



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
107

Box
37

Folder
363

Congressional Record, 1947.

The United States Senate Hails The Jewish State

Duplicate

A Reprint from the Congressional Record of December 1, 1947

THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am compelled to leave the Chamber in order to fulfill an engagement, I wish to make a very brief observation on a matter wholly dissociated from the interim European-aid bill, which has been under consideration most of the day, and was passed a few minutes ago.

For a long time the people of the United States and the people of the world have been interested in a fair and equitable settlement of the problems which face Palestine. The United Nations appointed a subcommittee to consider the settlement of the Palestine problem. After long hearings and very earnest efforts on the part of that subcommittee, it reported to the United Nations a recommendation that Palestine be partitioned so as to establish a separate independent Jewish nation in that part of Palestine between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea.

After long debate in the United Nations Assembly, just before it adjourned on last Saturday, by a vote of 33 to 13, the report of the subcommittee was adopted by the United Nations, 33 to 13 being a vote of almost 3 to 1 in the Assembly.

While in the declaration of that result, Mr. President, neither side received completely all that it had desired in the way of the establishment of a Jewish nation in Palestine, yet the result was a culmination of many years of study, thought, and agitation not only on the part of the United Nations, but on the part of the nations of the world and the people of the world.

There are many in this body who have been interested in a proper solution of the Palestinian question. I am one of those. We have felt for a long time that the peace of the world would be promoted by a settlement of this kind, by an adjudication, as it may be called, of the United Nations or of some international tribunal, even before the United Nations was created, which would give to the Jews, not only of Palestine but of the world, a reasonable degree of satisfaction in the consummation of this great ideal which they have for many years and generations held, that there would be established not only in Palestine a homeland for the Jews, but an independent nation. It has now come about, insofar as the judgment of the United Nations is concerned, by the vote providing for the partition of Palestine.

In my judgment, it is the best solution that could have been made of this troublesome, ticklish problem. In my judgment, if accepted in good faith by all the nations of the world, and especially by the nations in the Mediterranean basin, it will contribute much to the peace of the world by the elimination of a sore spot, of a condition which

has troubled not only the region in which it is involved, but all the nations of the world, great and small, more than anything that has happened in many years.

Therefore, I feel that those who have been working for the promotion of this ideal are to be congratulated. As to those who have opposed it, I feel that in the interest of world peace, security, and satisfaction ultimately all over the Mediterranean region, among the Jews and the Arabs alike, the acceptance of this decision will make a contribution toward world peace, world satisfaction, and the realization of an age-old ambition and ideal on the part of the Jews especially, and will do no substantial harm to those who opposed it in the United Nations.

I hope the decision will be accepted. I hope it will be received with that resignation on the part of those who opposed it which comes about through the necessity that if peace is to prevail in the world there should be concession, there must be acceptance of the verdicts of mankind, and a realization that the vote in the United Nations must be considered a verdict of mankind with respect to the solution of the Palestinian question.

The vote of the United Nations is only the beginning. A government must be set up. It will require time not only for it to be set up, but to adjust itself into the new world situation and with its neighbors on both sides of the Mediterranean Sea.

I urge upon all those who have been interested in this question and in its solution, no matter what attitude they assume, to accept the verdict of the United Nations and to cooperate in good faith in an effort honestly to carry out the judgment of the United Nations. I hope that ultimately Jew and Arab may live together in peace and harmony in the same region where the destiny of men has placed them. I think they can do that if they find themselves willing to accept this verdict as the verdict of mankind with respect to this particular problem, which has been, I think, so happily settled in the United Nations within the last few days.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I am one of those—and I doubt not that all my colleagues feel the same way—who have great admiration for the very consistent way in which he has carried out his convictions in this particular cause, which has now culminated in the vote to which he has referred.

I point out to him, and I doubt not it has occurred to him in his own heart, the lines of Spenser:

But Justice, though her dome she does prolong,

Yet at the last she will her own cause right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Just this one word in conclusion. I feel that the leaders of the great Jewish people who have undertaken to bring about the consummation of an independent nation in Palestine are to be congratulated upon the fact that while they did not get all they originally hoped to get, they have accepted the decision as the solution to which they are committed, and which they will undertake to carry out in good faith, and in the faith that stirs their hearts now, and has stirred them throughout all the years in which they have sought this consummation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rose to ask the senior Senator from Kentucky to yield for a moment, when he was speaking on the Palestine situation. He did not see me, and so I rise now in my own time, just to commend him for what he has said.

As one who has worked at public and private meetings on the subject of Palestine over a period of years, I certainly pray and hope that the present settlement will be one which will lead to greater peace, greater satisfaction, and greater comfort for many persons throughout the world today. I commend the Senator for his statement. I join with him in what he said.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for a brief time only. As one of the Senators from Illinois, I wish to associate myself with what the able senior Senator from Kentucky, our distinguished minority leader, said a few moments ago about the partitioning of Palestine. I know of no man in America who has done more in the dissemination of information upon the partitioning of Palestine than has the able Senator from Kentucky. Along with him, and, I think, with all other Senators, I was happy to know that the Assembly of the United Nations had, by a vote of 33 to 13, agreed upon what seemed to them, and what seems to the people of the country, to be the proper and adequate solution of one of the most troublesome problems the Assembly will probably ever be compelled to solve. Like other speakers, I am certain that if those people in the Mediterranean area who are vitally affected by the partitioning of Palestine will face the issue in the true spirit that was exhibited by those who voted in the affirmative, it will go a long way toward eliminating one of the real trouble spots of the world, and will help bring about the thing that every American is truly interested in, which is an everlasting and enduring peace.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators in rejoicing on the action taken by the United Nations in its vote concerning Palestine. However, there is nothing strange about that whatever. Irrespective of the vote

and irrespective of how different countries voted, the important and significant thing is that a historical fact has finally been recognized by civilized governments. That is as it should be. The situation is as it was from the time of Abraham, from the time of the coming of the Persians into Palestine, from the plowing of Palestine by Egypt, from the coming of Alexander of Greece and the Romans and the Crusaders. Think what happened even under England. The significant thing in my opinion is that civilized society, as organized at the moment, has finally recognized that the Jewish people have a place in the earth, something which history has always proved. The other significant thing is that the United Nations has said that foreign military must get out of Palestine, and they will get out of Palestine.

If, now, the United Nations will only carry the matter further and tell France to get out of Indochina, and the Dutch to get out of Java, then we shall really have something for which to be thankful. We shall then actually believe that civilization is making progress.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the other Senators here this afternoon in expressing my great satisfaction and happiness at the favorable decision reached with regard to the partition of Palestine by the United Nations General Assembly on Saturday.

