be those forces Arab, or British, or American, do so for selfish, reactionary, imperialistic, exploitive reasons. And if Palestine becomes Arab, the forces of the Arab world, personified in that war criminal and hater of everything western, the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, who recently was so brazenly defended by Arab representatives in the United Nations, will do their best to destroy democracy root and branch.

I cannot understand some Christian missionary support of the Arab position. To be sure, I believe in Christian education in Moslem lands, but if this opportunity must be purchased at the sacrifice of Jewish lives and Christian principles, then even that should be abandoned.

Our only hope in the Middle East is to support democracy, and if, in that region, we sell out our basic ideals for a mess of pottage, then we deserve to lose the democratic rights we now possess.

Some still insist, however, that it was not democratic for fifty-two nations to give Palestine to the Jews, when it had an Arab majority. But the nations examined the Jewish and Arab claims to Palestine and decided that where two peoples lay claim to one country, the people which is home-



less and can claim no other national territory has a better case than the people which was being given an opportunity for independent existence in a half dozen other countries. That conclusion is even more valid today, for now the Arab countries have arrived at full national existence and the Jewish situation is even more tragic than could possibly have been envisaged twenty-five years ago.

Palestine has become the acid test of democracy; and God help democracy if its so-called friends forsake it now in the Palestine settlement.

*Sixth*, Christians believe in peace—permanent peace. Let us not delude ourselves. Unless the world can arrive at a just solution of the Jewish problem, it cannot arrive at just solutions for other problems. As long as the Jewish problem exists in various nations, so long will Jews be vulnerable to those who will seek to use them as scapegoats for some new Hitlerian-like revolution. As long as Jews have no security in the Middle East, their very presence there, innocent though they be of the chicanery of power politics, will constitute a menace to peace.

The Arabs and Jews can live and work peacefully together, if left alone from the outside. Peace can be established in Palestine, even as the French and British have worked out an even more difficult problem of cooperation in Canada.

In keeping with the hallowed character of the country,

Palestine should be freed of political-strategic considerations, and be permanently neutralized. The temporary administration of Palestine should be entrusted to a committee of high-minded individuals, who, once elected by the United Nations and given their terms of reference, should be entirely free from governmental or inter-governmental pressure.

After a Palestinian State takes the place of the temporary administration, international treaties guaranteeing the neutrality of Palestine should become effective. Similar arrangements in the case of Switzerland and Belgium in the nineteenth century helped not only to keep those two small countries peaceful, but contributed greatly to the maintenance of peace in Europe for a long time. The neutralization of Palestine may play a similar part, and may contribute greatly to the dispelling of those dangers of war which are today so menacing in the Middle East.

These are some very brief observations from a Christian who looks at Palestine, not merely as an observer, but as one who is trying to do something about the problem. It is my deepest conviction that only as Christians individually or through the American Christian Palestine Committee demand the application of Christian principles to the solution of the Palestine problem, can we hope to lay the foundations of a better world.



# AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

## FOUNDERS AND HONORARY CHAIRMEN

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

REV. DR. HENRY A. ATKINSON

## CO-CHAIRMEN

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

REV. DR. DANIEL A. POLING

## VICE-CHAIRMEN

WILLIAM GREEN

ERIC O. JOHNSTON

HON. FIORELLO H. LA GUARDIA

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

DR. DANIEL L. MARSH

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL

PHILIP MURRAY

MRS. RUTH BRYAN OWEN ROHDE

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

HON. SUMNER WELLES

## SECRETARY

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

## TREASURER

DEAN ALFANGE

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

REV. DR. CARL HERMANN VOSS,

*Chairman*

FATHER GEORGE B. FORD

PROF. CARL J. FRIEDRICH

REV. DR. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

PROF. EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

MRS. WALTER CLAY LOWDERMILK

EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER

PROF. REINHOLD NIEBUHR

ROBERT E. SMITH

REV. DR. RALPH W. SOCKMAN

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PROF. JAMES LUTHER ADAMS

J. M. BLALOCK

DR. JOHN W. BRADBURY

REV. EMORY S. BUCKE

HON. OSCAR CHAPMAN

REV. KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

REV. DR. CLARK WALKER CUMMINGS

REV. DR. ALBERT E. DAY

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

JUDGE JOHN GUTKNECHT

PROF. S. RALPH HARLOW

REV. DAVID R. HUNTER

DEAN SIDNEY LOVETT

DR. WALTER CLAY LOWDERMILK

PROF. HALFORD E. LUCCOCK

REV. DR. LESLIE T. PENNINGTON

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

REV. WENDELL PHILLIPS

HON. FRANK A. PICARD

MISS DAPHNE ROBERT

REV. DR. HAROLD PAUL SLOAN

DEAN CLAUDE W. SPROUSE

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

PROF. PAUL TILLICH

REV. DR. HOWARD B. WARREN

PROF. HENRY N. WIEMAN

DR. MARY E. WOOLLEY

---

This organization combines the American Palestine Committee and the Christian Council on Palestine, and continues the work of both organizations.



*Published by*

**AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE**

**41 East 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y.**