



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
108

Box
38

Folder
445

Advertisements, 1948.

Barkley Says Dewey's Views Embarrass U.S.

Tells Rochester Democrats Governor Seems to Favor Private Atom Control

ROCHESTER, N. Y., Sept. 23 (P).—Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee, accused Governor Thomas E. Dewey tonight of "embarrassing" the foreign relations of the United States.

In his first invasion of the Republican stronghold in upstate New York, Senator Barkley said the Republican Presidential nominee's public utterances on atomic energy and Italian colonies left "a hollow ring" to Mr. Dewey's promise "that he will appeal to no special interests."

Mr. Dewey's campaign declarations indicating his favor for private development of atomic energy, Senator Barkley said in a speech at a Rochester Democratic rally, leaves some question whether Republicans "comprehend even the meaning of the force of atomic energy."

"But," he said, "this is not the first time that the candidate of the Republican party has appealed to special groups at the cost of embarrassing the foreign relations of the United States. At a time when negotiations were under way with Russia and other countries over the disposition of the former Italian colonies, Governor Dewey announced from Albany that he was for the restitution of these colonies to Italy."

Neither President Truman nor himself, Senator Barkley said, "has been willing for partisan political purposes to attempt to interfere in the delicate international negotiations now going on."

Earlier in the day, Senator Barkley addressed a luncheon of the Onondaga County Women's Democratic Club in Syracuse and challenged Governor Dewey and his running mate, Governor Earl Warren, of California, to discuss the "vital issues" of rising living costs and the shortage of housing.

Brownell Chides Truman On 'Hanging' Republicans

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28 (P).—Herbert Brownell Jr., Republican national campaign manager, said today that President Truman made a statement in Texas "which could, quite reasonably, be interpreted as an endorsement of lynch law."

Mr. Brownell said in a statement that he based his assertion on "The Washington Post's" report of Mr. Truman's speech. Mr. Brownell quoted this part of the dispatch from "Post" reporter, Edward T. Follard:

"In his Dallas speech, Mr. Truman accused the Republicans in Congress of submitting to the lobbies and then departed from his text to say:

"You can't expect the Republicans' spokesmen to come out and state clearly who it is the Republican party is working for. They don't dare do that."

"You'd take them out and hang them if they did. That would be disastrous—or would it?"

"Mr. Truman murmured the last part of the sentence, and he was not smiling."

Mr. Brownell commented: "Recently, Mr. Truman had to apologize for some other intemperate remarks in California. Is he trying to set up the routine of an apology for every state he visits?"

Truman Gets It, Right From a Horse's Mouth

ARDMORE, Okla., Sept. 28 (P).—President Truman showed his Missouri background today to the satisfaction of a group of Ardmore Roundup Club members.

The President was met by several cowboys on horses alongside his private car on the train. He shook hands with Clyde Wyond and admired his palomino pony. Then the President, the son of a former Missouri mule trader, opened the animal's mouth like an expert.

"Six years old," he said.

"Correct," Mr. Wyond replied.

Register early for the Presidential election Nov. 2. Registration places in New York City are open from 5 to 10:30 p. m. tomorrow through Friday and 7 a. m. to 10:30 p. m. on Saturday the final day.

WANTED

GENERAL MANAGER

Required immediately for important marine terminal operation in the southeast, including the operation of switching, roads, warehouses, refrigerating plants, and all auxiliary installations. Applicants must be fully conversant with all terminal procedures, loading and unloading of ships, cranes and constructive placement of cargo, stevedoring, maintenance, etc. No consideration will be given any applicant who has not had at least 15 years experience, the last 5 of which have been in a senior position similar to that now required, but who is under 40 years of age. The position, which is one of consequence, carries with it excellent prospects and a good salary. Applicants must submit fully detailed statement of experience accompanied by the necessary references and testimonials. H 158 Herald Tribune.

The above advertisement is just one of hundreds of job opportunities in today's Classified Help Wanted ads. You're missing plenty if you don't follow the Herald Tribune Help Wanted columns every day.