We in the Senate have a justifiable right in feeling that the solution of the Palestine problem was in no small way due to the efforts in behalf of the Zionist cause by many Members of this body throughout the past two decades. One of the leaders of this great cause was the very able and distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

I know of no better way of expressing my feelings about this fruition of the dreams of millions of our fellow citizens and the Jewish people throughout the world than to associate myself with the sentiments and remarks of the Senator from New York hailing the partition of Palestine.

I only want to add to his statement, which I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, the thought that the solution of this grave and difficult international problem holds out the hope and the promise that what has been demonstrated as possible in the solution of this problem can and should happen with respect to other great issues facing the world.

I join the Senator from New York in saluting Jewish Palestine.

May God grant both the Jews and Arabs the wisdom, the patience, and the good will to see the partition through in that same spirit of cooperation and good will that motivated the nations of the world in working out and voting for the partition of Palestine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. WAGNER HAILING THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY VOTE ON THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE

I hail the decision of the United Nations General Assembly to establish the Jewish

state in part of Palestine. This act by the United Nations is in accord with the highest dictates of humanity and the loftiest principles of justice. If the resolution for the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine is immediately implemented, I feel certain that the present tension and difficulties in Palestine will disappear and peace again will reign in the Holy Land.

The American people have for many years taken a close interest in the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. I was particularly pleased with the leading and vigorous role which the United States under leadership of President Truman, Secretary of State George Marshall and our delegation to the United Nations played at the sessions of the General Assembly in implementing the traditional policy of our Government in support of the establishment of the Jewish state. This policy can only further and strengthen the ideals and charter of the United Nations. I am sure that world public opinion will support the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine.

After an exile of more than 2,000 years from the Holy Land the Jewish people in their new state—their own state will start a new and glorious chapter in which hundreds of thousands of Jews can end their miserable wanderings and become rooted in the land of their fathers, the homeland of their prayers and the land of their dreams. Once given the opportunity and the initial economic aid the Jews of Palestine will develop a civilization worthy of their prayers and their aspirations for the future.

As one of the co-sponsors of the current resolution on Palestine adopted by the Congress of the United States and as one of the founders of the American Christian Palestine Committee, and because of my life-long interest and association with the Zionist cause, I am personally very thrilled to see in my lifetime the dream of a Jewish state converted into a reality. This has brought me much happiness.

I salute the Jewish state of Palestine!

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to the matter which engaged the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, in connection with Palestine. I ask permission that there shall be inserted in the RECORD at this point excerpts of publications of the last 2 days, commenting upon this subject, particularly an editorial from the Herald Tribune of this morning, an editorial from the New York Times of this morning, and a most penetrating analysis of the problems ahead in connection with Palestine, from the publication PM. I ask that these be printed at this point, because I think they furnish a most interesting and valuable historical record. I also ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a news article from the New York Times of this morning, on the significance of this occasion and what the future portends.

There being no objection, the excerpts of publications and the news article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 1, 1947]

THE ASSEMBLY ACTS

The final vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations approving the partition of Palestine by a little better than the requisite two-thirds vote represents one of the few great acts of courageous collective statesmanship which our shattered postwar world has been able to achieve. For the first time in some 30 years of anguished history it opens a real hope that a stable settlement of the Palestine issue can be reached. For the first

time in the far briefer but hardly less troubled history of the United Nations it reveals that organization acting as it was intended to act in precisely the kind of situation which it was created to meet, with a careful deliberation, but at the same time with an ultimate decisiveness, which are the best possible omens for the future of this second great attempt to bring order into the international world.

The partition plan, dealing as it was forced to do with an irreconcilable tangle of violently conflicting rights, represents only a very rough justice at best. Unable to rely for enforcement on anything more than the existing jumble of national policies, national interests, and available popular forces, it includes no detailed program for its own administration and there is no certainty of its practical success. Zionism, whose path has never been easy or safe, is presented with new perils in this proposed solution. It is clearly not in itself a final answer. But there are not infrequently moments in the affairs of men and peoples when some firm answer, however imperfect or even perilous it may be, is better than none.

It is quite clear from the shifting attitudes of the various delegations and from the composition of the final vote that the partition plan was adopted basically because there was no alternative. The most exhaustive investigation, the most patient hearing of all parties at issue, the most careful calculation of the actual political and human forces involved, yielded no solution which would have been more just, more practicable, or more certain in its operation than this one. What the United Nations did was to ascertain that fact, to have the courage to make the decision which the fact implied, even though it carried no sure guaranty for the future, and thus to establish as firm a foundation as has yet existed on which an ultimate settlement of the Palestine problem may one day be erected.

Whether or not such a settlement will be erected obviously depends upon many things. It depends upon the sincerity with which both the United States and the Soviet Union meet the implications of a policy on which they have been in rare and fortunate agreement. It depends very directly upon the willingness of the British to effect their evacuation as fully as possible in accordance with the spirit of this international directive, which they invited for their own relief. It depends immediately, of course, upon the Arab states and, perhaps upon the statesmanship which the Zionist community can bring to the problem in its new form. These variables are many, and the difficulties ahead may be grave. But whatever they bring, the two-thirds vote in the United Nations, recording a considered judgment upon the facts of the world as it is, will be a powerful aid and support for reasonable courses. The General Assembly has had the will to speak. That in itself is a new factor, and it leaves us with a new hope.

[From the New York Times of December 1, 1947]

THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE

History was written at Lake Success when the General Assembly of the United Nations approved, without major change, the plan recommended by its special committee for the partition of Palestine. Under this plan two independent states, one Arab and the other Jewish, linked together in an economic union, will be established after the termination of the British mandate. Jerusalem will be placed under a United Nations trusteeship. Provision is made for democratic rights and processes, for the protection of minorities, for the safeguarding of the holy places of three great religions and for the preservation of existing languages and cultures.

The decision in favor of partition has been made on the basis of an extremely close vote, but we do not believe that this result necessarily measures accurately the judgment of the Assembly on the merits of partition as such. It has been obvious throughout the long debate that a practical question of procedure was involved: namely, the question of how this decision for partition is to be enforced if there is resistance to it. Britain, the present mandatory power, has refused to accept this responsibility; the United Nations has as yet established no international police force which could be used for this purpose, and the General Assembly itself has created no enforcement machinery for a contingency of this kind. It seems probable, therefore, that the failure to make adequate provision for enforcement explains not only some of the negative votes but some of the abstentions when yesterday's poll was taken.

