



The Abba Hillel Silver Digital Collection

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

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

Reel
108

Box
38

Folder
449

American Zionist Emergency Council, communications to
chairmen of local emergency committees, 1948.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council **Date** January 2, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

The enclosed memorandum with attachment was sent today to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

HLS:LD
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees **Date** January 2, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Under separate cover we have sent you a number of speeches made at the recent dinner in tribute to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver on the eve of his departure for Palestine.

Please study the significant address of Dr. Silver carefully as it contains the basic elements of our present policy. Also convey its contents to the members of your committee so that they may be provided with an appraisal of the current situation.

- - - - -

Yesterday the New York Times published a story from London, which is the beginning of a new smear campaign by the officials of the British Foreign Office against Zionism. The purpose of the Times story was to give the impression that Communist agents are arriving in Palestine on Jewish refugee ships coming from Eastern ports of debarkation. Attached is a statement issued by Dr. Israel Goldstein, Acting Chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council. Should any item appear in your local press which is similar to the Times dispatch described above, please utilize the attached as an answer. We will very shortly send you a memorandum which will analyze this new British propaganda campaign. It is essential that we keep on the alert to expose any new move which the British, the Arabs, or some subordinate officials of our State Department may make to sabotage the implementation of the UN decision on Palestine.

- - - - -

I am departing on a leave of absence of several months. Mr. Abe Tuvim will occupy my position during this interval. I sincerely hope that you will give him the same splendid cooperation that you have accorded me.

kindest regards.

HLS:RB
Enc.

STATEMENT BY DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN
ACTING CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
JANUARY 1, 1948

The dispatch in this morning's New York Times quoting un-named British sources as charging that homeless Jews, now en route to Palestine aboard the refugee ships Pan York and Pan Crescent, are Communist "fifth column" agents is the latest example of the British smear campaign against Jewish refugees and the Zionist movement. It is a matter of deep regret that a great American newspaper like the New York Times should thus lend itself to the circulation and prominent display of deliberate fabrications emanating from British propagandists whose designs are all too transparent. No doubt the authors of this latest canard -- Mr. Bevin's associates in the British Foreign Office -- hope to frighten public opinion by linking the Zionist movement with Communism. This new variation on an ancient and discordant theme is strange, indeed, coming as it does from individuals who, only a few weeks ago, were threatening that aid to the Jewish cause will drive the Arabs into Russia's arms. Now that this line has been discredited by the United Nations decision on Palestine, which was the result of the harmonious cooperation of the United States and the Soviet Union, these same mischief-makers have set out to insinuate that Jewish refugees desperately seeking to enter their homeland -- and still barred by British armed force -- are serving Communist interests. I am confident that these latest British propaganda maneuvers against Zionism will fail as miserably as did the earlier ones, and that public opinion will not be influenced by such planted stories, which are as heartless as they are false.

Zionism, needless to say, serves as the agent of no foreign power. It is nothing more or less than the Jewish people's agent for auto-emancipation. This cause has furthermore won the support of American opinion generally, and the roster of devoted and unequivocal Christian friends of Zionism includes the names of the foremost -- leaders of our country -- Republicans and Democrats alike. We are, of course, happy that both the East and the West could come together in evolving a joint solution to the Palestine question. This is cause for general gratification and was hailed by leaders of the U. S. Government as one of the few happy auguries for the future of the United Nations. Now British agents are seeking to destroy the UN decision on Palestine by throwing the entire issue into the arena of big power strife and antagonism. Once again I am confident that they will not succeed.

As for the miserable men, women and children aboard those two refugee ships -- their only "political" affiliation is their membership in the various Zionist parties and organizations, none of which is Communist or remotely associated with the Soviet Union. It should be added, in passing, that the aforementioned dispatch distorts also the matter of the recently-announced resignation of Moshe Sneh from the Jewish Agency Executive -- a development which had nothing whatever to do with the selection of Jewish refugees for emigration to Palestine, as was alleged.

DRAFT OF MODEL LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir:

With tragic regularity American newspapers have been carrying daily accounts of the strife and tension now spreading through the Holy Land. Although the cries of the wounded and dying cannot be heard in this country, the people of the United States -- as, indeed, the people of all the nations of the world -- should not consider the turmoil in Palestine as a local struggle between Jews and Arabs, in which Americans should maintain a "hands-off" attitude. It will be recalled that it was not the Jews who decided on the partition of Palestine, but the United Nations. It should not be expected, therefore, that the whole burden of putting into effect the decision of the world's highest tribunal should rest exclusively upon the overtaxed shoulders of the Jewish people of Palestine.

In recapitulating the events which led up to the UN adoption of partition, one must consider that it was only after a long and careful examination of the UNSCOP report, first by the Ad Hoc Committee and finally by the General Assembly, that the United Nations finally reached its decision to divide the Holy Land. The United Nations was completely aware of all the difficulties involved, and was forewarned, not once, but many times by delegates of Arab States of their resolve to oppose by violence any decision of the United Nations favorable to partition.

Nevertheless, it is to the eternal credit of the UN that it acted despite these threats and in the full knowledge of all that was involved. If the United Nations were now to be intimidated by Arab violence, by riots and demonstrations deliberately calculated to make the world believe that the UN decision is impossible of implementation, then it would suffer an irreparable loss of prestige and authority. Its future effectiveness as the agency "to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and constitutional law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace" -- would be disastrously undermined.

The future of the United Nations will be enormously strengthened in the difficult months ahead if our own Government will live up to its moral and legal obligations, and actively cooperate with the United Nations on the question of Palestine. Since the last war the United States has assumed unprecedented diplomatic initiative and pre-eminent leadership in world affairs. Destiny has singled it out for leadership in this century. It has boldly assumed that role. In many parts of the world the impact of that political direction is now felt. Palestine is clearly within the orbit of those great political problems which America, true to its assumed role, must face, and to which it must bring the same determined leadership which has characterized its approach to other world problems.

With reference to Palestine, our Government now stands committed to the implementation of partition. The UN plan is now an integral part of official American foreign policy. Our Government should assist the UN in every way possible and should employ all its diplomatic machinery and influence to expedite the implementation of the Palestine solution. Delay is dangerous. Defeat will be catastrophic to the future peace of the world.

I am convinced that if the partition of Palestine is to be faithfully effectuated, then the United Nations must act in a manner that would leave no doubt as

to its intent. In view of the deterioration of public security in Palestine and the failure of the British authorities to maintain order, it now appears that an international force -- even a small one -- should accompany the United Nations Commission which has been delegated to carry out the actual partitioning of the Holy Land. This international force, although not necessarily great in numbers, must know what it is there for. Its military deployment in the Holy Land would be a concrete symbol of the authority of the United Nations and serve as a powerful deterrent to further violence.

Certainly it is imperative that the Jews of Palestine should be given every right to defend themselves. They have the manpower in the para-military organization of Haganah, but this force is badly in need of arms and materiel. Surely the nations of the world which voted to create a Jewish State -- and especially the United States -- must feel dutybound to insure that the citizens of that State are properly equipped to protect themselves against the assaults of those who are determined to defy the will and conscience of the world's highest tribunal.

The United States holds the key to the situation, both with regard to the formation of an international force and in the proper equipment of the Jewish militia. In our long history, our Government has not hesitated to send arms and military missions in other parts of the world to back up its foreign policy. It should not hesitate now.

Sincerely yours,

1/12/48

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date January 12, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find the following two items:

1. Statement issued by the Jewish Agency for Palestine with reference to the munitions seized by U. S. Government agencies.
2. A form letter embodying important elements in the Zionist position with reference to the Palestine situation.

We urge you to arrange for the widest possible dissemination of this information. There have been many news stories and radio broadcasts which have distorted and often misrepresented the facts as we know them. We must get our case before the people.

With reference to the statement by the Jewish Agency, it should be made perfectly clear that the Agency played no part whatsoever in the incident in which cases of explosives were seized aboard a ship which was to sail for Palestine. The materials which were confiscated subsequent to this incident were purchased legally and were subject to application for formal export license. Nothing in the transaction was in violation of any federal law or statute.

In the matter of the form letter which we are sending you, we advise very strongly that you do not use it in its present form unless it is for the purpose of orienting editors of your newspapers in personal visits. If it is to be used in a letter to the editor of your newspaper, it should be rewritten, since it would not do to have identical letters sent by different people in either the same city or in neighboring cities.

We cannot urge you too strongly to act on this directive at once. It is of the utmost importance to the future of the Yishuv that the American people be set straight on the issues confronting us.

It would be helpful if you could get outstanding Christians in your community to issue statements based on the information we are sending you.

It is also vital that this argumentation be made available to your radio commentators and to friendly Christian ministers who might be good enough to preach on the subject. This is the time for action. We depend upon you and our good friends in your community to carry out this directive with dispatch and efficiency.

We will look forward to receiving your report.

Kindest regards.

AT:RB
Encs.

STATEMENT BY
JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

The Jewish people of Palestine are in desperate need of arms for their defense. The ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, who collaborated with Hitler in the destruction of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe, has now called the Arab world to arms to carry on his work of massacre and extermination.

Through his connections with the Arab League and the Arab states, the Mufti has the facilities to acquire arms and munitions for aggression and invasion. The Jewish Agency for Palestine has the responsibilities of a state about to be born. It must protect the lives and homes of the 700,000 men, women and children of Palestine. The United Nations decision made no provision for an international force, but did provide for a Jewish militia to defend the Jewish state and to maintain public security. It therefore devolved upon the responsible defense forces of the Jewish community of Palestine to rush preparations in a race against time in view of the threatened Arab aggression in defiance of the U.N. decision and the announced early withdrawal of British troops.

Accordingly, steps were taken to arrange for the legitimate purchase of war surplus materiel and equipment. To facilitate these purchases, the Jewish Agency made dollar credits available. The materials found near Asbury Park on Thursday were, to the best of our knowledge, legally procured to await legitimate shipment. It has throughout been our understanding that all such purchases and their transportation were in full conformity with American law.

We are proud to give our aid to the embattled Jews of Palestine. We trust that materiel urgent for their defense may soon be shipped to them legally and with God's help reach them in time to meet their grave emergency.

C
O
P
Y

WESTERN UNION

January 17, 1948

Honorable Harry S. Truman
White House
Washington, D. C.

The Arab attack upon the Jewish people inspired by the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem and former collaborators of Adolph Hitler is also an attack upon the authority of the United Nations and the prestige of the United States.

The decision of the United Nations to partition Palestine was the first great definitive judgment of that body on an important international dispute. Should that decision be nullified by deliberate sabotage on the part of Arab states, which profess adherence to the United Nations Charter, the usefulness of that body would be irreparably impaired and its future jeopardized.

In view of the unlikelihood that an international police force can be organized in time to avert disaster, we respectfully call upon you to take immediate action to modify the arms embargo to the Middle East so as to permit lend-lease and shipment of military equipment to those states that support the United Nations decision to partition Palestine. There is no other alternative at the present time; and time is of the essence.

We are mindful, Mr. President, of your many exertions to fulfill our nation's pledges to the Jewish people. It was the resolute action of our government at Flushing Meadows which brought forth the decision to partition Palestine.

It is indefensible to exert our initiative to create a Jewish State on paper, and then simultaneously declare an arms embargo, the only effect of which is to enable Arabs to massacre defenseless Jews and prevent the fulfillment of the objective we so ardently sought. We would do simple justice to the Jewish people, while serving the cause of peace, to assist them in their heroic effort to resist aggression perpetrated in violation of international law.

THE COMMITTEE TO ARM THE JEWISH STATE representing American business, civic and professional leaders of all religious faiths appeals to you, Mr. President, to take prompt action to enable the Jewish people to defend themselves and to defend at the same time the authority of the United Nations and the prestige of the United States.

COMMITTEE TO ARM THE JEWISH STATE
Robert F. Wagner, Honorary Chairman
Dean Alfange, Chairman
9 East 40 Street
New York, N. Y.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees **Date** January 19, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The attached statement was sent to 180 leading newspaper editors in the United States as another step in our campaign to clarify, and to stimulate sympathy for, our cause.

The material embodied in the statement appeared also as full page advertisements in the NEW YORK TIMES, TRIBUNE, POST, PM, and the WASHINGTON POST.

We urge most strongly that wherever possible this statement and the important signatures which are appended be placed by Zionist communities as an advertisement in daily newspapers. The statement may be used also in such orientation work as may be going on among radio commentators, etc.

If any newspapers in your city use the material, whether sent by us or placed by you, we would be grateful for tear sheets.

Kindest regards.

AT:GH
Encs.

TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Since the United Nations General Assembly voted for the partition of Palestine on November 29, 1947, a shameful situation has arisen to which public opinion cannot remain indifferent.

Openly defying the United Nations, the governments of the Arab States, themselves members of the UN, are deliberately encouraging aggression against the Jews of Palestine. They are using Syria, Lebanon, Egypt and Iraq as bases for these operations. They are providing funds, ammunition and military training, and have already launched attacks in force from Syria and Lebanon against Palestinian Jews. In Palestine itself this state of affairs has resulted in unbridled violence by armed Arab bands organized by Haj Amin el Husseini, the same Arab leader who, during the war, immeasurably aided Hitler in broadcasts from Berlin urging the Moslems of the Middle East to revolt against the Allies.