NO THIRD PARTITION OF PALESTINE

IN a sudden burst of speed, the British Government and our Administration are seeking to bring about the earliest adoption of the last Bernadotte proposals on Palestine by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Bernadotte report recommends that the Negev, consisting of two-thirds of the State of Israel as set up by the United Nations Resolution of November 29, 1947, should be torn away from Israel and handed over to the Arab invaders, preferably Transjordan. It also proposes that Jerusalem be placed under United Nations control, without any corridor connecting it with Israel.

These proposals were put forward by Count Bernadotte merely as a basis for discussion, as his report makes clear. However, both Foreign Secretary Bevin and Secretary of State Marshall have chosen to ignore that fact and have urged acceptance of the Bernadotte plan *in toto*. The reason for this blanket endorsement and for their haste in trying to achieve the immediate adoption of the plan is transparent. It would seem that the British Foreign Office, whose longstanding hostility to the Jewish state has produced a lamentable record of deceit, is currently trying to make capital out of the assassination of Count Bernadotte—and our State Department is collaborating. They are attempting to railroad Count Bernadotte's plan through the General Assembly—as a monument to his memory—while his tragic death is still fresh in the public mind.

Such exploitation of a criminal act, committed by outlaws whom the State of Israel is trying to hunt down and root out, is what we have come to expect of Mr. Bevin's Foreign Office. But it is unworthy of our country and its traditions of justice. We do not think we are asking too much when we call upon the United States Government to deal with the Bernadotte proposals solely on their merits and quite apart from the tragedy of September 17.

An Unjust, Unworkable Plan

When viewed objectively and dispassionately, we believe that the Bernadotte plan is manifestly unjust and unworkable. By cutting away the Negev from Israel, the plan would reduce the Jewish state in size by no less than 3,800 square miles, while a mere 420 square miles of rocky and hilly western Galilee would be added to it "in compensation." Thus, the entire State of Israel would consist of approximately 2,400 square miles—a tiny area incapable of absorbing and supporting the hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees who are desperately seeking emigration to Israel.

Moreover, if it were removed from Israel the Negev would be doomed to remain a desert wasteland; for the Jews alone are prepared to make it habitable by costly and extensive irrigation projects—something which is not to be expected from King Abdullah, whose 35,000 square miles are largely underpopulated and uncultivated.

Not to be overlooked also is the fact that cutting away the Negev would deprive Israel of the waters and minerals of the Dead Sea and thereby seal off an important avenue for economic development which the new state sorely needs. It would also deprive Israel of access to the Red Sea and render it extremely difficult for Israel to engage in commerce with the Far East and with Africa.

Perhaps one of the real reasons why it is now proposed to take the Negev from Israel and hand it over to Britain's puppet, Abdullah, is to be found in recent reports of oil deposits in that area. Surely the industry of Israel could use such a fuel reserve without remaining forever at the mercy of British-Arab production in Iraq.

Last year our State Department argued in the United Nations that the Negev should be removed from the Jewish state area. After the Jewish Agency agreed to the transfer of sizable portions of the Negev to the Arab state, the State Department ceased its agitation. On November 22, 1947, Herschel V. Johnson, our delegate to the United Nations, declared: "We think that the Jewish Agency has made, from its point of view, an equitable and fair proposal, and whatever reservation the United States delegation maintains with respect to this area (the Negev) is withdrawn."

Has anything happened since November 22, 1947, to warrant a change of this clearly expressed attitude on the question of the Negev? Why, then, should our Government be a party to the latest British attempt to cripple Israel?

The Jerusalem Proposal

The Bernadotte proposal regarding Jerusalem is surely the most unrealistic of statements when viewed against the background of recent events in the Holy City. After having repulsed the wanton attacks of the British-led, British-supplied Arab Legion and after having endured months of siege and privation, the Jews of Jerusalem will hardly consent to leave their city unprotected in the midst of hostile Arab surroundings, unconnected with the State of Israel, and with no greater security for life and property than would be forthcoming from the nominal "control" of the United Nations. The Jews of Jerusalem and of Israel know only too well what it means to be dependent on Arab respect for United Nations authority. The almost daily flaunting of that authority by the Arabs has not served to reassure them that a better attitude will be demonstrated in the future. The Jews know that it was their own strength—their fight on the battlefields against overwhelming odds—rather than United Nations "control" which saved New Jerusalem and its inhabitants from destruction. They are not prepared to expose themselves to such murderous attacks again.