Many of us have long had doubts on another score; doubts concerning the wisdom of erecting a political state on a basis of religious faith. But these doubts must now yield to the fact of a decision made by the necessary two-thirds majority of the voting nations, after a thorough investigation and a full and fair debate. It has been clear for many months that the present precarious deadlock in Palestine required some new solution. It has been equally clear that the most appropriate forum in which to find such a solution was the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Assembly has now made its choice, and its decision should command the acquiescence, the respect, and the loyal support of all nations and all peoples. The award does not go so far, in territorial terms, as most Zionists had hoped. It will grievously disappoint the Arabs. But it is the decision of the United Nations; it is the best decision which that great agency of world opinion was able to discover, and we trust that it will have the willing compliance of the two peoples whose future it involves. Failing that, the Security Council must be courageous enough and resolute enough to supply the necessary means of enforcement. Let us hope that with this decision a solution has at last been found for the Holy Land's tragic and heartbreaking problems.

[From PM of December 1, 1947]

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR THE NEW JEWISH STATE

(The following articles were written by PM's two experts on Palestine. As the post-war fight for a Jewish homeland unfolded, I. F. Stone made three trips to Palestine. One trip was via the European underground of Jewish DP's attempting to reach their promised land. Victor Bernstein accompanied the UN special committee (UNSCOP) to the Holy Land and reported first-hand its findings and recommendations. Here they give their reactions to the fight for partition and how the birth of two nations will come about.)

THE END OF A 2,000-YEAR JOURNEY FOR THE JEWS

(By I. F. Stone)

The decision taken at Flushing Meadow on Saturday gave international approval to the reestablishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Almost two millennia, more than 18 centuries, have passed since the last Jewish state in Palestine fell. It was in A. D. 70 after a struggle whose fury still lives for us in the pages of Tacitus, that Jerusalem was taken by the Romans and the second temple destroyed, all but that fragment of wall at which Jewish pilgrims have long prayed and wept.

Much has been paid for the reestablishment, and much more will be paid before it is firmly realized. It was made possible first of all by those who in the latter half of the

last century began to return, not to pray and weep but to build and sow. Except for the empty desert spaces of the Negev, which new settlements have just begun to penetrate, the land granted the Jews by the UN are those acres of Galilee, the Emek, and the coastal plain which these settlers and those who followed them wrested from desert sands, malarial marsh, and stony hills.

Many names are associated with the return: the Viennese journalist, Herzl, who helped inspire it; Weizmann, the chemist with a poet's vision, who played the crucial role in winning the first international recognition of a Jewish national home; the British philosopher and statesman, Lord Balfour, to whose declaration Woodrow Wilson lent his support. Another American President, Harry S. Truman, has made possible the completion of the work to which they set their hands.

Hitler helped to spell out the validity of Jewish claims

One other name, a strange one in this list, must be added, that of Adolf Hitler. No more terrible instrument of Providence could be envisaged. The main payment for what happened in the UN Assembly was the payment of 6,000,000 Jewish lives taken by the Nazi terror. This it was which spelled out in blood and fire a message the most unwilling among Jews as well as non-Jews could not escape: the validity and the necessity of Jewish national aspiration.

The doubts and hesitations, the hypocrisy and reluctance, the intrigue and the power politics of the prolonged UN inquiry and debate, will dwindle into the distance as time passes. And what will loom larger on the horizon of history is the fact that the world did make recompense to this new Attila's foremost victims; that justice and good will and Christian conscience did triumph after all.

A need for understanding between Arab and Jew

The circumstances under which this new nation makes its debut are the circumstances on which its future, like the future of every small country and of the world depends. The United States of America, the British Dominions without exception (only the mother country abstaining), and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with its new east European bloc (only Yugoslavia abstaining) joined to make Saturday's two-thirds vote possible. Everywhere it is hoped that such agreements on other, wider, problems can again be achieved.

Next to this overwhelming need for world peace is the new nation's need for understanding with its Arab citizens and its Arab neighbors. What the Jews have been given is what they had already made theirs by their own sweat and courage; the UN merely set its seal on an accomplished fact. What the Jews can achieve in their area will depend, as it would depend even if they had all Palestine, on joint economic development and trade with the Arab sections of Palestine, with Trans-Jordan, and with the Middle East as a whole. Under such circumstances, the new Judea, like Denmark and Switzerland, can provide a home for several million people.

The courage and the will to do a good job

Those who have been to Palestine and felt the dynamic and confident spirit of the Yishuv will have no doubt that this little community will do an astounding job. Those who have seen the courage and the will to live that throbs in the Jewish DP camps in central Europe and in the detention camps on Cyprus will have no doubts about these folk, on whom the impact of the UN decision is beyond the imagination of those who possess comfort and country.

To these scattered remnants the news on Saturday must have seemed the fulfillment of that prophecy which Jeremiah spoke: "I will set mine eyes upon them for good, and

I will bring them again to this land; and I will build them, and not pull them down; and I will plant them, and not pluck them up." On this joyous occasion we greet them and the Yishuv, and wish them in the ancient formula, peace and serenity, "Shalom v'shalvah."

PROPHECY: ARAB ARMIES WON'T MARCH INTO JEWISH PALESTINE

(By Victor H. Bernstein)

"Judge us by the results," a member of the United States delegation pleaded a few weeks ago. The results came Saturday: 33 votes for the partition of Palestine, 13 against, and 10 abstentions. The victory for partition was put through despite last-minute parliamentary maneuvers by the Arabs and their supporters aimed at delay and diversion. But the founding of the Jewish state could be no longer delayed nor any longer diverted.

The day was one of triumph not for Jews alone. The UN, ending its session on a singularly constructive note, disproved the plaints of its critics that it was already a moribund organization. It was a day which also told the world that the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could work in close harmony for justice and human rights.

How much luster would be added to November 29 if it should prove not only freedom day for Palestine and resurrection day for Judea, but also the birthday of future United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics collaboration.

The architects of this freedom day are many. One cannot hope to name them all. The delegates of the UN Special Committee on Palestine laid the foundation. Among those who built upon it were men like Granados, of Guatemala; Fabregat, of Uruguay; Pruszyński, of Poland; Pearson, of Canada; Tsarapkin, of the Soviet Union; Zoloaga, of Venezuela.

Hats off to United States delegation and to President Truman

I leave for special mention Johnson and Hildring, of the United States of America, because of the special role they played as representatives of the most influential of all UN members. The United States delegation blew alternately hot and cold during the long and tortuous weeks which came to a climax on Saturday. But in the final and crucial hours they blew hot. "Judge us by the results." America is grateful, President Truman.

I have been here speaking of the architects of freedom. But architects are only designers, not builders. The builders of freedom were the 600,000 and the 6,000,000—the 6,000,000 who died nameless in Europe that the 600,000 in Palestine, and thousands more to follow might live in peace on land that they can call their own.

I have spoken of November 29 as a day of freedom. In cold analysis it is merely a day of opportunity.

I think that, of the thousands who crowded the Assembly hall on that date and tensely counted the ballots, some of the greatest realists sat in that block under the south gallery reserved for Moshe Shertok and his colleagues of the Jewish Agency.