This campaign of violence has no moral justification. It is directed against a decision of the United Nations made only after nearly twenty committees of inquiry investigated the problem over a period of more than 25 years. This decision was, finally, a compromise which granted national states in Palestine to both Jews and Arabs.

The campaign of violence we now witness does not spring from a spontaneous uprising by the majority of Palestine's Arabs. On the contrary, they wish to live in peace with their Jewish neighbors. But they are terrorized by the Mufti's bands assisted by his confederates in Cairo, Baghdad, Beirut and Damascus. Significantly, Arab violence is largely directed against Jerusalem which, according to the UN decision, is to be an international territory because of its sacred character to the Christian world.

The campaign of Arab aggression, led by a group of former Nazi allies and aided by accomplices across the frontiers, is therefore directed not only against the Jews, not only against the peaceful majority of the country's Arabs, but against the authority of the United Nations itself.

This is a bold attempt to blackmail the United Nations into submission. It is an attempt by violence to render impotent the first great decision of the United Nations. If this campaign succeeds, it will reduce the United Nations to a debating society. In a moment when world peace is the hope of all men of good will, it will smash the effectiveness of the only instrument of international peace we possess. It will disillusion those millions who had hopes that at last some way other than the holocaust of war could be found to settle international problems.

If the United Nations cannot make its Palestine decision stick, if a handful of willful men can prevent a UN decision from being carried out because they do not like that decision, then no future action of the UN will have more worth than the paper upon which it is written.

For this state of affairs not only the Mufti and his cohorts are responsible. Other powers are not wholly free of responsibility. The British Government, which insisted that it retain sole control over the country and sole responsibility for law and order until the termination of the Palestine Mandate, seems either unwilling or unable to maintain law and order. We do not attempt to judge whether it is a matter of unwillingness or of inability. But the fact remains that the security situation in Palestine is steadily deteriorating.

One thing is certain: while Arab bands attack Jewish settlements, blockade wide areas, and waylay traffic on the highways, British officials and forces have

repeatedly interfered with Jewish defense and counterattack, repeatedly arrested and disarmed the defenders, and repeatedly confiscated their armaments.

The United Nations has not yet taken action against these overt acts of its Arab member-governments, which constitute an open defiance of the Resolution of the General Assembly and of the Charter itself. Nor has the United Nations reacted as yet to the fact that the Mufti's bands and the attitude of the British Administration are a clear challenge and threat to the authority of this international body.

If only the safety of the 700,000 Jews of Palestine were at stake, this alone should have evoked the concern of American public opinion. Our Government was largely instrumental in bringing about the United Nations decision on partition. What had we in mind when we encouraged the aspirations of the Jewish people to nationhood in Palestine? Was it our intention to leave them there defenseless?

Much more is at stake than our moral responsibility toward the Jews. We repeat, the very future of the United Nations is in jeopardy. This open defiance of a United Nations decision comes from a group of Middle Eastern states, which depend upon the UN and the Western world for their sovereignty and international recognition, for their political and military protection as well as economic development. If we permit such conduct on the part of the Arab States, then the authority of the United Nations will suffer a staggering blow which can result in incalculable harm to men everywhere.

Let us make no mistake about the dangers involved in this situation. The conflict may widen and assume world-wide dimensions, or this aggression of the Arab States can be restrained, thus making the Palestine solution a potent

factor for peace and stability in the world. America must help to determine whether the effectiveness of the UN shall be destroyed or strengthened.

The United States wants peace in the world. It is to its vital interests to uphold the Palestine decision of the United Nations. Our Government should therefore actively support the following measures:

1. A stern warning to the Arab States calling for an end to the sabotage of the UN decision.
2. An unmistakably clear declaration to Great Britain that as long as she remains in Palestine, her armed forces can be neither neutral nor quasi-neutral, but must align themselves in defense of public law and the UN decision.
3. Immediate use of the proper UN agencies to provide international military protection for Palestine Jewry and make immediately available the necessary military force to implement the United Nations decision on Palestine.
4. Immediate equipment of the Haganah, under United Nations auspices, to enable this Jewish constabulary defense force to carry out police powers within Jewish territory in Palestine.

Only in this manner can the United States and the United Nations prevent the threatened conflagration. The delay in implementing the UN decision has encouraged the Arab League and the Mufti in their defiance of the UN, and have forced the Jewish people to resort to desperate means to provide themselves with arms for their defense and the maintenance of the UN decision.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson
Senator Owen Brewster
Frank Buxton
Bartley C. Crum
Samuel Guy Inman
Senator Edwin C. Johnson

Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk
Senator James E. Murray
Prof. Harry A. Overstreet
Dr. Daniel A. Poling
Dr. Ralph W. Sockman
Senator Charles W. Tobey
Senator Robert F. Wagner

To the UNITED STATES and the UNITED NATIONS...

Since the United Nations General Assembly voted for the partition of Palestine on November 29, 1947, a shameful and deeply disquieting situation has arisen to which public opinion cannot remain indifferent.

Openly defying the United Nations, the governments of the Arab States, themselves members of the UN, are deliberately encouraging aggression against the Jews of Palestine. They are using Syria, Lebanon, Egypt and Iraq as bases for these operations. They are providing funds, ammunition and military training, and have already launched attacks in force from Syria and Lebanon against Palestinian Jews. In Palestine itself this state of affairs has resulted in unbridled violence by armed Arab bands organized by Haj Amin el Husseini, the same Arab leader who during the war immeasurably aided Hitler in broadcasts from Berlin urging the Moslems of the Middle East to revolt against the Allies.

This campaign of violence has no moral justification. It is directed against a decision of the United Nations made after nearly twenty committees of inquiry had investigated the problem of Palestine over a period of more than twenty-five years. The decision of the United Nations was, moreover, a compromise which granted national states in Palestine to both Jews and Arabs.

The campaign of violence we now witness is not a spontaneous uprising by the majority of Palestine's Arabs. On the contrary, they wish to live in peace with their Jewish neighbors. But they are terrorized by the ex-Mufti's bands assisted by his confederates in Cairo, Baghdad, Beirut and Damascus. Significantly, Arab violence is largely directed against Jerusalem which, according to the UN decision, is to be an international territory because it is sacred to the Christian world.

The campaign of Arab aggression, led by a group of former Nazi allies and their accomplices across the frontiers, is therefore directed not only against the Jews, not only against the peaceful majority of Palestine's Arabs, but against the authority of the United Nations itself.

This is a bold attempt to blackmail the United Nations into submission. It is an attempt by violence to render impotent the first great decision of the United Nations. If this campaign succeeds, it will reduce the United Nations to a debating society. At a moment when world peace is the hope of all men of good will, it will smash the effectiveness of the only instrument for international peace we possess. It will disillusion those millions who had hopes that at last some way other than the holocaust of war could be found to settle international problems.

If the United Nations cannot make its Palestine decision stick, if a handful of willful men can prevent a UN decision from being carried out because they do not like that decision, then no future action of the UN will have more worth than the paper upon which it is written.

For this state of affairs not only the ex-Mufti and his cohorts are responsible. Other powers are not wholly free of responsibility. The British Government, which insisted that it retain sole control over Palestine and sole responsibility for law and order until the termination of the Palestine Mandate, seems either unwilling or unable to maintain law and order. We do not attempt to judge whether this policy is dictated by unwillingness or inability. But the fact remains that the security situation in Palestine is steadily deteriorating.

One thing is certain: while Arab bands attack Jewish settlements, blockade wide areas, and waylay traffic on the highways, British officials and forces have repeatedly interfered with Jewish defense and counter-attack, repeatedly arrested and disarmed the defenders, and repeatedly confiscated their armaments.

The United Nations has not yet taken action against those overt acts of its Arab member-governments which constitute an open defiance of the Resolution of the General Assembly and of the Charter itself. Nor has the United Nations reacted as yet to the fact that the ex-Mufti's bands and the attitude of the British Administration are a clear challenge and threat to the authority of this international body.

Even if the only issue at stake were the safety of the 700,000 Jews of Palestine, American public opinion should have been deeply concerned. Our Government was largely instrumental in bringing about the United Nations decision on partition. What had we in mind when we encouraged the aspirations of the Jewish people to nationhood in Palestine? Was it our intention to leave them there defenseless?

Much more is at stake than our moral responsibility toward the Jews. We repeat, the very future of the United Nations is in jeopardy. This open defiance of the United Nations decision comes from a group of Middle Eastern states which depend upon the UN and the Western world for sovereignty and international recognition, for political and military protection as well as economic development. If we permit such conduct on the part of the Arab States, then the authority of the United Nations will suffer a staggering blow which can result in incalculable harm to men everywhere.

Let us make no mistake about the danger involved in this situation. The conflict may assume world-wide dimensions, or, alternatively, this aggression of the Arab States can be restrained, thus making the Palestine solution a potent factor for peace and stability in the world. America must help to determine whether the effectiveness of the United Nations shall be destroyed or strengthened.

The United States wants peace in the world. It is to its vital interests to uphold the Palestine decision of the United Nations. Our Government should, therefore, actively support the following measures:

1. A stern warning to the Arab States calling for an end to the sabotage of the UN decision.
2. An unmistakably clear declaration to Great Britain that as long as she remains in Palestine, her armed forces can be neither neutral nor quasi-neutral, but must act in defense of public law and the UN decision.
3. Immediate use of the proper UN agencies to provide international military protection for Palestine Jewry and make immediately available the necessary military force to implement the United Nations decision on Palestine.
4. Immediate equipment of the Haganah under United Nations auspices to enable this Jewish constabulary defense force to carry out police powers within Jewish territory in Palestine.

Only in this manner can the United States and the United Nations prevent the threatened conflagration. The delay in implementing the UN decision has encouraged the Arab League and the ex-Mufti in their

defiance of the UN, and has forced the Jewish people to resort to desperate means to provide themselves with arms for their defense and for the maintenance of the UN decision.

AMERICAN CHRISTIAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

41 East 42nd St., New York

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson
Sen. Owen Brewster
Frank Buxton

Bartley C. Crum
Samuel Guy Inman
Sen. Edwin C. Johnson

Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk
Sen. James E. Murray
Prof. Harry A. Overstreet
Sen. Robert F. Wagner

Dr. Daniel A. Poling
Dr. Ralph W. Sockman
Sen. Charles W. Tobey

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date January 21, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find the following:

1. Copy of a telegram sent to President Truman by the "Committee to Arm the Jewish State" which is self-explanatory and which may be useful to you in the work which you are carrying on. This was featured widely by the press and radio.
2. Reprint of the advertisement of the American Christian Palestine Committee from the Herald Tribune of New York. We hope that you have made some headway in placing this material as an advertisement in your local press. It was sent to you several days ago in multigraphed form, but we are sending the printed layout as well.

In connection with this, it is subject to your own determination as to whether such advertisements as you place in your newspapers are signed by the people whose names appear at the bottom of the advertisement or are signed by local leading Christians and Jews, or both.

We will appreciate very much receiving copies of any advertisements you may place.

Regards.

AT:RBH
Encs.

C
O
P
Y

WESTERN UNION

C
O
P
Y

NIGHT LETTER

JANUARY 27, 1948

AS MAYOR OF ONE CITY TO THE MAYOR OF ANOTHER, I APPEAL TO YOU WHILE ON MY TEMPORARY VISIT TO YOUR COUNTRY FOR YOUR UNDERSTANDING, SYMPATHY AND MORAL SUPPORT. THE CITY OF TELAVIV, PALESTINE, OVER WHICH I PRESIDE, WITH ITS TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND INHABITANTS, HAS ONLY ONE SACRED AIM: TO DEVELOP AND GROW FOR THE GOOD OF ITS PEOPLE, AND THE GLORY OF THE HOLY LAND. I AM PROUD TO SAY THAT IN ONE GENERATION, TELAVIV HAS GROWN FROM A LITTLE SUBURB TO THE LARGEST CITY IN PALESTINE AND THE MOST MODERN, PROGRESSIVE CITY IN THE ENTIRE MIDDLE EAST.

MY CITY, AND OTHER TOWNS AND SETTLEMENTS IN PALESTINE ARE NOW THE TARGETS OF ARAB ARMED BANDS. IN DEFIANCE OF UNITED NATIONS DECISION, HITLER'S WARTIME ARAB AGENTS ARE CONDUCTING A CAMPAIGN OF TERROR IN PALESTINE WHICH ENDANGERS THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ONE OF THE FINEST CONSTRUCTIVE EFFORTS IN HISTORY.

THERE IS ONLY ONE AUTHORITY WHICH CAN STOP ARAB VIOLENCE IN PALESTINE. THAT IS THE UNITED NATIONS. THERE IS ONLY ONE POWER WHICH COULD MAKE THE UNITED NATIONS ACT VIGOROUSLY AND IN GOOD TIME. THAT IS THE UNITED STATES. IN THE NAME OF TELAVIV, YOUR SISTER-CITY ON THE SHORES OF THE BLUE MEDITERRANEAN, AND IN THE NAME OF PEACE AND HUMANITY, I APPEAL TO YOU, MR. MAYOR, TO RAISE YOUR POWERFUL VOICE FOR THE SPEEDY SUPPLY OF MEANS OF DEFENSE TO THE ATTACKED JEWRY OF PALESTINE, AND FOR THE DETERMINED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS DECISION ON PALESTINE.

WITH MY FRATERNAL WISHES FOR YOUR AND YOUR CITY'S SUCCESS IN YOUR PEACEFUL ENDEAVORS.