Israel Cannot Submit

For all of these reasons—and there are many more—Count Bernadotte's proposals

must be rejected. It should be added that the British and American officials who are now working for the adoption of this plan are incredibly naive if they expect Israel to submit to it. No self-respecting nation would passively accept its own dismemberment—and Israel is a self-respecting nation. Having successfully defended their political independence, having spilled their blood in expelling the invaders from their territory, the citizens of Israel will surely not permit any part of their land to be presented to an Arab potentate. They had accepted the United Nations partition decision of November 29, 1947—at great sacrifice to their legitimate rights and aspirations—because they believed that this was a final compromise solution. But they will not accept a third partition of Palestine.

The United Nations should consider well the full implications of the proposals which Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall have endorsed so heartily. What is being suggested is that military aggressors receive in a gift package what they failed to win by force of arms, and that a nation which successfully defended its territory against international gangsterism be penalized for its efforts. That, in effect, is what Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall are advocating. We fervently hope that the United Nations will refuse to become a party to this scheme.

The Bernadotte recommendations do not even possess the virtue of Arab agreement to commend them to the serious attention of the United Nations. The Arabs have already rejected the proposals. The Bernadotte report and Mr. Bevin's statement make it clear that the plan would have to be imposed. If a solution is to be imposed in Palestine, why not that solution which has the backing of world opinion—the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947? Why does Mr. Marshall seemingly prefer to impose a new, unjust, unworkable plan rather than a just, workable compromise which has received the overwhelming approval of the nations of the world, including the United States?

The Latest Pledge And The Latest Performance

Mr. Marshall's unequivocal endorsement of the Bernadotte report can only be regarded as another unwarranted reversal of United States policy, such as took place on March 19, when the Administration suddenly attempted to scuttle the partition decision and proposed a trusteeship for Palestine.

President Truman is seeking re-election on a platform which declares: "We approve the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations Resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel."

How does President Truman reconcile this plainly-stated pledge with the position taken by his Secretary of State?

The American people have a right to know.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

ANOTHER REVERSAL— ANOTHER BETRAYAL

IN a sudden burst of speed, the British Government and our Administration are seeking to bring about the earliest adoption of the last Bernadotte proposals on Palestine by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Bernadotte report recommends that the Negev, consisting of two-thirds of the State of Israel as set up by the United Nations Resolution of November 29, 1947, should be torn away from Israel and handed over to the Arab invaders, preferably Transjordan. It also proposes that Jerusalem be placed under United Nations control, without any corridor connecting it with Israel.

These proposals were put forward by Count Bernadotte merely as a basis for discussion, as his report makes clear. However, both Foreign Secretary Bevin and Secretary of State Marshall have chosen to ignore that fact and have urged acceptance of the Bernadotte plan *in toto*. The reason for this blanket endorsement and for their haste in trying to achieve the immediate adoption of the plan is transparent. The British Foreign Office, whose longstanding hostility to the Jewish state has produced a lamentable record of deceit, is currently trying to make capital out of the assassination of Count Bernadotte—and our State Department is collaborating. They are attempting to railroad Count Bernadotte's plan through the General Assembly—as a monument to his memory—while his tragic death is still fresh in the public mind.

Such cynical exploitation of a criminal act, committed by outlaws whom the State of Israel is trying to hunt down and root out, is what we have come to expect of Mr. Bevin's Foreign Office. But it is unworthy of our country and its traditions of justice. We do not think we are asking too much when we call upon the United States Government to deal with the Bernadotte proposals solely on their merits and quite apart from the tragedy of September 17.

An Unjust, Unworkable Plan

When viewed objectively and dispassionately, the Bernadotte plan is manifestly unjust and unworkable. By cutting away the Negev from Israel, the plan would reduce the Jewish state in size by no less than 3800 square miles, while a mere 420 square miles of rocky and hilly western Galilee would be added to it "in compensation." Thus, the entire State of Israel would consist of approximately 2400 square miles—a tiny area incapable of absorbing and supporting the hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees who are desperately seeking emigration to Israel.

Moreover, if it were removed from Israel the Negev would be doomed to remain a desert wasteland; for the Jews alone are prepared to make it habitable by costly and extensive irrigation projects—something which is not to be expected from King Abdullah, whose 35,000 square miles are largely underpopulated and uncultivated.