Those partisans of partition who saw the desert blooming anew with each affirmative vote were not realists.

The Saudi Arabian, the Yemenite, the other Arabs who made great show of repudiating the UN decision, and talked of reserving their freedom of action as against the majority of the civilized nations of the world, were not realists either.

The truth about the Arab threats at Flushing

I should like, first, to discuss briefly the phony fervor with which the Arabs insisted on their unity against the Jewish state and against the United Nations.

The Arabs know, and I hope they realize that the world knows, that however they

may appear to be at Flushing and Lake Success, walls of conflicting ambitions tower high between Aman and Damascus, Cairo, and Bagdad. The saber rattling the world heard a few weeks ago emanating from the Arab League Conference in the Lebanese Mountains above Beyrouth turned out to be the tinny sound of pennies rattling in a beggar's cup.

The world should know now the truth of what happened at that conference. The truth was that Saudi Arabia refused even to threaten termination of her oil contracts as a weapon against the United States. The truth was that Egypt declared herself powerless to do anything while her demand that Britain evacuate the Sudan was before the Security Council. The truth was that Syria, with camels instead of tanks, feared the military machine of Iraq on the one hand and of Transjordan on the other. The truth was that Abdullah, ruler of Transjordan, hopeful of swallowing the Arab state which would evolve out of the partition of Palestine, had no desire to burn his fingers before the prize was available.

If you will look at your newspapers of a few weeks ago, you will see in bold headlines the only practical results achieved by the vaunted unity of the Arab League states in their meeting at Lebanon. "Troops menace Palestine along Syrian and Egyptian borders," read the headlines. No one knows how many troops there were on these borders nor how well they were armed. What we do know is that a single Associated Press reporter, flying in an unarmed plane over the reported areas, seems effectually to have dispersed them.

Some prophecies as to the future

The truth was that the Arab League members failed to agree on maneuvering their troops anywhere except across newspaper headlines, where operating costs, presumably, could be kept at a minimum.

I should like, at this point, to make a prophecy that is not based entirely on speculation. If any Arab army crosses into Palestine en masse in the near future, it will be the Transjordan Legion into Arab Palestine. I venture to add that not a single legion soldier will march across any boundary into the Jewish state. And I prophecy, thirdly, that if this does happen, the last pretense of Arab unity will dissolve and the hot winds of the Arab world will be filled with imprecation called out upon the head of Abdullah by enraged politicians in Beyrouth and Damascus, Cairo and Bagdad.

One notes that neither the delegate of Egypt nor of Lebanon associated himself with their fellow Arabs in their explicit repudiation Saturday of the Assembly's adoption of the partition plan.

But if the Arab chauvinists are not realists, neither are those Jews who feel that the UN has guaranteed the Jewish state for them by a stroke of the pen.

What has been created is an opportunity, not a state

The loud-talking Arab politicians at UN may be phony in their arguments on unity, but the mufti and his gang of cutthroats are not. Neither is there anything phony in the simple Arabs throughout the Middle East whose passions have been aroused by years of propaganda against the Jew and the Jewish state. One should not be surprised if riots do occur in all the cities of the Middle East, where Jews are settled in large numbers, nor should one be surprised if before the Jewish desert blooms it will be moistened not only by the sweat of pioneers but by the blood of the defenders.

Above all, there is nothing phony in the oft-repeated statement of the Jewish agency that the Jewish state will be a tiny oasis in an Arab sea whose only hope for survival will be ultimate understanding and cooperation with the Arab world.

I repeat: the partition plan does not create a state; it creates only an opportunity. The plan is merely a skeleton, a frame, upon which the Jews must build with flesh and blood.

No one, least of all the UN Commission which is to go to Palestine, can make the plan work unless the Jews themselves are prepared to pay the price in statesmanship and, if need be, in lives. Those of us who have watched the evolution of the plan through the UN have come to realize and to appreciate the misgivings with which it was finally adopted. At crucial points it was saved by only a handful of votes. Some of its staunchest supporters recognized in it grievous weaknesses which only superhuman efforts can overcome.

I would like to say in passing that the Commission membership chosen by the Assembly on Saturday does not seem, at first glance, an entirely satisfactory substitute for the original list approved by the Palestine Committee. Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Panama, and the Philippines have been chosen to substitute for Poland, Uruguay, Guatemala, Norway, and Ireland. It is evident that the change, sponsored by the United States, was made as a last-minute gesture of appeasement toward the Arabs. As such, it may have some value if the Arabs accept it as a conciliatory gesture. But it is particularly to be regretted that Guatemala, which fought so valiantly from the outset for the partition plan should not have been retained as a counterweight to the Philippines, whose propartition stand is of rather extraordinary recent origin.

In the end, the plan can only succeed if (a) the United Kingdom fulfills with good will and with sincerity its Saturday pledge to the UN that it will cooperate; and (b) if the Jews of Palestine are granted the arms with which their militia must be made ready to secure law and order as and when the British evacuate their territory.

The actions of the United Kingdom will be watched from here on in with all the cynicism which its past performances in Palestine have given rise. As to the arming of the Jewish militia, that duty will rest primarily on the United States, which can once more perform as the arsenal of democracy.

[From the New York Times of November 30, 1947]

PALESTINE IS HELD UN TURNING POINT—RISE IN PRESTIGE SEEN IF PLAN WORKS, PERIL TO WORLD BODY AND TO PEACE IF IT FAILS—MAJOR POINTS APPRAISED — PRECEDENTS, TROOPS, ADEQUACY OF SOLUTION, RESPONSIBILITY AMONG FACTORS AT ISSUE

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., November 30.—The decision by the General Assembly to partition Palestine is generally recognized as a turning point in the history of the United Nations. If the Assembly's resolution brings about a workable solution, the prestige of the United Nations will be greatly increased. If it fails, not only will Palestine become a potential breeding ground for war, but the future of the United Nations itself will be imperiled.

The following questions and answers are intended to clear up some of the principal points involved:

1. Is there any precedent for such a decision by an international organization to divide up a disputed area?

Students of history agree with Herschel V. Johnson, the United States representative on the Assembly's Palestine Committee, that there is no direct precedent. Next to Palestine, the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein provoked the most intense dispute known in modern history. They were annexed to Prussia, and subsequently became a part of Germany, not by the decision of an international organization, but as a result of the "blood and iron" policy of Bismarck.

He promoted the Austro-Prussian War with Denmark in 1864 and 2 years later fought Austria to get undivided control of the spoils. Part of the Duchy of Schleswig was restored to Denmark under the Treaty of Versailles.