ISRAEL ROKACH, MAYOR OF TELAVIV
41 EAST 42ND STREET, NEW YORK

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date January 28, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

I am sure you will be interested in the attached copy of a telegram which was sent yesterday to the Mayor of your city by Mayor Israel Rokach of Tel Aviv. Similar telegrams were sent to the Mayors of several hundred cities in the expectation that they would give public expression to the need for a sympathetic and helpful approach to the Palestine problem.

I am aware of the intensive program of activity which undoubtedly has been undertaken in your community as a result of our recent directives. I feel, however, that if it is at all possible, some effort should be made to assist your Mayor in formulating his public response to the appeal from Mayor Rokach, and in directing this response to the proper channels, i.e., press, radio and, where advisable, the Washington scene.

Kindest regards.

AR:RB
Enc.

MEMORANDUM

To CHAIRMEN OF LOCAL EMERGENCY COMMITTEES Date January 30, 1948

From ABE TUVIM

A SPECIAL EMERGENCY MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVE COMMUNITIES OF THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL WILL BE HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 15TH AND MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16TH, AT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER, 16TH AND Q STREETS NORTHWEST. The Sunday session will begin at 11:00 A.M. KOSHER LUNCHEON WILL BE SERVED. There will be a mass meeting Sunday night at which Dr. Abba Hillel Silver is expected to report on his visit to Palestine and to review the critical political situation which prompts the calling of this meeting. IT IS OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE THAT YOUR COMMUNITY BE REPRESENTED. An effort will be made to provide hotel facilities for those who cannot do so directly. We urge, however, that you make your own reservation, if at all possible. We will try to devote most of Monday, February 16th for visits to Congressmen and Senators. IT MIGHT BE WELL FOR YOUR REPRESENTATIVE TO BEGIN MAKING APPOINTMENTS NOW. LET US KNOW BY WIRE WHO WILL REPRESENT YOUR COMMUNITY AND WHETHER YOU ARE MAKING YOUR OWN HOTEL RESERVATIONS.

* * * * *

Our situation has not improved sufficiently to warrant any let-up in our present campaign to bring to the attention of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State the deep misgivings we feel because of their failure to take steps to implement the decision of the UN by the creation of an international force, or to provide arms for the heroic Jews of the Yishuv.

We call upon you to accelerate your efforts. Every avenue for political contacts and for messages and telegrams to the President and the Secretary of State should be explored and followed through. All friendly organizations should be called upon to help. Christians - ministers and other leaders in public life - should be enrolled in this effort. Every Jewish family in your community should be represented by at least two telegrams. These activities are most vital to our cause. Nothing should stand in the way of carrying them out.

AT:RB

THE FOLLOWING WASHINGTON HOTELS, IN THE ORDER LISTED, ARE NEAR THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

HOTEL ROOSEVELT
HOTEL MAYFLOWER
HOTEL STATLER
HOTEL CARLTON
HOTEL LAFAYETTE
HOTEL HAY-ADAMS
HOTEL AMBASSADOR
HOTEL HAMILTON
HOTEL WILLARD
HOTEL WASHINGTON

NOTE: When asking for reservations, please inform the hotel of the time of your arrival, accommodations desired, and length of stay.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date February 2, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find a fifteen minute radio script, which calls for the use of two speakers and a moderator.

We have tried to cover the principal questions involved in the present Palestine situation and we feel that it would be of great help if this material could be put on the air in your community.

A strong effort should be made to get local radio time. Where it is difficult to obtain the services of a radio commentator, it might be well to ask an outstanding community leader to serve as the moderator and have the answers given by the most representative and best-spoken among our people and our Christian friends.

We will be very glad to hear about any progress you may make.

Kindest regards.

AT:RB
Enc.

SUGGESTED RADIO SCRIPT

MODERATOR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The subject of Palestine -- which has always been a most provocative one -- is especially timely at this moment since in our troublesome post-war world the Holy Land is one of those key places upon which the peace and future security of all of us may very well hinge. During the past six or seven weeks, bloodshed and civil strife have characterized life in the Holy Land. More than 900 persons have been killed since the United Nations made its recommendation to divide Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. In the midst of all this grief and turmoil, I am very happy that we have with us this afternoon two gentlemen -- Mr. A.,

(his title and background)
and Mr. B.,
(his title and background)

-- who are familiar with all aspects of the Palestine problem and who, I hope, will be able to bring us up-to-date on this vital subject. Mr. A., I wonder if you would be good enough to start the discussion rolling by giving us a brief summary of the situation in Palestine right up to the present moment.

Mr. A.: Well, as you undoubtedly know, Mr. (Moderator), in 1917 in a document called the Balfour Declaration, the Jews were promised a national home in Palestine by the British war cabinet. After a quarter-century of Jewish immigration and reconstruction in Palestine, the British issued what is known as the White Paper of 1939. This policy cut down Jewish immigration into the Holy Land to a mere trickle and stipulated that after five years, immigration would cease completely. The Jews reacted most intensely to this doctrine, because as they pointed out, the sole reason for establishing a Jewish National Home in Palestine was that here, in this little country, there was finally set aside one place on earth to which Jews could legally migrate in the hour of their need. Consequently, in putting a stop to Jewish immigration, the British were putting a stop to the Jewish National Home. It will be remembered that the year in which the British instituted this White Paper policy was -- 1939 -- the year of Munich and Chamberlain appeasement. In this instance, the British appeased the Arabs with the White Paper.

When World War II finally ended in 1945, the Jews of Palestine had every good reason to believe that Great Britain would revoke its White Paper policy. In the first place, they had made a significant contribution to the allied war effort in the military campaigns in Africa and Italy. In the second place, the British Labor Party -- which you will recall came into power after V-E Day -- had made strong commitments to the Jews, promising them that they would do everything

within their power to give the Jews the State that they desired. And finally -- and perhaps, most important -- the end of the War had disclosed the tragic story of six million Jewish casualties to the Nazi war machine -- with about a million and a half Jews still alive in Europe, but with no place to go. With these three factors as a backdrop, the Zionists were led to believe that now, at long last, they would get what had been promised to them in 1917. The British, of course, had other ideas. They wanted to continue their rule of Palestine as though there had never been a war -- as though they had never made any promises -- as though there were no Jewish DP's stagnating in Europe. Finally, in 1945, a deadlock was reached between the Jews of Palestine and the British. Terrorism broke out; so-called "illegal" immigration was stepped up; the British clamped down a tighter rule. It all eventually led up to -- what might be called -- international intervention in the Palestine mess. There were two international investigations of the problem of Palestine in its entirety. The first was the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry composed of representatives from the United States and Great Britain. The second -- and the one with greater authority -- was a special committee appointed by the United Nations. To be brief -- and I realize that I have not been that at all -- both committees found justification to the Jewish claims in the Holy Land, one of them -- the committee of the United Nations -- recommending that Palestine be split up into separate Jewish and Arab states. After a great deal of debate, the United Nations, on November 29 -- just about seven weeks ago -- decided to partition the Holy Land into two states -- one Arab, one Jewish. That just about brings me up to your introduction, Mr. (Moderator).

MODERATOR: I must say that that was a most informative bit of summarizing, Mr. A. Do you have anything to add to that, Mr. B.?

Mr. B.: Well, Mr. (Moderator), I agree with everything Mr. A. has said. I would like to say something about your introduction. Although you gave a fairly accurate account of what has happened in the Holy Land in the seven weeks since partition was voted, I don't think that your bare recitation of statistics gave the full and complete story. It is necessary, I believe, Mr. (Moderator), to go beyond the figure of 700 new Jewish and Arab graves in the Holy Land and the millions of dollars lost in property damages. One must consider what the fighting is all about in Palestine. We know that -- superficially speaking -- Arabs are attacking Jews because they are bitterly opposed to the partition plan. But is that the sole motive? Are Arab attacks a popular mass demonstration against the decision, or are they being fostered by elements other than the Arab masses? What is the position of the British in all this bloodshed? Are they really neutral -- as they say they are? What is the position of the United States? What is the position of the United Nations? All these questions must be

if one is to understand exactly what lies behind the so-called "incidents" that recur day after day in the Holy Land.

MODERATOR: Well, Mr. B., if you can answer those questions it will certainly go a long way towards clearing up a lot of rather foggy notions that we've been getting just from reading our daily newspapers.

Mr. B.: I'll take a stab at it, Mr. (Moderator). And if my colleague, Mr. A. sees that I am committing any errors of omission I hope he will correct me. Let me start my story this way. The decision by the General Assembly of the United Nations to partition Palestine was a notable one since, for the first time in thirty years, an international body with wide powers did find a solution for what appeared to be one of the world's unsolvable problems. By agreeing to divide the Holy Land into two states, the United Nations put down -- in black and white -- a blueprint for the future of Palestine. But in finding this solution, an incidental minor miracle had occurred. For the first time in the brief but stormy history of the United Nations, both the United States and Russia found themselves on the same side of the fence. For the first time, they were in agreement on an important international issue. Both countries -- the United States and Russia -- supported partition and fought for its passage. This spirit of cooperation between the East and West was the most significant accomplishment of the recent session of the General Assembly. Out of the disillusionment that had been caused by frequent and violent differences between our country and Russia, there had emerged the miraculous sign that the impossible was quite possible after all.

MODERATOR: Yes, I can recall that very well. From the point of view of a layman -- that is, one who is not particularly conversant with the day-to-day workings of the United Nations Organization -- I remember that most Americans were pleasantly surprised at this rather unusual turn of events, and most of us thought that in the United States-Russian agreement -- the United Nations was given a shot in the arm -- one that, in time, might completely cure the ailing patient.

MR. B.: That's exactly my point, Mr. (Moderator). The Palestine solution was the only constructive accomplishment of which the United Nations could boast during the last session of the Assembly. It, therefore, becomes increasingly tragic that the partition solution -- which spoke so well for the future of the United Nations -- is now in such great danger of being stymied by certain forces bent on sabotaging it.

MODERATOR: What forces are you specifically referring to, Mr. B.?

MR. B.: I mean both the Arabs and the British in Palestine. With reference to the Arabs, their opposition was definitely anticipated by most of us. During the entire period that Palestine was before the United Nations,

and poured out millions of words, saying something to the effect that they would never tolerate anything in Palestine other than a complete and undivided Arab State. When the UN made its decision, they threatened to plunge the Holy Land in war, and implied that there would never be a Jewish State in Palestine, no matter how small.

MR. A.: If I can break in at this juncture, Mr. B. I would like to point out for the benefit of our radio audience that the Arabs, to whom you just referred, the Arabs who ranted and raved at Lake Success, are not the Arabs of Palestine, but actually are Arabs from such neighboring states as Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and others. These people have about as much legal right to mix the internal affairs of Palestine as, let us say, Mexico has in the internal affairs of the United States. It just so happens that their opposition to Zionism is the only common front on which seven Arab states agree. The Zionist so-called "danger", therefore, serves as the glue which holds the Arab League together.

As to the Arabs of Palestine, we know that the great majority of them are grateful to Jewish settlers for what they have done and ready to live in peace with them. This feeling is understandable if you can visualize a decadent, disease-ridden society which is suddenly rescued from its terrible plight by the influx of a modern, dynamic group of persons who are equipped to cure their diseases, give them new clothes, teach them how to get more out of their piece of soil, and acquaint them with something they had never known -- that all men are created equal. Of course, there is in Palestine a large following of Arabs who are faithful to the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem. The ex-Mufti wants to set up Palestine under his own rule and would drive out, or put to the sword, every Jew who entered the Holy Land since 1917. In other words, he would drive out some 600,000 Jews, if he could, and restore the same type of feudal Arab society that flourished during the time of the Turkish Sultan. This is the same Mufti, by the way, who served Hitler in Berlin during the war years, broadcast appeals to Arabs in the United States to sabotage our war effort and helped blueprint Himmler's plan for the liquidation of the Jews of Europe -- a plan which subsequently resulted in the deaths of more than six million Jews.

I didn't mean to make such a lengthy interpolation, but these things just seem to go on endlessly -- they are so involved.

MODERATOR: To get back to our central theme, Mr. B., you also mentioned that the British were doing some sabotage work against the partition plan. Can you elaborate on that accusation?

MR. B.: Yes, I can. You will recall -- I am sure -- that the British had emphatically promised at the last meeting of the United Nations General Assembly that they would...

"troubles" in Palestine. As we saw, difficulties did arise. But were the British neutral? Absolutely not. Palestine is now being invaded from Syria and Lebanon, and the British have done nothing about stopping these invasions. They know exactly from what points these invading armies come, but they have refused to establish adequate patrols at the vital borders. An army of 100,000 British soldiers is unable to keep open the important Jerusalem-to-Tel-Aviv highway. This road is only 35 miles long, yet traffic on it is constantly threatened by Arab snipers and guerrilla bands who have wiped out scores of Jews who are forced to travel that highway. The Old City of Jerusalem is completely blockaded by the Arabs. 1500 Jews are locked within this small section, and are slowly being starved to death. Yet, the British have done nothing to relieve this blockade.