Not to be overlooked also is the fact that cutting away the Negev would deprive Israel of the waters and minerals of the Dead Sea and thereby seal off an important avenue for economic development which the new state sorely needs. It would also deprive Israel of access to the Red Sea and render it extremely difficult for Israel to engage in commerce with the Far East and with Africa.

Perhaps one of the real reasons why it is now proposed to take the Negev from Israel and hand it over to Britain's puppet, Abdullah, is to be found in recent reports of oil deposits in that area. Surely the industry of Israel could use such a fuel reserve without remaining forever at the mercy of British-Arab production in Iraq.

Last year the British induced our State Department to argue in the United Nations that the Negev should be removed from the Jewish state area. After the Jewish Agency agreed to the transfer of sizable portions of the Negev to the Arab state, the State Department ceased its agitation. On November 22, 1947, Herschel V. Johnson, our delegate to the United Nations, declared: "We think that the Jewish Agency has made, from its point of view, an equitable and fair proposal, and whatever reservation the United States delegation maintains with respect to this area (the Negev) is withdrawn."

Has anything happened since November 22, 1947, to warrant a change of this clearly-expressed attitude on the question of the Negev? Why then, should our Government be a party to the latest British attempt to cripple Israel?

The Jerusalem Proposal

The Bernadotte proposal regarding Jerusalem is surely the most unrealistic of statements when viewed against the background of recent events in the Holy City. After having repulsed the wanton attacks of the British-led, British-supplied Arab Legion and after having endured months of siege and privation, the Jews of Jerusalem will hardly consent to leave their city unprotected in the midst of hostile Arab surroundings, unconnected with the State of Israel, and with no greater security for life and property than would be forthcoming from the nominal "control" of the United Nations. The Jews of Jerusalem and of Israel know only too well what it means to be dependent on Arab respect for United Nations authority.

The almost daily flaunting of that authority by the Arabs has not served to reassure them that a better attitude will be demonstrated in the future. The Jews know that it was their own strength—their fight on the battlefields against overwhelming odds—rather than United Nations "control" which saved New Jerusalem and its inhabitants from destruction. They are not prepared to expose themselves to such murderous attacks again.

Israel Cannot Submit

For all of these reasons—and there are many more—Count Bernadotte's proposals must be rejected. It should be added that the British and American officials who are now working for the adoption of this plan are incredibly naive if they expect Israel to submit to it. No self-respecting nation would passively accept its own dismemberment—and Israel is a self-respecting nation. Having successfully defended their political independence, having spilled their blood in expelling the invaders from their territory, the citizens of Israel will surely not permit any part of their land to be presented to an Arab potentate. They had accepted the United Nations partition decision of November 29, 1947—at great sacrifice to their legitimate rights and aspirations—because they believed that this was a final compromise solution. But they will not accept a third partition of Palestine.

The United Nations should consider well the full implications of the proposals which Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall have endorsed so heartily. What they are suggesting is that military aggressors receive in a gift package what they failed to win by force of arms, and that a nation which successfully defended its territory against international gangsterism be penalized for its efforts. That, in effect, is what Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall are advocating. We fervently hope that the United Nations will refuse to become a party to this immoral scheme.

The Bernadotte recommendations do not even possess the virtue of Arab agreement to commend them to the serious attention of the United Nations. The Arabs have already rejected the proposals. The Bernadotte report and Mr. Bevin's statement make it clear that the plan would have to be imposed. If a solution is to be imposed in Palestine, why not that solution which has the backing of world opinion—the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947? Why does Mr. Marshall seemingly prefer to impose a new, unjust, unworkable plan rather than a just, workable compromise which has received the overwhelming approval of the nations of the world, including the United States?

The Latest Pledge And The Latest Performance

Mr. Marshall's unequivocal endorsement of the Bernadotte report can only be regarded as another unwarranted reversal of United States policy, such as took place on March 19, when the Administration suddenly attempted to scuttle the partition decision and proposed a trusteeship for Palestine.

President Truman is seeking re-election on a platform which declares: "We approve the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations Resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel."

How does President Truman reconcile this plainly-stated pledge with the position taken by his Secretary of State?

The American people have a right to know.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

342 Madison Avenue

New York 17, N. Y.

New York 17, N. Y.