WHY THE ASSEMBLY ACTED

2. Why did the General Assembly have to assume responsibility for the fate of Palestine?

Great Britain placed the responsibility on the Assembly for recommendations regarding its future government. The British, who had held Palestine under a mandate from the League of Nations, decided to give it up because they could not find a solution acceptable to both Jews and Arabs. Since the League of Nations had been liquidated, the British turned to the United Nations.

3. What right did the United Nations, and specifically the General Assembly, have to order the partition of Palestine?

There are no specific provisions in the Charter, but the Assembly has the right to make recommendations to member governments and also to the Security Council regarding the maintenance of peace and security. However, since its recommendations are not legally binding, the Assembly in its resolution asked the Security Council to assume the responsibility if a threat to the peace should develop—that is, if the Palestinian Arabs or the neighboring Arab states should carry out their threats to fight rather than agree to partition. Internal disturbances are to be handled by armed militia recruited by the provisional councils of government of the two nascent states.

4. Are these arrangements adequate for keeping peace?

The sponsors of partition, and particularly the United States Government, hope so; but no one knows how much of a fight the Arabs inside or outside Palestine will put up. However, the supporters of partition think the crucial period will come after, not before, the independence of the two states is proclaimed. In that case, serious fighting would be a matter for the Security Council anyway.

The British, however, think the severest test will come between now and the termination of the mandate and the evacuation of British troops—for which the deadline is next August 1—and particularly in the 2-month interregnum between that time and the proclamation of the two states as independent—which is to be not later than October 1. The majority of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, which recommended partition, said it thought force would be necessary to enforce it.

THE PROBLEM OF TROOPS

5. Why did not the Assembly provide outside military force to be on the safe side?

Some members, including apparently the United States, kept thinking until the last that the British would back down on their announcement that they would not allow British troops to be used to enforce any solution unless it was satisfactory to both Jews and Arabs—in which case, of course, no armed force would have been necessary anyway.

The Security Council is supposed to have standing arrangements for an international force to deal with such contingencies, but never has been able to agree on the size of the respective contingents.

The trouble about recruiting an international force from scratch was that the small powers did not have the forces available, and were not willing to send them anyway; and if the great powers sent troops, that might give the Soviet Union a chance to establish itself in a strategic center of the strategic Near East. Besides, the United States State Department did not think that Congress would agree to the sending of United States troops.

The result was that the United States at first proposed the formation of an international constabulary force recruited on an individual basis. This obviously was unworkable, and the United States along with the other supporters of partition then decided to depend on the armed militia in the respective states for keeping internal order.

6. Where will the militia get the necessary guns and other equipment?

Presumably, these will come from the United States and other supporters of partition, although the Assembly resolution says nothing on that subject.

IMMIGRATION CURB SEEN RETAINED

7. What happens about Jewish immigration, and the British laws restricting the purchase of land by Jews, between now and the proclamation of independence?

Presumably the British will keep in force the land laws and the present immigration quota of 1,500 a month until they give up the mandate. However, the Assembly resolution says that the respective councils of governments, under the supervision of the United Nations commission, will have responsibility for such questions during the transition period.

This is one of the many points that have to be worked out with the British. It is supposed that the Jewish state will provide virtually unlimited immigration permits once it gets going.

8. What are some of the other questions to be settled with the British?

For one thing, the British say that although, of course, they will have to evacuate their troops gradually, they will give up authority all at once except for the gradually diminishing area occupied by their troops as they are withdrawn, where the British would govern by military law alone.

On the other hand, the Assembly resolution provides for the progressive transfer of authority; that is, the British would hand over authority as they withdrew their troops, but would continue the civil administration until the last in whatever areas they occupied. In view of this unsettled dispute, it is not clear who would be responsible for restoring order if there were a serious clash between Jews and Arabs after the termination of the mandate.

Much as they dislike it, the British apparently are responsible until they end the mandate, which is one of the reasons why many delegates think this will come sooner, rather than later.

AN ARAB COUNCIL HELD UNLIKELY

9. What are the prospects that the Arabs will form a council of government in the part of Palestine assigned to them, and in general cooperate in carrying out the Assembly resolution?

Such a prospect is regarded as remote.

10. How will this affect the Jewish state?

That state can and no doubt will be established anyway. However, Arab noncooperation would make it impossible to carry out the complicated business of taking over the liabilities and assets of the British administration, arranging for an economic union and a common currency, agreeing on the administration of telegraph and railroad facilities, and so forth.

11. What will become of the area assigned to the Arab state if there is no cooperation?

The Security Council is supposed to do something if provisional councils of government have been established in both states by next April. Some delegates expect the Arabs in the intended Arab state to take over after the British withdraw. As King Abdullah of Transjordan is strongly opposed to partition, his actions may determine whether it can be carried out with relatively little bloodshed.

12. Since the Jewish state will have almost as many Arabs as Jews (397,000 to 538,000), why was there no provision for the exchange of minorities?

Each state is required to write into its constitution guarantees of the rights of the respective minorities. In addition, any Arab who desires to do so may opt for citizenship in the Arab state within 1 year, and vice versa.

No exchange of minorities is authorized because the partition plan is based on the belief that, once a final decision is reached, Arabs and Jews will accept it and live together without fighting, and eventually may even find it possible to forget their present enmity.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES APPRAISED

13. What United Nations agencies are involved in the partition plan?

All the important ones have some role. The Assembly adopted the partition plan, named the commission to help carry it out, and will get the commission's final report.

The Security Council is responsible, if either side refuses to cooperate, to the extent of naming a provisional government, and if there is outside intervention or serious fighting from any direction.

The Trusteeship Council is responsible for administering the city of Jerusalem and outlying towns. The Economic and Social Council is to name three representatives who will hold the balance of power on the commission that is to carry out economic union.

14. Were there any alternatives?

There were, but none apparently could have received a two-thirds majority in the Assembly—certainly not the earlier Arab demand for a single Palestinian state, where the present Arab majority would have had permanent control. A federal state would have had a good chance if the Arabs had accepted it before the eleventh hour.

15. Will partition work?

The answer depends primarily upon the Arabs of Palestine and the neighboring states. If they accept the Assembly decision, it will work. However, their statements at the closing session of the Assembly indicate that they will not. In that case, the answer depends upon the degree of cooperation of Britain in surrendering her authority over Palestine, and in keeping order until the transfer takes place; and, also, the ability of the United States and the Soviet Union to work together in the Security Council in handling the difficult problem of providing military force, if that should become necessary.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly on this subject, because, while we are witnessing one of the significant events of history in the birth of a nation by a new process, through the action of the United Nations, and with the refusal of Great Britain, who hitherto has been responsible for Palestine, to accept responsibility in the future, it means the United Nations has not only given birth to this nation, but must see to it that the infant shall be properly nourished and developed. So that while we pause for a moment here appropriately to congratulate both the new nation and its parents, and all those who have been concerned in the past half century with bringing this great dream of Zion to pass, we should also remind ourselves that the United States Government, as one of the chief sponsoring powers for this solution in bringing to pass the vote by which it was given birth, 33 to 15, has assumed a considerable measure of responsibility.