Whenever members of the Jewish defense militia -- the Hagannah -- attempt to set up a defense against attacking Arabs, they are disarmed and jailed if arms are found in their possession. On the other hand, British police look the other way whenever Jews are attacked by Arab mobs. During a riot which broke out in the Haifa Refinery, 1500 Arabs attacked some 200 of their Jewish co-workers there, killing 41 Jews and wounding about 50 others. This Refinery was policed by the British who did not move a muscle until it was too late. In addition, I recently read that the British absolutely refuse to open a port in Palestine for Jewish use. This refusal is an out-and-out violation of the United Nations recommendation which requested that a port be opened up to the Jews no later than February 1st.

MODERATOR: In the early part of your discussion, Mr. B., you put the question before us: What about the position of the United States? Well, what about it? How does our Government fit into the picture you just painted?

MR. A.: If you don't mind, Mr. B., I'd like to answer this one. As was pointed out earlier in our discussion, the United States played perhaps the most important role in the passage by the United Nations of a decision to partition Palestine. Since the United States did play such a strategic role in securing the passage of the partition plan, it cannot now allow conditions in Palestine to become chaotic. As the situation stands, the only persons who are trying to effectuate the partition of Palestine are the Jews. But remember, it was not the Jews who ordered partition, but the United Nations. And it was not the Jews who voted for partition, but 39 different countries, including the United States. Our Government, therefore, cannot allow a decision of the United Nations -- of which it was the deciding factor -- to go to pot without attempting to implement that decision with the machinery that will make it work.

MODERATOR: What is your suggestion, Mr. A.? What policy would you recommend our Government to follow?

MR. A.: The United States must see to it that the heroic Jewish men and women

of Palestine are given arms and ammunition so that they may defend their lives against attack. In allowing weapons to reach the Jews of Palestine, the United States is not violating any international law, but on the other hand, is acting within the word and spirit of a pledged decision of the world's highest tribunal. It will be remembered that the United Nations recommended the establishment of a Jewish militia for the purpose of defending the Jewish State and maintaining public security. Well, there is such a Jewish militia and it is badly in need of arms. This Jewish militia is the Haganah which demands only the right to fight in its own defense. The United States would not be violating its policy of neutrality, because any nation which voted for the partition of Palestine is not neutral in the struggle now going on there. The fight is between those who are attempting to carry out a decision of the United Nations -- and those who are fighting desperately to sabotage it. We know where the United States stands. In a struggle between those who are fighting to preserve the United Nations and those who want to smash it to bits, the United States can not stand idly by as a neutral. We must give arms to the Jews of Palestine. This is the least we can do for those who fight on the side of liberty and justice.

MODERATOR: Well, gentlemen, our time is just about up. I believe that the subject was covered very well indeed, and I hope that the discussion this afternoon served to clear up any misapprehensions that our listeners may have had on the subject of Palestine. I wish to thank you both, Mr. A. and Mr. B., for your expert comments on a most difficult and perplexing problem.

* * *

P R E S S R E L E A S E

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
701 Ring Bldg. - 1200 18th St., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.
Michigan 4480

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN FRANKLIN J. MALONEY, (REPUBLICAN OF PENNSYLVANIA, MEMBER OF HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE), to NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 15, 1948.

* * * * *

In the bosom of every true American beats a heart filled with love and loyalty for our great country, and this is true whether the American be Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, white or colored, Republican or Democrat. Right or wrong, either in internal or foreign policy, though our country may be, this warm affection never diminishes. If she be wrong, then it is our right -- nay, it is our duty, to exert every effort within our means to right that wrong; and if we hold public office, the means to right the wrong is enhanced, and the duty proportionately greater.

Conscious of a wrong in the Palestinian situation, and likewise conscious of our duty, thirty Republican members of the House of Representatives, including myself, within the last few days addressed a Petition to Secretary of State Marshall. We requested information as to whether or not Great Britain was, directly or indirectly, shipping arms to the Arabs to be used against the Jews in Palestine; and if Great Britain was condoning such action in others, and what position was the United States going to take.

Under our Constitution the Executive Branch, headed by the President, primarily is responsible for foreign policy. We in the House of Representatives have practically no authority in such affairs except in matters of appropriation, but we do have the authority to direct such a Petition to the Secretary of State. This we could do. This we did do.

Further than this we can speak before the people and help to direct public opinion along the proper channel. With this purpose in mind I am addressing you tonight.

I need not dwell lengthily upon the history of the struggle of the Jews in Palestine, as you only too well are aware of these facts. What is happening there today is that a small, willful group of self-appointed, rather than democratically elected Arab leaders, has incited a number of their countrymen to deeds of horrible violence, in an attempt to defy the recognized decision of the United Nations. To begin with, this violence was on a small scale and tentative in character. If the British authorities, which so proudly declared that they and they alone were going to maintain order and did not wish anyone to interfere with them, had taken the most elementary police precautions, these misdeeds would have remained a minor incident. But the British Government has chosen to assume an attitude of benevolent neutrality toward the rioters, thus encouraging them to ever greater misdeeds and thus persuading others, who has so far been peaceful, to join their ranks.

Essentially, therefore, the responsibility for what is going on in Palestine at the present time rests with Great Britain.

A second consequence of the British attitude is that the neighbouring Arab states of Palestine were encouraged thereby to lend active support to the Arab rioters in the country. Their territories are now openly used as bases for operations against Palestine; men are being trained and armed in those neighbouring states for the fight in Palestine; soldiers and officers of their armies are being encouraged to take leave with pay to join the Arab rioters in Palestine along the well-known model of the German and Italian "volunteers" in

Spain; arms from government stores and money from governmental treasuries are being given to those rioters; and several invasions of armed groups into Palestine have taken place from Syria, the Lebanon and Trans-Jordan. In two cases those invaders engaged in battles with the Jews as soon as they crossed the frontiers, and upon being repelled, withdrew with their arms into Syria and the Lebanon, there to prepare for their next act of aggression.

This is no longer disorder or a civil war within a country. This is international aggression. This is the very state of affairs to prevent which the United Nations has been created. But to this very day, the United Nations has done nothing in order to call those states on the carpet. As for the British Government, it tolerates this state of affairs and it is believed even continues to supply those aggressor governments with armaments.

But there is no point in we, citizens of the United States, protesting either against the sins of commission of the Government of Great Britain, or against the sins of omission of the United Nations. We must look to our own Government to do the right thing and not to tolerate the wrong thing. It is up to the American Government to take whatever steps are necessary in order to recall the British Government to the sense of its obligations and to the elementary decencies involved. Specifically it is up to the American Government to take up the matter in the United Nations, of which we are so leading and so active a member. It is up to the American Government to do everything in its own power to bring about the speedy implementation of the United Nations decision, and neither to do nor to tolerate anything that would run counter to the verdict of the United Nations.

This is the crux of the situation where we, citizens of the United States, are concerned. Unfortunately, the position assumed by our Government

in many ways has been as shameful as, and in other ways more shameful than, that assumed by others. The British never supported the Partition Plan adopted by the United Nations. They were markedly cool to it from the start and made no secret of their dislike for it. The Arab Governments openly spoke against it. But our Government supported partition as the fairest compromise between the Jews and the Arabs, each of whom claimed Palestine as their own.

Having thus actively supported the plan, and having greatly contributed to its adoption by the United Nations, our Government has assumed in the last two months a most reprehensible attitude of coolness toward it; an attitude of straddling the issue. Nothing has been done by President Truman and his subordinate officials to smooth the way for the carrying out of the decision. But a lot has been done, mainly under cover, to put new obstacles in its way.

We might have signified to the Arab states our displeasure at their acts of aggression. We have not done so.

We might have used our friendly relations with Great Britain, with whose government we are so closely linked, to represent to it the need to conform with the United Nations' recommendations, to allow an increase of Jewish immigration into Palestine, to open the port of Tel-Aviv for the influx of immigrants, arms and civilian supplies. We have not done so.

We might have put the question of acts of aggression, now brazenly perpetrated in Palestine, before the Security Council of the United Nations, as we have put the questions of Greece, Iran, Korea and other countries before the United Nations. We have not done so.

We might have relied on the long American tradition in permitting individual American citizens, who voluntarily feel like joining the fight for

just causes, go abroad without hindrance and accompanied by the best hopes and wishes of the American people, as we had done in the cases of those who had gone from this country to help defend England, France and Finland and many free countries in their hour of stress. We have not done so.

While thus carefully refraining from doing anything that might help transform the United Nations decision into reality, Mr. Truman and his subordinate officials have done plenty in the other direction.

An embargo has been clamped on arms to the Middle East. No difference has been made between arms for the attackers and arms for the defenders; between arms for those who seek to defy the United Nations and arms for those who defend its verdict. Since the Arab rioters are kept fully supplied by the Arab Governments and it is believed -- indirectly -- by Great Britain, this means in practice that the embargo has been instituted in order to make it impossible for the Jews of Palestine to defend their lives and the newly proclaimed Jewish State.

Pressure has been exercised in respect to Jewish immigration. But this pressure was not applied to the British in an effort to get them to admit more Jews to Palestine. This pressure was applied to the Jews in an effort to get them to stop further immigration for the time being, thus nullifying the essential stand taken by our own Government for the last three years, according to which the immediate admission of large numbers of Jewish immigrants into Palestine was the most urgent of all tasks relating to that country.

Steps have been taken by our present Administration to recall the passports of Americans fighting alongside the forces of law and order in Palestine. Press announcements have been issued by this Administration and

and unfriendly comments have been inspired by officials of this Administration, seeking to place these Jewish volunteers in a bad light before the public. Our country was founded by volunteers from abroad who helped defend a just cause. Lafayette and Kosciuszko are names of honor in the history of America. From time to time, freedom-loving Americans returned the compliment and helped to fight for liberty and justice, even in those cases where our country was formally neutral. But disregarding these precedents, the Administration has now chosen to take punitive measures in order to discourage those of us who are young enough and indignant enough to want to help a small people which fights alone for a cause sanctioned by the United Nations of the world.

A lot of arguments are being used to justify this attitude of the Administration. Some of these arguments find their way into the newspapers, others are bandied around by word of mouth. It is alleged that the United States of America cannot afford to back its own policy and the United Nations policy; cannot afford to back it because of the international situation. What does that mean? We can rightly afford to stand up to Russia, the second greatest and strongest nation in the world, when we believe that justice demands it. And here it is said that we cannot afford to stand up to a few ambitious rulers and arrogant demagogues in the Middle East.

It is said that we dare not support the Palestine Partition Plan because Russia supports it. How do you like this way of double-talk? As long as Russia's stand was undecided, we were told we could not support the Jews in Palestine because Russia would come out against them. Now that Russia has come out for them, we are told that we cannot support them because Russia has come out for them. Heads I win. Tails you lose.

I do not believe that the present stand of the Administration is necessary in the national interest, however narrowly you construe that national interest. But I do believe that the present attitude of the Administration is very much contrary to American national interest if you look at this national interest from a broader and higher point of view. I think the principal national interest of America is to assure respect for the United Nations, to show continuity and determination in backing that which is right, and to safeguard the reputation of America for integrity and honesty.

I feel that the present attitude of the Administration is not calculated to advance any of these three objectives and I, therefore, oppose it.

I am not a member of the Democratic Party nor do I have its confidence regarding the internal relations within the Administration. I do not know, therefore, neither do I wish to know, to what extent the present attitude is due to Mr. Henderson, to Mr. Lovett, to Mr. Forrestal, to Mr. Marshall, to Admiral Leahy, or to President Truman. Our Constitution does not make any such fine distinctions. Nor are the citizens of the United States called once every two or four years to make such fine distinctions. The Executive branch of the American Government is one whole. It is headed by the President who instructs the members of his Cabinet, and who, in turn, issue directives to their subordinate officials. All I can do, all we can do, is to address our protest to the Executive Branch of our Government as a whole and, if necessary, to carry our protest, against this Executive policy, to the American people as a whole.

In this sense I join with you in this expression of indignant protest against the attitude assumed by the American Government on the question of Palestine and in the insistent demand that our Government should immediately take the only stand consistent with its dignity and integrity.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. McCORMACK, (DEMOCRAT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
MINORITY WHIP), to NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY
COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C. FEBRUARY 15, 1948

* * * * *

I am one of the hundreds of members of Congress, one of the many millions of Americans, who felt profound relief and gratification on November 29th of last year. I thought - as you all did - that the decision on Palestine taken by the United Nations on that day marked the end of one of the greatest tragedies in human history and the beginning of new life and new glory for Israel and the Land of Israel.

Henceforth, we said to ourselves with hope and pride, the Jews will not have to protest any longer; they will be busy building their new state, absorbing all the displaced and homeless Jews of Europe. The Jewish people will be a full-fledged member of the international family of nations, an equal among equals. And the friends of the Jews - all those Christians, among whom I am proud to count myself, whose minds and souls smarted at the shame of Jewish suffering - they, too, would have a respite from unending protests and indignation on behalf of the Jewish cause.

I thought so and you thought so, and God knows that it was not mere wishful thinking on our part. After the United Nations decision on Palestine, coming as it did as a result of a protracted and fierce debate between the advocates and the opponents of Palestine partition; after our great country agreed to support Partition; we all had the right to feel optimistic. We knew how difficult it had been to bring about the international decision on Palestine, but after the decision was adopted, we had no doubts as to the future course of events.

Why then am I standing once more before this gathering which has assembled not to celebrate the new Jewish State, but - I am sorry to say - once again to voice indignation and bewilderment?

Only two months have passed since November 29, 1947, and great anxiety is once again upon us. There are strong indications, and even more than indications, to the effect that powerful opposing forces are actively at work to scuttle the United Nations decision on Palestine and to kill the Jewish State even before it is born.

A powerful anti-partition alliance (most of which is anti-Jewish) is now engaged in a war, in part a declared war and in part an undeclared war, on the United Nations decision. It is a strange and unnatural alliance which is ready and willing to employ every means to block the United Nations decision.

Every partner in this alliance has a job of his own. The Arab potentates in the Middle East do their share by encouraging anti-Jewish riots and massacres in their lands, by supplying money, arms and manpower for attacks on Jewish Palestine, and by threatening the United States with oil and other sanctions if the partition decision is implemented.

The British partner does his full share. In Lake Success, Great Britain temporizes and slows down the workings of the United Nations with regard to the implementation of the General Assembly's decision. In Jerusalem, the British Administration and armed forces prevent the effective functioning of the Jewish defense forces while apparently condoning Arab riots and attacks. In London, Mr. Bevin's government continues to supply arms and ammunition to the Arab States in the Middle East. In general, Britain continues to act as if no United Nations decision on Palestine had ever been adopted. Not one of the many positive recommendations of the General Assembly has been carried out by the British Government. A port has not been placed at the disposal of the Jews of Palestine; nor has the ban on immigration into Palestine been eased; nor has the British Government ever offered honest cooperation to the United Nations Commission of Implementation.

And here I come to that part of the alliance about which I cannot speak without a sense of deep shame and humiliation. I refer, of course, to the American members of this strange and unnatural alliance. Some of these Americans, it has been stated, fight for their vested interests, very tangible interests, translatable into the language of dollars and cents, or rather of millions of dollars, where cents hardly count, certain big oil interests in America. They are neither the first nor the last men in this world prepared to sacrifice peace and progress in order to make their profits secure, or to make more profits. They should realize what they are doing before it is too late, and withdraw from this strange and unnatural alliance.

There have been rumors in the press, and elsewhere, that the position of our Government has changed since the vote in the United Nations which provided for the Partition of Palestine. Secretary Marshall and Secretary Forrestal have denied these rumors insofar as they apply to themselves or to their Departments. Secretary Marshall's denial also applies to our Governmental policy, as the State Department is the Department mainly responsible for our policy on foreign affairs. We are thankful to Secretary Marshall and to Secretary Forrestal for their recent statements which were most timely. We hope they will be made effective. Insofar as both Secretaries and their Departments are concerned, if it has not already been done, they should see that any lesser officials in their Departments act affirmatively in accordance with their recent statements and avowed policy of our Government in relation to Palestine.

When our representatives in the General Assembly voted for Partition and our Government did everything it could to get the necessary two-thirds vote for its adoption, that action definitely committed our country to a policy of seeing that Partition in Palestine became successful. For Partition to be voted, as it has been, and then for Partition to fail would result in a catastrophe that would stun the world, and would destroy the United Nations organization as an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security in terms of the U.N. Charter. I have no knowledge of any, but if there are any of our officials, directly or indirectly linked with this strange and unnatural alliance, they should withdraw from it at once. It is their duty to do so. Their position is inconsistent with the definite and avowed policy of our country in relation to Palestine.

If the Arab nations, the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, and the Arab League, or any group or groups of people can successfully defy the Mandate of the United Nations, then all governments and all groups would be encouraged to do so. As I see it, unless proper action is taken to carry out the decision of the United Nations Assembly; unless Partition is effected successfully, and it must be done at once, the United Nations organization will be destroyed. Like the League of Nations after World War I, when events transpired that were in violation of the League and its covenants, the League died. So will the failure to carry out the partition of Palestine result in the death of the United Nations.

President Truman and Secretary Marshall kept faith with the vital interests of our country when they provided American backing for the Report of the United Nations Committee and for the decision of the United Nations Assembly to partition Palestine into Jewish and Arab independent states. It was not mere sentiment that dictated this American policy on Palestine, but the realization that freedom and democracy in the world, justice in international relations, world peace and the legitimate interests of America would best be served by the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine and by a solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness, which has been a festering sore in international relations for such a long time.

Nothing has happened since November 29, 1947, to warrant a revision of this American policy on Palestine, which has been endorsed time and again not only by our Chief Executive but also by the two Houses of Congress, by the two political parties, by the Governors and Legislatures of most of the States of the Union, and by American public opinion. Nothing has happened in these two months, which could not have been foreseen with absolute certainty. Has any new element, any unforeseen element, appeared in the picture - any element of such significance, as to change our entire attitude, shaped over a period of many years?

The only true answer to all these questions is an emphatic "No". On November 29, any man, even moderately acquainted with the Palestine situation, could have given us a blueprint of future events which would have corresponded with great precision to what has since actually happened. We all knew that the Jews would abide by the United Nations decision and do their utmost to bring about its speedy and orderly implementation. We all knew that the Arabs, especially the ruling cliques of Arabia, would do their utmost to oppose and sabotage the United Nations decision. The Jews and the Arabs have behaved in complete accordance with these expectations. During the General Assembly's deliberations on Palestine, the Arabs issued one threat after another, announcing that a United Nations decision on Partition would be followed by armed Arab rebellion in Palestine; that Jews in Arab countries would be massacred; that the Arab States in the Middle East would place their forces at the disposal of the fight against the United Nations decision.

The United Nations and the United States Government heard these oft-repeated threats, and proceeded to adopt the decision to partition Palestine. The Arabs, on the other hand, proceeded to carry out their threats.

There is no justification for any revision by the United Nations or by our Government.

If any efforts are made to bring about a revision of our pledges and commitments on Partition, we will make vigorous protest. For even a child can understand that the issue before us now is much deeper and wider than Palestine and the Jewish people. It is the existence of the United Nations that is at stake. If we let down the United Nations on the question of Palestine, it will never recover. The United Nations is our hope for world peace.

We are now faced by a most serious situation in Palestine in which those who are fighting for freedom and democracy are seriously handicapped by this strange and unnatural alliance.

Men and women are fighting for their lives in Palestine. Boys and girls are forced to bare their chests to Arab bullets because they do not have the armor to protect buses on the street; houses are raided, looted and burned to the ground because householders do not have the rifles they need to defend themselves against Arab gangsters.

The United Nations and our country have a great task before them. Our country has imposed an arms embargo on the Middle East. Under this embargo as it now stands we cannot send arms and ammunition to the states of the Middle East. But Great Britain is still disposing of excess war material in the Middle East - and a swift transmission belt makes certain that a dozen submachineguns, unloaded today in Alexandria or Port Said, tomorrow will be in Arab hands spitting their loads of death into Jewish buses and Jewish homes - murdering a little people whose only fault is that they do not wish to be exterminated, and who have signified their willingness to accept the decision of the United Nations.

The result of this embargo is decidedly unjust. It is tantamount to arming Arabs to attack Jews and the authority of the United Nations, while preventing the Jews from receiving arms to defend themselves and thus defend the United Nations.

The embargo in this form must go!

Those whom the United Nations Palestine Commission certifies as abiding by its verdict and needing arms for defense, should not be denied through the action of our country the power and right to arm and defend themselves.

This is the first step to be taken. In addition, our delegates in Lake Success should support, and, if necessary, lead a demand that no member-state be allowed to sabotage the international verdict. We should give our support to the speedy establishment of a militia for the Jewish State, and of an international police force for Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine.

Such an attitude on our part would immediately tend to quiet down the forces of disorder, just as vacillation on our part would serve to encourage those forces.

This change is necessary in the interest of Palestine. It is necessary in the interest of the United Nations. But - above all - it is necessary in order to vindicate the integrity and the good name of America.

PALESTINE PARTITION AND UNITED STATES SECURITY

In the two months which have passed since the adoption of the Partition Plan for Palestine by the United Nations General Assembly, the irreconcilable opponents of the Plan have been conducting a vigorous campaign aimed at the annulment of the UN decision. With inventiveness of mind worthy of a better cause, they have marshalled conceivable and sometimes quite inconceivable arguments. As soon as any one argument is refuted by hard facts and actual developments, a new reason is put forward or a new rumor spread. What all these arguments and rumors have in common is one aim: to upset the UN decision and prevent the materialization of Palestine Partition.

Several already discarded arguments of the anti-partitionists ought to be mentioned here before considering the important aspect with which we are here concerned. Among these exploded arguments the following are most prominent:

1. The threat that if the United States supported the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine and the United Nations approved the Report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, the Arab States in the Middle East would align themselves with Soviet Russia.

2. The threat that King Ibn Saud would cancel the American oil concession in his domain in retaliation for American support of Palestine Partition.

The facts are that the United States of America did officially support the UNSCOP plan for Palestine Partition and the United Nations did approve of that plan, yet this did not lead to an alignment between the Arab States and the Soviet Union. Nor has King Ibn Saud cancelled American oil concessions; he told an American newspaperman in December that reports that his government was prepared to cancel American oil concessions are "untrue and irresponsible". Now that these two arguments can no longer be used to combat the Partition Plan, we find the UN decision being assiduously described as a threat to American security in this period of dangerous international friction. The unrest caused by the Partition Plan, the argument runs, may have an adverse effect on the flow of Middle Eastern oil; lose America the friendship of Arab and Moslem everywhere; and make the establishment of a Jewish State so difficult that it had better be scrapped before it is too late.

THE TRUTH ABOUT OIL

Middle East oil, described as vital to our security, particularly in case of war, figures very prominently in the arguments against Palestine Partition. The validity of the oil argument depends on the answers to the following questions:

(a) Is there a shortage of oil in the United States, or is such a shortage likely to arise as far as our domestic requirements in peacetime are concerned?

(b) What is the relation of Middle East oil to the Marshall Plan and what part would it play in a new world war?

(c) Can the oil-producing countries in the Middle East afford to let their "black gold" stay underground undeveloped, unproduced and unmarketed? Can they dispose of their oil through some alternative to the present American-British concessions?

(d) Is there complete identity between the business interests of the big oil companies with holdings in the Middle East and the national interests of the United States?

DOES OIL SHORTAGE THREATEN AMERICA?

Many authorities on oil can be quoted to the effect that the United States possesses enough domestic oil resources and has access to enough oil deposits in geographically close areas to supply all our peacetime requirements for a long time to come. To quote one authority among many, Mr. Joseph E. Pogue, Vice-President of the Chase National Bank of New York, and member of the National Petroleum Council, addressing the Economic Club of Detroit on November 17, 1947, stated:

"...The United States will face a shortage of oil only if we create it out of a shortage of understanding and imagination... The current short supply of oil is linked to our rapid industrial expansion, but there is more smoke than fire in any interpretation of this as an indication of rapid failure of oil resources.

"...Estimates of proved underground oil reserves for the entire world now stand at 73 billion barrels, distributed as follows: In the United States, 24 billion; Caribbean Basin, 9 billion; Russia, 8 billion; Middle East, 30 billion; and the rest of the world, 2 billion.

"The oil of the Middle East is not primarily required in the United States, and no large quantities of it in the foreseeable future need come here... Most of that oil will be consumed in the Eastern hemisphere, gradually relieving the dependence of that area upon the oil of the United States and the Caribbean and increasing the availability of the latter for consumption in this country."

Mr. Pogue should know. His connections with one of America's leading banks and with the National Petroleum Council, place him in a good position to judge the requirements of our industrial expansion and the extent of our oil reserves. The figures which Mr. Pogue quotes speak for themselves. Of an estimated world total of 73 billion barrels, the United States has in its own territory and at its doorstep (Caribbean Basin) 33 billion barrels, which represents over 45% of all the oil on the globe.

By way of postscript, we should quote a significant statement which has just been made on this very subject. We refer to a Letter to the Editor by Eugene Holman, President of Standard Oil of New Jersey, published in the New York Times of February 4, 1948. We suggest that Mr. Holman's letter be

read by all those who seem to be alarmed by the prospect of an oil shortage in the United States. It states inter alia:

"...That future discoveries in the United States will be large is generally agreed. One estimate is that as much oil remains to be discovered in the land area of continental United States as has been discovered since the beginning of the industry... Thus, the nation's oil 'resources' are much larger than its 'reserves'. Clearly, we have far more than - at least several times - ten years to count on for very large-scale domestic oil production."

Mr. Holman goes on to evaluate optimistically the large quantities of petroleum to be found under offshore areas, as well as the prospects of synthetic oil production.

While the magnitude of Middle East oil resources is undeniable, the sober truth emerges, that the United States is not threatened by an oil shortage at present or in the foreseeable future, and that America does not need Middle Eastern oil for its domestic requirements.

MIDDLE EAST OIL AND ERP

Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, testifying before a Senate Committee, stated recently that Middle East oil is indispensable to the success of the Marshall Plan for the recovery of Europe. All the oil experts who deny that America is threatened by an oil shortage agree that oil for Europe must be supplied largely from the Middle East.

The petroleum reserves of Europe (located in Rumania, Austria and Poland) are comparatively small, and are now for the most part under Soviet control. If America is not to oil the Marshall Plan from domestic or Caribbean resources, Europe must get oil from elsewhere. The natural source would be the Middle East.