This is no time for international or political recrimination. There is glory enough for all if the fond hopes of those who have sponsored this project shall be realized. But we may go far back to see

the great vision of Chaim Weizmann, who originally had the vision of recapturing Palestine as a homeland for what seemed to be otherwise a homeless people except as they had found lodgment in other parts of the globe—a vision that, after 2,000 years of wandering the Jews should come to what might be for them appropriately considered the homeland that was promised to them by the so-called Balfour Declaration—Palestine as a homeland for the Jews.

I have said that there is glory enough for all, and what has now occurred is another evidence of the significance of bipartisan achievement in our foreign policy, because it is interesting to note that the first steps for United States participation in this great achievement were taken under the direction of a Republican administration, and its final consummation has been under a Democratic Executive.

After Mr. Balfour's Declaration, the United States, not being a member of the League of Nations, which issued the mandate for Palestine, became a party to the mandate by its treaty, the so-called Coolidge convention with Great Britain in 1924, under the leadership of the late Henry Cabot Lodge, the distinguished predecessor as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the one who has so successfully advanced the measure we have considered here today.

Under his leadership, as well as under the leadership of Charles E. Hughes as Secretary of State and Calvin Coolidge as President, the United States became a party to the British pledge of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine.

It is not here appropriate to go into the history of the past 20 years, and all of the somewhat equivocal attitude that developed in the mandatory power as a result of the tragic incidents of the last decade, when the Arabs protested vigorously, and there came on the incidents which have more and more occasioned the world to consider that here was the possibility of a disturbance of the peace. But we have come down through to the episodes of the last year, when finally, after some 25 commissions and committees of various kinds had studied the situation, the United Nations were convened this last spring in special session at the request of Great Britain and asked to recommend a solution, which they have now done, with only two dissenting votes outside of the countries which had certain very strong prejudices regarding the appropriate solution, as the result of racial and religious views. So that, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said, the giving of this mandate for the partition of Palestine may be considered the consensus of the opinion of mankind, although two-thirds of Palestine has been removed as the result of the creation of Transjordan.

In the past year the cause has been greatly served by the leadership of the world leader of Zionism, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, and it is under his leadership and wise statesmanship that this successful result has finally been brought to pass.

It is no time to speak of a certain schizophrenia that has apparently affected our State Department during the

various considerations of this question. It is enough that finally the goal desired has been achieved. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind that while both great political parties in this country, in their last political platforms, adopted resolutions endorsing the Palestine solution, and while members of both political parties, including Senators on both sides of the aisle, have in repeated public utterances supported their own resolutions, it was not until Russia, to the amazement of everyone, a few short weeks ago became also a cochampion of the partition, that the result was finally achieved.

We were told during the past 2 or 3 years that the reason we must consider the solution of Palestine as a Jewish homeland was because the Russians were going to take advantage of Arab intransigence and would use the action of Britain or the United States regarding Palestine to the prejudice of world peace by stimulating Arab aggression. So it was to the amazement of everyone that Russia in the United Nations a few short weeks ago championed the partition solution. I shall not enter into a discussion of what may or may not have been her motives, whether she was primarily concerned with what seemed to be a just solution, or whether there were some more devious reasons, but at any rate her action destroyed for all time the idea that she was seeking to cultivate Arab national aspirations for the sake of securing interests in our oil concessions in these Arabian lands. I think it is well to bear that in mind as we go forward into consideration of this matter, realizing that this is the beginning, and not the end; that while we are here giving birth to what we trust will be a nation, its continuation will be achieved not only by the continued sacrifice and possibly suffering of those immediately concerned, but that the United Nations themselves, and the commission which they have created for the purpose, have now the tremendous responsibility of seeing that this infant nation shall have its proper nurture during the undoubtedly difficult days that so obviously lie ahead.

I think all the speeches here have appropriately pointed out that it is to be hoped that whatever may be the irresponsible acts of individuals or certain small collective groups in seeking to challenge this solution, that those responsible for the administration of the affairs of the nations which oppose this solution, some of them very old governments, and others comparatively new, that have been born within recent decades and admitted to the United Nations, shall demonstrate their recognition of world order and world democracy by yielding to the overwhelming opinion of mankind, and joining in the suppression of aggressive acts calculated to challenge a solution which has had so long, so sympathetic, and so conclusive a decision.

In that respect I think our own country has now to consider its course. We proposed originally that there should be created an international police force under the direction of the United Nations, although that was not contemplated within the terms of any of the discus-

sions of the Charter, but that rather individual nations should contribute quotas to care for whatever responsibilities should arise. In the suggestion I now call to the attention of the Senate, I do not wish to imply any anticipation that there will be armed revolt on any major scale. It is my hope, my belief, that those concerned will respect this overwhelming decision, and that the two new nations which have now been born will be given their proper opportunity for becoming contributing members of the family of nations. But if such a distressing situation should arise, with the absolute refusal of Great Britain to assume responsibility further and its withdrawal of all its forces, the United States must realize that neither we, nor Russia, as the parties which have championed this solution, can avoid the responsibility that is appropriately ours, and I speak to this because, as the weeks and months pass by, if we shall be faced with a crisis in this situation we must be prepared then to act.

For that reason I call attention to what in my judgment should be the next question considered by the administration in the obvious challenge it may face, the question of whether or not we in America shall be prepared to contribute the indispensable elements essential to the preservation of the peace.

On that score it is a curious anomaly that those who have been most inhospitable to the Jew have been also most opposed to the idea of a homeland for the Jew in Palestine. Meanwhile, whether or not we shall have in the world the force necessary to implement the decision of the United Nations may be determined in no small measure by the action the United States shall take. The United Nations has taken this action, but unless it is supported by appropriate power to compel the acceptance of its decision, then the United Nations will demonstrate its absolute futility, and the United Nations will fall into innocuous desuetude like the League of Nations. I was privileged last week to hold sessions in the vast mausoleum costing \$60,000,000 on the shores of Lake Geneva standing as a solitary monument to the vain hopes of all mankind.

So I trust that we in this country will realize that we have set out hand to the plow. If the difficulty comes—and God forbid that it should—it seems to me that it is none too early for the United States to consider the action it shall take. I do not believe that the opinion of America would support the sending of our armed forces to Palestine to preserve order except on the basis which I shall now suggest, and that is that no man shall go there who is not a volunteer. I suggest that serious consideration be given without delay to the organization of a volunteer force not solely for this purpose but for any purpose for which it shall be required under the action of our Government and under the proper direction and request of the United Nations Security Council, to implement and preserve, in collaboration with other countries which shall be ready to take their share of responsibility, the action which we may be called upon to take.