It is now argued that though Ibn Saud has not withdrawn the oil concession from the Arabian American Oil Company, or Iraq from the British-American-French-Dutch concession, the partition decision has already caused enough trouble to slow down the flow of oil from these concessions and to prevent the construction of the Trans-Arabian Pipeline from Saudi Arabia to the Eastern Mediterranean. This is absolutely false. Actually, the refusal of the Syrian Government to ratify its agreement with the Trans-Arabian Pipeline was due not to its opposition to Palestine Partition but to a quarrel between Syria and Lebanon as to their respective shares in the pipeline royalties. As long as there is no new world war, the oil of the Middle East, it may be safely assumed, will flow to Europe. What will happen in case of a new war, we shall try to describe below.

MIDDLE EAST OIL IN THE EVENT OF WAR

The map will tell us what our military experts must know by heart - that Russia is the only great power whose home territory is directly adjacent to the Middle East. The United States is about 7,000 miles away. Even Great Britain has the whole length of the Mediterranean and a slice of the Atlantic to cover before its ships reach the oil on the Persian Gulf.

Experience has shown that formal ownership of oil fields, pipelines and refineries is of no account in time of war. Accessibility is the only thing that matters. The Rumanian oil fields in Ploesti were owned mainly by American and British companies, but in World War II Ploesti was accessible to the Wehrmacht and not to the Western Powers. It was Hitler who used the oil of Rumania. Similarly, for many crucial months in the last war the oil of Iran, Iraq and other Middle East countries was inaccessible to allied tankers, and American and Caribbean reserves were drawn upon disproportionately. In the first World War, the British fleet succeeded in defeating the German fleet, not because Winston Churchill had acquired 51% of the stock of the Anglo-Persian Company for the British Government, but because British control of the seas enabled the oil tankers to reach Scapa Flow from the Persian Gulf.

In sum, should there be a new world war our strategists would be prudent to realize that we should not count on the oil reserves of the Middle East.

IS IBN SAUD FREE TO CHOOSE?

King Ibn Saud may be considered the arch-type of the potentates in the oil-producing countries of the Middle East, and the questions asked here about him apply to all the others. Is Ibn Saud free to choose; is he in a position suddenly to decide to cancel the American oil concession? Is there any competitor in sight, whom he could call in to work his oil fields, after withdrawing the American concession? Or would he let the vast deposits of petroleum remain underground, unproduced and unsold?

The only sober and realistic answer to all these questions is an emphatic "no". In the present state of international relations and in the light of the financial dependency of Europe on the United States, there is no country in Western Europe whose government would encourage or permit its oil companies to take over a concession which belonged to American oil interests. Nor is there today any oil combine outside of the United States which could offer King Ibn Saud sizeable royalties, technical skill and all the equipment necessary for large-scale production, piping, refining and marketing, on a level anywhere near that of the American companies.

The only country which would feel no hesitation on political grounds if the Saudi Arabian concession were offered to it, is Soviet Russia. In this case, however, Ibn Saud would be the one to hesitate - and hesitate very

definitely. For perfectly obvious reasons, Ibn Saud would be opposed to any Soviet penetration of his domain. Moreover, financially and technically Soviet Russia would be even less advanced than any of the Western European powers. We may, therefore, safely say that King Ibn Saud and the other Arab kings and governments have no choice - unless they are prepared to forego all the benefits accruing to them from the black gold found in abundance in their domains.

Should any country with large deposits of such a crucially vital resource as oil adopt a dog in the manger policy, it is rather doubtful whether the world at large would stand for it. Were King Ibn Saud, the Shah of Iran, the Regent of Iraq or the Sheik of Kuwait suddenly to announce that he no longer wished to have his oil extracted from underground and supplied to people in need of oil, the world would not hesitate to employ means which would quickly change the minds of these Arab potentates. Nor, objectively speaking, is any of these Moslem rulers or all of them jointly, in a position - political, military or economic - to withhold from the world such vital supplies. One may, however, say with the greatest certainty that such a contingency is not likely to arise. It is so well known as to be a truism that Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait and Bahrein are largely dependent on their income from oil for their existence, their governmental budgets, and the comforts and luxuries of their ruling classes. Striking confirmation of the correctness of this analysis is provided by King Ibn Saud's repeated statements, both before and after the Partition decision, to the effect that he has no intention of cancelling the American concession and will in fact provide all necessary protection for its normal functioning.

ARAMCO'S INTEREST AND U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

The stand adopted by the Arabian-American Oil Company on political issues in the Middle East and on Palestine Partition in particular, is simple and understandable. The only criterion which the owners of the Saudi Arabian concession apply to any Middle East issue or development is its possible effect on the company's business interests and profits. This is the narrow though natural approach of the businessman, and is understandable, particularly when one remembers that Saudi Arabian oil has already provided many millions of net profit to ARAMCO and is likely to supply many more millions.

Applying its yardstick of business and profits to the Palestine problem, ARAMCO soon arrived at the conclusion that, as far as it was concerned, Jewish need and hope for national rebirth in their historic homeland were no help and might possibly prove disturbing. Clearly, even though help to Zionism cannot cause Ibn Saud to withdraw the concession, it may put him in a bad mood and result in inconvenience. This possibility was enough to cause ARAMCO to take a hostile attitude toward Zionism.

All this is human and, therefore, understandable. But American big business behind ARAMCO went much further. Over a number of years, our policy-makers in Washington have been skillfully impressed with the idea that America's national interests are necessarily and always identical with ARAMCO's business interests. This supposed identity of interests between the American

people and the Arabian-American Oil Company, was manifestly absent when ARAMCO overcharged the American navy for petroleum supplies to the tune of many millions of dollars or when ARAMCO manipulated its affairs so as to deprive the U.S. Treasury of large sums in corporation taxes - as has been demonstrated before a Senate Committee just recently. An old anti-Zionist bias among certain officials in the Department of State was reinforced by planting ARAMCO's own men in key government positions where they could promote the company's interpretation of American national interest in the Middle East. The records of the Senate Investigation Committee show several cases of men who while in service with the State Department and the Petroleum Administration were at the same time on the payroll of ARAMCO or of one of the large oil companies controlling ARAMCO. It is needless to add that the salaries they received from the oil companies were three times as high as those paid them simultaneously by the U.S. Treasury.

It is evident that the national interests of the United States are not necessarily and automatically identical with the interests of a private business concern. The whims and preferences of Ibn Saud may be all-powerful with ARAMCO, but American foreign policy must be based on long established American principles and traditions, international commitments, the interests of world peace, the upholding of the United Nations. When the line of demarcation is drawn between American national interests and ARAMCO's interests, it becomes apparent that while the United States is interested in the development of the oil fields of Saudi Arabia, there is a limit to the price - in national honor and in stable world relations - which we should be willing to pay for it.

U.S.A., RUSSIA, BRITAIN AND PARTITION

American-Soviet agreement on Palestine Partition was undoubtedly a very fortunate feature in United Nations developments. The two great powers, at loggerheads on every other international issue, found a common approach to one important problem. This augured well for the United Nations, for the prospects of world peace and for adequate solution of the Palestine problem. The present effort of anti-partitionists to present this American-Soviet agreement as a devilish device of the Kremlin to cause chaos in the Middle East and make America unpopular among "the 80,000,000 Arabs" or even "350,000,000 Moslems" in the world is a blatant absurdity. Assuming that American endorsement of partition has been unpopular among Arab leaders, how can Russian backing of partition be said to have made friends for the Soviet among the same Arabs?...

Appeasement of Arab extremists has never paid. The fact of the matter is that even Great Britain - despite its determined opposition to partition and despite its very outspoken pro-Arab line of policy on the question of Palestine - cannot boast of having acquired unquestioning Arab friendship in the Middle East. The developments with regard to the new British-Iraqi Treaty prove this point. Palestine Partition had nothing at all to do with the riots in Baghdad, the dismissal of the Iraqi Cabinet, the flight of the Prime Minister and the new Iraqi Government's refusal to ratify the proposed treaty. The rioting was purely anti-British, for sentiment against Britain runs high in Iraq, though it was Britain that piloted Iraq toward early independence; sponsored Iraq for membership in the League of Nations and later in the

United Nations; promoted the Arab League; saved Iraq from Rashid Ali's Nazi putsch in 1941; trained Iraq's army and supplied its armaments.

Or let us take British-Egyptian relations. The minute the Palestine question is solved, the problem of the Sudan will again appear prominently on the international agenda. Egypt will again be up in arms against Britain, and Egypt will be supported by all the other Arab States.

Britain is no more sure of the friendship of the Arab Middle East than the United States. From either or both of the two powers the Arabs will take as much as they can get - in money, arms, military training, economic development and political support - and if a world crisis comes, they will give little or nothing in return. It was so in the first and second world wars, and it will be so if and when a new world conflagration occurs.

Among the many strange rumors spread behind the scenes, there is a new story to the effect that Great Britain and with her the Arab States may stay neutral in the event of a Russian-American War. This is of course ridiculous. America may need Middle East oil to supply Europe, but England would be completely paralyzed without the oil of Iran and Iraq, for there are no domestic oil resources in the British Isles. Greece and Turkey may be considered forward positions of American security, but for Britain they are the frontline trenches of her Empire. Should the great calamity of a new world war occur, it is safe to predict that the United States will join Great Britain in such a war and not the other way around.

THE "FORMIDABILITY" OF ARAB OPPOSITION

If two gunmen were to attack a citizen on Times Square in New York and beat him to death, while the policeman on the corner did nothing to defend the victim or even helped the attackers, the impression would be created that the two gunmen were very strong and the victim very weak. This elementary parable applies admirably to what is happening today in Palestine and in the Arab countries. In Syria, Iraq, Aden, Bahrein the application is quite literal. The local Arabs, with the active help of the police, massacre Jews, loot and burn Jewish property, and prevent Jewish defense. In Palestine itself, the British condone and support Arab bands, and hinder Jewish defense. What is more, while the Arabs get arms from the British, via the Arab States, the Jews are denied arms by the United States Government, which applies its embargo equally to the Arabs defying the United Nations decision and to the Jews fighting for its implementation.

In these circumstances, it is easy to create the impression that Arab opposition to partition is formidable and Jewish ability to defend the future Jewish State is questionable. It was precisely this impression that the anti-partitionists wished to create in the public mind, as an important tactic in their campaign for a reversal of the United Nations decision. If one sees through this artificially distorted picture, a different pattern of Middle Eastern realities emerges.

As far as population statistics are concerned, Arab propaganda runs wild in its exaggerations, and there are naive people among us who accept their exaggerations. There are no 80,000,000 Arabs in the Middle East. There are only about 15,000,000 Arabs and 16,000,000 Egyptians (who are not Arabs but an Arabic speaking people). Likewise, there are not 350,000,000 Moslems in the world. The grand total of Mohammed's followers in the world amounts to about 285,000,000. But the Moslem world, as a whole, is very little concerned with Palestine. Mohammedan Turkey and Mohammedan Iran, the Moslems of Soviet Russia, of China and of India are not ready to wage war on behalf of Palestine's Arabs. As for the Arab States in the Middle East, the numerical weakness, inadequate technical training and equipment of their armies are well-known. These armies cannot represent a "formidable" force, even if all of them should merge under a unified supreme command. In fact, the existing Arab armies together are numerically not stronger than the Haganah. In technical skill, adaptability to the requirements of modern warfare, spiritual strength and readiness for sacrifice, the Jews of Palestine - fighting for their lives and for their only hope of national freedom - certainly represent a much more determined and potent force than the Arabs.

Furthermore, the Jews of Palestine and of the world are united (even the Irgun and the Stern Group will submerge their differences in face of an Arab onslaught), while the criss-cross ambitions, feuds and interests of the Arab potentates and the ruling cliques of Arabia are as strong as ever. Ibn Saud and King Abdullah are still mortal enemies; so are King Ibn Saud and the Regent of Iraq. The politicians of Syria are opposed to Abdullah, fearing his Greater Syria Plan. The Christian majority of the Lebanon is opposed to its own Pan-Islamic Government, to Syria and to the Arab League. The kings of Egypt and Saudi Arabia are serious rivals in the Islamic world. King Abdullah and Amin el Husseini, the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, are openly opposed to each other and compete for control over the Arabs of Palestine.

With the "policeman on Times Square" siding openly or tacitly with the gunmen, it is easy to create the impression of a formidable and united Arab opposition. In actual fact, however, no more than a few thousand mercenaries, many of them drafted from among the starving proletariat in the Arab lands outside of Palestine, have thus far been active in the Palestine disorders.

Once the Jews of Palestine have the arms and modern equipment which they need; once the United Nations has all the support it legitimately deserves in the implementation of its decision; once the Arab League knows beyond doubt that the United Nations and the great powers are determined to carry out partition, the "formidability" of Arab opposition to Palestine Partition will disappear.

February, 1948

PRESS RELEASE from AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

Associated Organizations

Zionist Organization of America • Hadassah • Mizrahi Organization of America • Labor Zionist Organization of America-Poale Zion
United Zionists-Revisionists of America • Hashomer Hatzair • Achdut Havodah-Poale Zion (United Labor Zionist Party)

342 Madison Avenue • New York 17, N. Y. • MU 2-1160

FOR RELEASE MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1948

DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER CHARGES THAT "ENEMIES" OF
PARTITION PLAN FOR PALESTINE "HAVE RALLIED TO DEFEAT IT"

- - - - -

CONGRESSMEN MALONEY AND McCORMACK ATTACK AMERICAN EMBARGO
ON ARMS TO JEWS OF PALESTINE AND CALL FOR SPEEDY
IMPLEMENTATION OF UNITED NATIONS DECISION -- BEFORE
NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE OF ZIONIST LEADERS

- - - - -

Washington, Feb. 16 -- Charging that the foes of the
United Nations decision to partition Palestine "have mobilized
for a last determined attack", Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, Chairman
of the American Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and
Chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, last night
declared that "it now remains to see whether the friends of
the Plan and those who voted for it will yield to intimidation
and threat or will rally to maintain the authority of the
United Nations."

Dr. Silver, who made his first public appearance since
his emergency return from Palestine, was joined by Congressman
John W. McCormack, Minority Whip in the House of Representatives,
and Congressman Franklin J. Maloney, a member of the House
Foreign Affairs Committee, in demanding that American arms be
made available immediately to Palestine Jews. Their sharp

utterances were made last night before a National Emergency Conference of 800 American Zionists from 35 States at the Jewish Community Center in Washington. Dr. Emanuel Neumann, President of the Zionist Organization of America, presided at last night's session. The Conference will continue through today.

Cheers from the overflow audience greeted all references to the repeal of the arms embargo and the demand that an international force be immediately sent to Palestine by the United Nations.

Dr. Silver continually referred to the UN Partition Plan as a compromise solution. He attacked "so-called moderates" who now propose a "new compromise" plan for Palestine. The Zionist leader pointed out that "the Partition Plan itself as finally proposed by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine and accepted by more than two-thirds of the members of the United Nations" represented a "supreme decisive compromise when all other proposals had failed of acceptance."

Dr. Silver quoted the statement made by Herschel V. Johnson, American delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, on November 26, 1947. At that time Mr. Johnson stated: "If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of the problem, it cannot be done without the use of the knife. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs will ever be completely satisfied with any thing we do and it is just as well to bear that in mind."

In commenting on Mr. Johnson's statement, Dr. Silver declared: "This is as true today as it was then. Those who talk piously of new compromises can only refer either to new concessions to be forced from the Jewish people who have seen the Jewish National Home reduced since the Balfour Declaration in 1917 from over 40,000 square miles to a little over 9,000 square miles, or to the technique of delay which would defeat any plan and which would lead Palestine to chaos."

Congressman Maloney (Rep., Pa.) called the present position of the United States towards Palestine "a most reprehensible attitude of coolness...an attitude of straddling the issue." He charged that "nothing has been done by President Truman and his subordinate officials to smooth the way for the carrying-out of the decision." Congressman Maloney insisted that the United States Government could have reacted to the present crisis in Palestine in a number of ways.

"We might have used our friendly relations with Great Britain, with whose government we are so closely linked, to represent to it the need to conform with the United Nations recommendations, to allow an increase of Jewish immigration into Palestine, to open the port of Tel-Aviv for the influx of immigrants, arms and civilian supplies. We have not done so.

"We might have put the question of acts of aggression, now brazenly perpetrated in Palestine, before the Security Council of the United Nations, as we have put the questions

of Greece, Iran, Korea and other countries before the United Nations. We have not done so.

"We might have relied on the long American tradition in permitting individual American citizens, who voluntarily feel like joining the fight for just causes, go abroad without hindrance and accompanied by the best hopes and wishes of the American people, as we had done in the cases of those who had gone from this country to help defend England, France and Finland and many free countries in their hour of stress. We have not done so," the legislator charged.

The Minority Whip in the House of Representatives, Congressman John W. McCormack (Dem., Mass.), took to task the British Administration of Palestine. "Britain continues to act as if no United Nations decision on Palestine had ever been adopted. Not one of the many positive recommendations of the General Assembly has been carried out by the British Government. . . A port has not been placed at the disposal of the Jews of Palestine; nor has the ban on immigration into Palestine been eased; nor has the British Government ever offered honest cooperation to the United Nations Commission of Implementation."

Congressman McCormack viewed the American arms embargo as "tantamount to arming the Arabs to attack Jews and the authority of the United Nations, while preventing the Jews from receiving arms to defend themselves and thus defend the United Nations."

He charged that "Great Britain is still disposing of excess war material in the Middle East -- and a swift transmission belt makes certain that a dozen submachineguns, unloaded today in Alexandria or Port Said, tomorrow will be in Arab hands spitting their loads of death into Jewish buses and Jewish homes -- murdering a little people whose only fault is that they do not wish to be exterminated, and who have signified their willingness to accept the decision of the United Nations."

The Democratic Party leader in the House of Representatives stressed that "those whom the United Nations Palestine Commission certifies as abiding by its verdict and needing arms for defense, should not be denied through the action of our country the power and right to arm and defend themselves."

--30--

(The texts of all speeches are included in succeeding pages)

#310 - 2/16/48

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
1342 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council *Date* February 17, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The enclosed memorandum with attachment was sent today to the Chairmen
of Local Emergency Committees.

AT:LD
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees Date February 17, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Attached you will find a press release covering the National Emergency Conference of the American Zionist Emergency Council held in Washington on February 15th and 16th. This includes the resolutions which were adopted unanimously by the assembled delegates of approximately 800 representatives of Jewish communities in 35 states. The release does not include the excellent political analysis made by Dr. Emanuel Neumann at the morning session on February 15th, nor the brilliant summary of the Palestine situation and the fervent appeal made by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. These will be sent to you within a few days.

We suggest that the material contained in the resolutions be used as the key points in our propaganda approach to news columns, editors, radio commentators and Christian contacts. They summarize our objectives most effectively.

I take this occasion to express the wholehearted appreciation of the American Zionist Emergency Council for the magnificent response to our call for the Emergency Conference. Both the spirit and the content of the Conference were of a high order. The men and women who came to Washington carried out their directives in an efficient and constructive manner. We feel that as a result our position has improved somewhat, but most assuredly not to the extent which would enable us to slow down the work which has been outlined to you and which you are carrying on. Every effort must be stepped-up. The telegram and letter campaign must be continued. We must also maintain our alertness with regard to newspaper material, radio reports and comments. Mass meetings must be held through which we can place our case before the public. Christian contacts must be expanded and wherever possible our Christian friends should be asked to send letters and telegrams and hold meetings under their own auspices.

Kindest regards.

AT:RB
Enc.

PRESS RELEASE from AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

Associated Organizations

Zionist Organization of America • Hadassah • Mizrahi Organization of America • Labor Zionist Organization of America-Poale Zion
United Zionists-Revisionists of America • Hashomer Hatzair • Achdut Havodah-Poale Zion (United Labor Zionist Party)

342 Madison Avenue • New York 17, N. Y. • MU 2-1160

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

EMERGENCY CONFERENCE OF 800 ZIONIST LEADERS CALLS UPON
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT "TO RE-ASSERT ITS INITIATIVE"
IN UNITED NATIONS ON PALESTINE DECISION

- - - - -

REPRESENTATIVES FROM 35 STATES URGE MODIFICATION OF U.S.
EMBARGO AND ASK AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR JEWISH MILITIA;
ZIONIST DELEGATES CONFER WITH HOUSE AND SENATE MEMBERS

- - - - -

Washington, D.C., Feb. 16 -- The National Conference of
Zionist leaders, convoked by the American Zionist Emergency Council,
today called upon the United States "to re-assert its initiative
in the United Nations and to take action to vindicate the integrity
of American policy."

In a tri-fold request addressed to the United States Govern-
ment, the 800 Zionist leaders representing 35 states, specifically
asked the immediate modification of the American embargo on arms
to the Middle East; action by the Security Council against the
nations defying the United Nations Resolution on Palestine, and
the formation of a Jewish militia and "of such international forces
as may be required" to carry out the Palestine decision.

Participants in the National Emergency Conference, which was
held in the Jewish Community Center, represented approximately
250 cities throughout the United States. The Zionist leaders

spent most of today calling upon Congressmen and Senators from their sections of the country. The legislators were given a detailed report on the crisis in the Holy Land and were enjoined to take such steps that would lead to the immediate implementation of the United Nations decision on Palestine.

An eye-witness account of the present position of Jews in Palestine was given last night by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and Chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, who recently made an emergency return from the Holy Land.

Declaring that threats, intimidation and aggression were forces which helped to destroy the League of Nations while the United States stood idly by, Dr. Silver said: "If the work of the UN can be scuttled by Arab threats, then the United Nations might as well fold up and everyone will know the blame will lie at the door of the United States," Dr. Silver charged.

In the resolutions adopted unanimously by the Conference, reference also was made to recent statements by President Truman and Secretary Marshall to the effect that the United States was continuing to support the UN decision on Palestine.

"It (the Conference) finds it indefensible," the resolution stated, "that the Government of the United States has, on the one hand, failed to act in the face of this grave situation, and on the other hand, by certain specific actions of its own has contributed to its deterioration."

The full text of the resolutions adopted by the Conference follows:

RESOLUTIONS

I. The National Emergency Conference of the American Zionist Emergency **Council**, meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 15, 1948, sends its message of greetings and solidarity to the valiant em attled Yishuv in Palestine. It pledges the whole-hearted support of American Jewry to our brothers in Palestine in our common struggle to establish the Jewish State.

II. The Conference condemns the sabotage of the UN Resolution by the British Government. After insisting on sole control over Palestine, the British Government has not only failed to maintain public order, but is using these powers of control to encourage lawlessness on the part of Arab extremists, to permit the invasion of Palestine by armed Arab bands from neighboring countries, and to disarm and otherwise prevent effective defense by the Jewish defense forces in the country.

III. The Conference takes cognisance of the statements of the President of the United States and of the Secretary of State to the effect that the United States Government continues to support the settlement arrived at by the United Nations.

It, therefore, finds it indefensible that the Government of the United States has, on the one hand, failed to act in the face of this grave situation, and, on the other hand, by certain specific actions of its own, has contributed to its deterioration.

IV. The Conference calls upon the Government of the United States to re-assert its initiative in the United Nations and to take

action to vindicate the integrity of American policy.

The Conference, specifically, calls upon the Government of the United States:

(a) To instruct the American Delegation to the United Nations Security Council to obtain faithful compliance with the UN Resolution by all governments concerned and to take all necessary measures against those member states of the United Nations which openly defy the General Assembly's Resolution;

(b) To instruct the American Delegation to the United Nations Security Council that it support, and, if necessary, initiate, the formation of a militia for the Jewish State and of such international forces as may be required to insure the speedy carrying out of the Resolution of the Assembly;

(c) To modify the embargo on arms to the Middle East so as to insure an unimpeded flow of arms to the Jewish defense forces in Palestine for the purpose of defending attacked Palestine Jewry, which is upholding the UN Resolution.

V. The Conference appreciates the energy and devotion with which the UN Palestine Commission is pursuing its task. The Conference expects the UN Security Council to act decisively to implement the Resolution of the UN Assembly and to prevent defiance of the Charter and of the Assembly Resolution by the Governments of the Arab States and of the United Kingdom.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees Date February 24, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find a recent column by Sumner Welles and a release covering the response from Mayors of numerous cities in the United States to a telegram sent to them by Mayor Israel Rokach of Tel Aviv.

The Welles article is one which can be put to good use in the contact work you are carrying on. We are trying to get permission to use it as an advertisement and will inform you as soon as we receive an OK from the syndicate which publishes Mr. Welles' material. The argumentation used by Mr. Welles is especially suited for constructive editorial comment. Should you require additional copies, we will send them to you.

* * * * *

We take this occasion to remind you of the need for maintaining the contacts which were established with your Representatives and Senators as a result of the Washington Conference. Individual thank-you letters should be sent by the members of the delegations which met with their Congressional representatives and every effort should be made to keep their interest alive. Where additional material is needed to inform them on specific issues, we will be most happy to send the material to you, or directly to your Congressmen. If so, advise us.

We wish to remind you also of the need for maintaining the tempo of telegrams to the White House and the State Department. There should be no letup in this activity. Communities which have held no mass meetings should plan them at once.

It is also vital that we elicit public expressions from our Christian friends, as well as telegrams and letters to Washington.

Regards.

AT:RB
Enc

U. S. Stand on Palestine Viewed As Starting U. N. on League's Path

Sumner Welles Attacks Counselors of Caution, Says Holy Land War Would Realize Their Fear—Soviet Troops in the Middle East

By Sumner Welles

Former Under Secretary of State

It is hard to arouse a democracy to impending danger when the clouds on the horizon still seem no larger than a man's hand. Even Winston Churchill could not waken the British people to the menace in the rise of Nazism. The peril to us in Japan's aggression against China and in Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia went largely unperceived. But even if the tragic lessons of the recent past are to be so easily forgotten, the clouds now looming are no longer on the horizon. They are hanging over us.

This government has repeatedly announced that the United Nations is the foundation of American foreign policy. Yet because of the failure of the United States to adopt a consistent and courageous policy on Palestine, the United Nations is today faced with the gravest dilemma in its history.

Save for Britain in the days of Baldwin, it would be difficult to find a more sorry instance of a major power refusing to face facts.

The decision to partition Palestine was taken after full investigation and debate. It was in strict accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The United States was in great part responsible. This country played a leading role throughout the events that led up to that decision.

Lack of Enforcement

The American government failed however to insist that the United Nations must be enabled to enforce its decision, and to protect life and property in Palestine until the independence of the two new states had been finally established.