To that end I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter sent to the Secretary of State, Hon. George C. Marshall, by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America on August 8, 1947, in which, among other things, recommending action on Palestine, they make this proposal:

Recognizing the practical administrative and manpower obstacles which the United Nations might face in placing and maintaining an adequate police force in Palestine at this time, the Jewish war veterans of the United States suggest that such a force be recruited from among trained veterans of all faiths and all nations who would volunteer to comprise such a United Nations police force. The Jewish war veterans of the United States offers its total resources to aid in the efforts to obtain such a force.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., August 8, 1947.
Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: The Jewish War Veterans of the United States, representing 600,000 American Jewish veterans who were proud to fight under your command in World War II, and the over 200,000 who fought in the American armies of World War I, respectfully recommend a course of action to alleviate the present intolerable situation in the Holy Land.

It is obvious that if forthright steps are not taken immediately, violence in Palestine will continue to mount until the rising tide of reprisals by the contending parties will have reached a volume that will gravely menace any attempt at peacemaking.

Under your able leadership our Government has already pointed out an avenue of solution for the problem through the action recently taken with respect to a state of war between the Netherlands and Indonesia. The successful action of the United States delegate to the United Nations Security Council in pressing a resolution that led to a suspension of armed conflict in Indonesia establishes a precedent which may well prove effective in the Palestine crisis.

We, therefore, fervently recommend that our Government pursue that precedent to the following extent:

1. That our delegate to the United Nations be instructed to have placed upon the agenda of the United Nations Security Council, for immediate action, a resolution requesting the United Nations to assume authority in the Holy Land dispute.

2. That the United Nations order the immediate withdrawal from Palestine of all British troops and police and substitute therefor United Nations personnel. Great Britain has not only proven herself unable to maintain the peace in Palestine, but her actions have incited continuing turmoil and bloodshed.

We are convinced that these two simple steps will facilitate the immediate cessation of hostilities and will serve as a logical preface to the definite and final solution of the entire problem by the United Nations.

Recognizing the practical administrative and manpower obstacles which the United Nations might face in placing and maintaining an adequate police force in Palestine at this time, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States suggest that such a force be recruited from among trained veterans of all faiths and all nations who would volunteer to comprise such a United Nations police force. The Jewish War Veterans of the

United States offers its total resources to aid in the efforts to obtain such a force.

Said police force would be under the jurisdiction and direction of the United Nations. Participation of American veterans would, of course, be subject to the approval of our own Government and on the basis of existing laws.

We feel that the presence of a police force responsible only to the United Nations, instead of troops now answerable only to Great Britain—one of the disputant parties—suggests a course of action that can put an effective halt to further unnecessary killings on both sides.

The principles of the four freedoms, borrowed from the institutions upon which American democracy is founded, have been incorporated into the Charter of the United Nations. Historical precedent, as well as the basic precepts of human decency, require that the United States now take through the United Nations with respect to Palestine the action that has already been initiated in Indonesia—action that will bring peace to a distracted world. The Palestine problem is a challenge to the necessity for, and the effectiveness of, the United Nations. For the benefit of all freedom-loving peoples and the peace of the world, we appeal for your approval and immediate action on this proposal.

Respectfully yours,

MILTON H. RICHMAN,
National Commander.

Mr. BREWSTER. That proposal was the result of the proposal by the United States in the United Nations Assembly that an international police force should be recruited. There was no provision for it in the Charter and apparently little is likely to come of it.

That has been followed by a resolution adopted in St. Paul at the fifty-second annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States under the leadership of Col. Julius Klein, a veteran of the last war with a distinguished war record in the Pacific under General MacArthur, proposing again that the Jewish War Veterans of the United States were prepared themselves very actively to promote the organization of such a group in whatever way might be found feasible. It seems to me, as we realize the responsibilities which are ours, that we may appropriately consider their action, representing 800,000 veterans who have offered their lives on many fields, and their belief that there would be ample resources from which to recruit such a force to be available in the event of need.

In this resolution, adopted at St. Paul at the fifty-second annual encampment, October 15 to 19 of this year, it is recited:

If it will prove to be necessary to establish a United Nations constabulary during the period between the United Nations' acceptance of the said report and the final establishment of the Jewish and Arab states in Palestine, we hereby place the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, its facilities and membership, at the disposal of our Government and of the United Nations, and assure our Government of the readiness of our members to stand prepared to the end that the UNSCOP majority report shall be implemented without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINE

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, assembled together for its

fifty-second annual encampment in St. Paul, Minn., October 15-19, 1947, as representatives of 800,000 veterans of the Jewish faith who fought in the wars of the United States, recognizing that we stand on the threshold of the realization of the aims, aspirations, dreams, and hopes of the Jewish people for the past 2,000 years of reestablishment of a Jewish state in Palestine;

And expressing in this conclave our solidarity with our brethren in Europe whose one hope for a new and stable existence is emigration to Palestine and with our brethren in Palestine whose efforts have resulted in the development of that country to the point where it is now ready for complete independence and statehood, and recognizing that our efforts can aid in the realization of the establishment of such a Jewish state, hereby direct our national executive committee to take such steps and make such representations to the appropriate authorities as will make most effective the following policies and principles which this convention now approves and for which it stands:

1. We urge the approval of the UNSCOP majority report, with such modifications as will insure viability of the Jewish state as a minimum measure of justice to those who have suffered the most.

2. We urge the immediate implementation of the said report and believe that such implementation demands the immediate withdrawal of all British troops and police forces from Palestine.

3. We approve wholeheartedly the action of the United States Government in endorsing the majority report of the UNSCOP and in offering assistance in the economic and financial problems which will arise in the implementation thereof.

4. If it will prove to be necessary to establish a United Nations constabulary during the period between the United Nations acceptance of the said report and the final establishment of the Jewish and Arab states in Palestine, we hereby place the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, its facilities and membership, at the disposal of our Government and of the United Nations, and assure our Government of the readiness of our members to stand prepared to the end that the UNSCOP majority report shall be implemented without delay.

5. We condemn the current Arab threats of war and economic sanctions as reminiscent of Nazi tactics and as a direct violation and affront to the Charter of the United Nations, and we voice our confidence that the United Nations will withstand such intimidation and that the people of the world will realize these threats to be hollow and baseless.

6. In the interest of preserving order during the initial period of the establishment of such separate states in Palestine, we urge immediate recognition by the United Nations of the Jewish Agency for Palestine as the interim governing body of the Jewish state.

7. We urge the United States to announce immediately that upon a definite decision by the United Nations in support of the said majority report, that it, the United States, will assume its full share of responsibility for such economic, political, material and other aid as may be necessary under the circumstances.

8. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the members of the United States delegation to the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, my reason for calling attention to this is that I share the high hopes of all that whatever difficulties may arise will be of an incidental, fragmentary character, that there will be no action by any of

the countries in this area which have opposed the adoption of this report, and that they will not precipitate any collective incidents. I do not believe they will. I believe that calmer and cooler heads will prevail. But we cannot blind ourselves to the responsibility which has been assumed. I point out to the Senate and to the country that if such a situation arises and the United States is not prepared to act, then the only alternative is the prospect and probability that our fellow nation which has joined us in sponsoring this proposal may be prepared to act, and that the United States might find itself in a very unfortunate and very humble position if in the suppression of difficulties of any character we are obliged to allow the Soviet Nation to take over responsibility for the preservation of law and order in this entire area.

I am calling attention to this subject so that 1 month or 2 month or 4 months from today we may not be faced with another crisis proposal because there is difficulty in the Middle East and some action must be taken, requiring, perhaps, that American armed forces be sent there, when it is obvious that a volunteer force prepared for this purpose should be recruited now. In my judgment it can be done well within the law, so that the existing administration could have such a force ready. No man would be called upon to offer up his life in defense of this situation unless he had properly and voluntarily made an offer of that kind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. At this late hour I do not wish to press a discussion with the distinguished Senator from Maine on this subject, because I think it could better wait for another day. However, the Senator is leaving me in doubt as to just what he is proposing as a means for enforcing the Palestine partition decision. Let me say incidentally that I am very much in favor of the decision which has been reached by the United Nations in regard to the partition of Palestine. The Senator leaves me in doubt as to whether or not he is suggesting that, if it becomes necessary to enforce that decision, it should be done by an armed force other than a United Nations police force. Am I to understand that the Senator is suggesting that there be raised a volunteer army in this country, of Americans, to be used in enforcing that decision? If so, under what flag would it fight?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know that the Senator has been present during all the time I have been speaking.

Mr. MORSE. I have been present every moment of the time the Senator has been speaking.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then evidently I did not make myself sufficiently clear.

As I pointed out, the original proposal of the United States was for the recruitment of an international police force under the Security Council.

Mr. MORSE. That proposal has not been adopted.

Mr. BREWSTER. No; it was dropped, because whether or not there was legal

authority for it within the Charter, there was certainly no contemplation of it. The entire contemplation of the Charter was that whatever force was used would be composed of quotas from various countries which would be contributed to operate as a united whole under the Security Council. It has been impossible to implement that proposal because of the apparent reluctance of Russia to agree upon the composition of the force.

Everyone says that he is in favor of the decision; but, if we favor the decision without being prepared to support it, we are doing a very vain thing. I do not believe that we could justify our action in giving birth to a child whom we immediately throw to the dogs.

I have not gone further than to say that if difficulty arises—which God forbid—the Commission and the Security Council must maintain order. It would be most unfortunate if the United States were to find itself in the position of not being able to assume whatever might be its proper share of the burden, because then we certainly could not challenge the action of Russia or any other eastern power in moving in. Therefore, we should give serious consideration to the question of how we can implement our action. For that purpose, I propose that a portion of our armed forces—not solely for this purpose, but for any purpose for which there might be a legitimate call by the United Nations—should be recruited on a volunteer basis, either from men now in the service or men who might later volunteer for such service. The analogy I suggest is that of the French Foreign Legion. It should be understood that such a volunteer force should be available for whatever purpose the President of the United States should find it proper and necessary to use it. To what extent there should be further legislative authorization, I am not clear. I do not speak on that point.

But, certainly, we should begin to give consideration to how we are to assume our share of responsibility.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me, I think I now understand his point of view. I think he illustrates very clearly, at least to my satisfaction, the importance of this country's making clear to the members of the United Nations that there should be established at

the earliest possible date a police force of the United Nations, because unless that is done I think there is grave danger that we shall be maneuvered into a position in which American boys under the American flag will be called upon to enforce some decision of the United Nations.

I do not agree with the Senator, if I understand him correctly, that I put myself into an indefensible position if I take the position, as I would take the position, that the American Army should not be used to enforce a decision of the United Nations except as a part of a United Nations police force. I think the nation members of that organization must be called upon to enforce the decisions of the organization. I do not think we should ever permit ourselves to be placed in a position in which, because a difficulty arose in Palestine, for example, the American Army would be used to enforce a United Nations decision. A volunteer force raised in this country, as I understood the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, would lead us into grave difficulties unless it were raised as a part of a yet to be agreed upon United Nations police force. A volunteer force of Americans fighting in Palestine, for example, under the American flag would necessarily carry with it the complete backing of the military might of the United States the moment the first shot was fired against our flag. Hence I urge extreme caution in this situation. I am for the enforcement of the decisions of the United Nations but by the joint action of a United Nations police force.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator has not understood my statement. I should like to make my position crystal clear. It is not my concept that an American Army, as the Senator terms it, ever could or ever should enter into this situation. I have repeatedly stated that it would be a question of the Security Council of the United Nations calling upon the Associated Powers for the creation of the force which was contemplated in the Charter. At that point, unless we have a force in being that we could appropriately contribute to that quota under proper arrangements, the problem would be a very difficult one. I am not prepared to take any of our boys who may have been secured either under the draft

or, at the present time, under the volunteer system, and order them to such a service. It is my thought that there should be a particular force recruited, understanding that at some time they might be called upon for service of this character if the situation should demand and the Congress and the President, under their proper exercise of power, should so determine. The average man joining the American Army today or at any future time should not be faced with the possibility that he might be sent to such a foreign field. That is the point I am making, and for that purpose it seems to me to avoid exactly what the Senator from Oregon suggests. If 3 months from today we are confronted with a crisis, as we were in Greece, and suddenly the President says, "Russia is endeavoring to take over the whole Middle East. I must send a force there," we shall have to order American boys who have not been recruited or prepared for such service. That is my point.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator, because I think he is making a valuable contribution to the discussion of the Palestine issue, particularly in pointing out, as I think he has, the need of developing a police force within the United Nations so that it can enforce its own decisions.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is exactly the point I wished to make.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the reference that was made earlier to the part which my late grandfather played in connection with a homeland for the Jews. This furnishes a personal reason for my satisfaction at the development which has taken place in setting aside a place in Palestine which the Jews can think of as their own.

Another memory which gives this event special significance for me lies in the recollection which I have of the Jewish units which fought in Libya in 1942, in the desert, against the common enemy.

I desire to express my congratulation to Rabbi Silver, who has shown real statesmanship in leading this very complicated and arduous problem to such a successful outcome. I hope that it means that the Promised Land has been reached at last, and that it is the beginning of new happiness and more auspicious events for the Jewish people.