For lack of any United Nations police force, the members of the Palestine commission have now been told by the British that they will be assassinated if they set foot in Palestine. Major hostilities between Jews and Arabs are imminent. The United Nations cannot carry out its decision. Because the United States has during the last two months renounced every semblance of leadership, the smaller countries are increasingly reluctant to assume any responsibility.

The Palestine commission has at length been compelled to ask the Security Council to determine that there is a "threat to the peace" and to take action under the Charter. And Washington still remains silent.

It is notorious that there is a sharp cleavage of opinion within the government. The Army and Navy, supported by some officials of the State Department and of other departments, insist that the United States must take no action to back up its words. They allege that our growing controversy with Russia makes it unwise for us further to antagonize the Arab states or jeopardize this country's access to Middle Eastern oil.

Soviet Troops?

Such arguments are wholly unconvincing. The British government cannot prolong its mandate in Palestine. Once British forces withdraw, war will result unless the United Nations can send an international constabulary to Pal-

estine. If hostilities break out, the Soviet Union will undoubtedly insist that its vital interests require it to send its own forces to maintain order in its neighborhood.

Should our service departments prevail upon the Administration to refuse to exercise any leadership within the United Nations to maintain peace in Palestine, they will pave the way for what they fear most, namely, the extension of Soviet control over the Middle East.

The arguments on oil are just as unrealistic. If a new war breaks out, the Middle Eastern oil resources would certainly not be available to western Europe nor to the United States. Should peace be preserved, since the Arab governments depend upon the royalties from their oil concessions, they are hardly likely to oppose their exploitation.

But we are face to face with a far more fundamental issue.

Japan defied the League of Nations in 1932 and was permitted by the great powers to do so with impunity. The Italian aggression against Ethiopia, the civil war in Spain, and the rape by Hitler of Austria and of Czechoslovakia were the inevitable result.

The Arab states have now defied the United Nations.

U. S.-Soviet Concurrence

The partition of Palestine is the one major question upon which the policies of the United States and of the Soviet Union have coincided. Yet this government has so far failed to initiate any measures within the United Nations to guard against the Arab aggression which is under way, or even to protest the flagrant violation of their Charter commitments by the Arab states.

If the United Nations is, in fact, the foundation of American policy, the United States must support the United Nations, not only when that is convenient and easy, but quite as much so when such support implies effort, sacrifice and risk.

The League of Nations collapsed because the major powers then members of the League supported the League only when it suited their own ends. They failed to support the League when it seemed that their selfish interests might be prejudiced.

We are seeing exactly the same trend. The Palestine question is a test case. Should the United States persist in its present blind inaction it will be preparing the way for the failure of the new international organization. And if the United Nations fails, the one hope humanity today possesses for the rule of law rather than the rule of force, for the freedom and progress of mankind, and for the establishment of a peaceful world order will vanish with it.

PRESS RELEASE from AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

Associated Organizations

Zionist Organization of America • Hadassah • Mizrahi Organization of America • Labor Zionist Organization of America-Poale Zion
United Zionists-Revisionists of America • Hashomer Hatzair • Achdut Havodah-Poale Zion (United Labor Zionist Party)

342 Madison Avenue • New York 17, N. Y. • MU 2-1160

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

MAYOR ROKACH OF TEL-AVIV RECEIVES EXPRESSIONS OF FRIENDSHIP AND ENCOURAGEMENT FROM LARGE NUMBER OF U.S. MAYORS

- - -

New York, Feb. 23 -- On the eve of his departure for Palestine, Mayor Israel Rokach of Tel-Aviv, Palestine, disclosed today that he had received messages of friendship and encouragement, directed to the Jews of Palestine, from a large number of mayors in the United States.

During his stay in this country, Mayor Rokach had visited many of the larger cities in the United States where, under the auspices of the Jewish National Fund, he gave a report on the present crisis in the Holy Land. The Tel-Aviv Mayor was a guest of honor at the recent Convention of the United States Conference of Mayors which just ended in New York City.

Mayor Rokach disclosed a number of letters sent to him from various official sources.

The Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, Thomas A. Burke, greeted Mayor Rokach as follows "I understand that your city may become the capital of the new Jewish State soon to be established in accordance with the decision of the United Nations. I hope and pray that peace may soon replace terror in the Holy Land and that this great historic task becomes a reality. We shall do everything we can to help with all means within our power."

In his letter to Mayor Rokach, Mayor Hubert H. Humphrey of Minneapolis, Minn. warned that "if the decision to partition Palestine is not carried out, then the United Nations will fail. That failure means the destruction of our hopes for world peace."

(more)

Mayor Thomas L. Cummings of Nashville, Tenn. wrote: "As it now stands, the Arabs have access to arms from a number of Arab states. It appears to me that the United Nations should either defend the Jews in Palestine or make it possible that they will be able to defend themselves from the attack of the Arabs who surround them."

Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison, of New Orleans, La. wired: "My feeling is that the United Nations reached its Palestine decision only after open debate and fair vote. For the United Nations to fail to implement that decision with an international police force would be damaging to hopes for world peace. May you and your people obtain speedy relief from oppression and suffering."

Mayor William R. Lupton of Niagara Falls, N. Y. wrote the Tel-Aviv Mayor: "As citizens of the United States, we call upon the American Government and the United Nations to implement their decision with forthrightness and intelligence, to give aid and assistance to the Jewish defenders so that innocent and unnecessary bloodshed may be averted."

"I know that I am voicing the opinion of our inhabitants when I say that our moral support goes out to you in your valiant effort to defend your community and your land against the aggression of the Arabs. I trust that the Government of my country will utilize its influence in seeing to it that arms are speedily provided the Jewish community through the medium of the United Nations so that they will be able to defend themselves," Forrest M. Olson, Mayor of Sioux City, Iowa wrote.

Other communications were sent to Mayor Rokach by Mayor Robert Pfeifle of Bethlehem, Pa.; Mayor C. Hal Brues of Wheeling, W. Va.; Mayor Curtiss Frank of Yonkers, N.Y.; Mayor P. D. Snipes of Raleigh, N.C.; Mayor Erastus Corning II of Albany, N.Y.; Mayor Vincent J. Murphy of Newark, N.J.; Mayor Michael V. De Vita of Paterson, N.J.; Mayor Frank C. Owens of Columbia, S.C.; Mayor Joseph Morrison of Easton, Pa.; Mayor John J. McDonough of St. Paul, Minn.; Mayor Arthur N. Harriman of New Bedford, Mass.; Mayor Dennis J. Roberts of Providence, R.I.; Mayor Ambrose P. McCoy of Pawtucket, R.I.; Mayor Joseph Altman of Atlantic City, N.J.; and Mayor Luther M. Kniffen of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committee *Date* February 25, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find the address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver at the Extraordinary Conference of the American Zionist Emergency Council held in Washington, D. C., on February 16, and the political analysis by Dr. Emanuel Neumann at the same Conference on February 15. This presents a wealth of material which you may apply to your current efforts.

A directive is being prepared covering our political situation in view of the address of Senator Warren Austin before the Security Council of the United Nations. This directive will go forward to you tomorrow. It will clearly indicate the need for increased efforts by our communities and our friends in the present campaign.

Regards.

AT:RB
Encs.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council *Date* February 25, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The enclosed memorandum with attachments was sent today to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

AT:LD
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committee **Date** February 25, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find the address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver at the Extraordinary Conference of the American Zionist Emergency Council held in Washington, D. C., on February 16, and the political analysis by Dr. Emanuel Neumann at the same Conference on February 15. This presents a wealth of material which you may apply to your current efforts.

A directive is being prepared covering our political situation in view of the address of Senator Warren Austin before the Security Council of the United Nations. This directive will go forward to you tomorrow. It will clearly indicate the need for increased efforts by our communities and our friends in the present campaign.

Regards.

AT:RB
Encs.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, TO NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 15, 1948. DR. SILVER IS ALSO CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL.

As the time for implementing the UN decision on Palestine draws near, the powerful forces which have always been opposed to it, inside and outside Government circles, have mobilized for a last determined attack. Though the plan has not yet been in operation, and even the preliminary steps have not been taken, it is loudly pronounced a failure. Efforts are being made to reopen the entire debate. All the arguments which were fully aired during the long deliberations at the United Nations before the decision was taken are being put forward again as new reasons for revision or abandonment of the plan.

One hears again the utterly misleading pleas of the so-called moderates for some new compromise as if the partition plan itself as finally proposed by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine and accepted by more than two-thirds of the members of the United Nations did not in itself represent the supreme decisive compromise when all other proposals had failed of acceptance.

The Special Committee of the United Nations in proposing partition declared: "It was realized by all members that an effort should be made to find a solution which would avoid meeting fully the claims of one group at the expense of committing grave injustice against another".

The U. S. delegation at the United Nations also believed that the solution represented a commendable compromise and the only one feasible under the circumstances. Speaking before the General Assembly on November 26, 1947, Ambassador Herschel V. Johnson declared: "that plan (partition) however, offers, in the view of the UN delegation, the best practicable present opportunity and possibility of obtaining.....a peaceful settlement in Palestine". He moreover stated a fact which was crystal clear to anyone who was acquainted with Palestine realities. "I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented either to this Assembly or to the Mandatory during its long years of tenure, or in any other plan which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe any such plan will ever be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of the problem, it cannot be done without the use of the knife. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs will ever be completely satisfied with anything we do and it is just as well to bear that in mind."

This is as true today as it was then. Those who talk piously of new compromises can only refer either to new concessions to be forced from the Jewish people who have seen the Jewish National Home reduced since the Balfour Declaration in 1917 from over 40,000 square miles to a little over 9,000 square miles, or to the technique of delay which would defeat any plan and which would lead Palestine to chaos.

No one of those who advocate vague compromises indicated what they would do or what they would want the United Nations to do, if such a new attempt on compromise would fail, even as such attempts always failed in the past due to Arab intransigence which increased through the years because of their success in forcing revisions of international decisions by threats and violence.

Partition was a compromise to end an interminable controversy. It was a compromise which appeared fair and reasonable to the United Nations. The justice and conscience of the world approved of it. The procedure for implementation was defined. The UN Commission was appointed with authority to carry out the plan. The enemies of the plan have rallied to defeat it. It now remains to see whether the friends of the plan and those who voted for it will yield to intimidation and threat or will rally to maintain the authority of the UN and insure its implementation by acts and not by words.

*

National Emergency Conference
American Zionist Emergency Council
Jewish Community Center, Washington, D. C.
February 15, 1948

ADDRESS BY DR. EMANUEL NEUMANN

There is unfortunately no doubt about the fact that we are going to continue to find ourselves in a state of permanent emergency until we are over the last hurdle and the Jewish State has been established in fact as well as in law, firmly and unshakably. Until then we may expect recurring crises and until then you may expect to be summoned time and again when the situation requires it. It is well at such a moment of crisis to bear in mind older struggles and how we surmounted our difficulties in the past. We have been through the wars and we are not easily daunted by new campaigns and new offensives, however formidable they appear to be when they are mounted.

It is well in the moment of triumph to bear in mind the difficulties which still lie ahead and it is well at the hour of peril to cast a backward glance at the times and think of the dangers surmounted on other occasions. You recall the past crises. You recall the apprehension, for example, with which we met the announcement of the formation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry and how our worst apprehensions did not come true; how our general moral and political position was not weakened but rather strengthened by the unanimous report which finally emerged. It is only a matter of eighteen or twenty months since the leaders of the Jewish Agency in Palestine were arrested and detained at Latrun in a tremendous effort on the part of the British Government to crush the spirit of the Yishuv, to break its resistance, to break the backbone of our movement generally. You recall how that effort failed ingloriously. You recall, too, the attempt of the British Government to cover up its repudiation of the Anglo-American Committee Report by putting forward the celebrated Morrison-Grady proposals. That maneuver was defeated and the report rejected not only by Jews and Arabs, but also by the Government of the United States.

Last year after our discussions with Mr. Bevin had collapsed, or after his discussions with us had collapsed, we met here under the impact of the announcement from London that the whole question would be referred to the U.N. That, my friends, was a very serious moment and a very serious challenge. Nobody could tell how it would go. If you allow me, I'd like to quote a brief passage from my report last year. I said then: "The position in the U.N., difficult and uncertain today as it is from our standpoint, contains elements of great uncertainty and potential danger to the British point of view. Britain is no longer on the bridge at the helm directing the ship of state of the community of nations. There are fresher, younger, stronger, more powerful forces that have appeared upon the world scene." Nevertheless, it was a very great challenge, and no one could foretell the outcome. That chapter, as you know, has ended and ended well for us. But think for a moment of what might have been the situation if things had not gone so well. We had been summoned by the British Government before the highest international tribunal, the court of last resort. If the verdict had gone against us, the British Government would have had in its hand an iron-clad decision and judgment from which so far as we could see there was no further appeal. We went into that arena and fought it out to a victorious and glorious conclusion.

There were many crises during those few months, as you know. Time and again you were summoned, you and the countless thousands whom you represent, to bring to bear the full weight of American opinion, the conscience of this country, to strengthen the hands of those in our Government who wished and sought to do the right thing. To be sure, diplomacy and diplomatic negotiations are highly dramatic and carry a romantic appeal. I was privileged to be one of the small number of representatives of the Jewish Agency who participated in the U.N. proceedings day after day and week after week, but I know I am speaking for my distinguished colleagues when I say that the best of diplomats can only make the best out of given circumstances. He can only exploit existing forces and realities in political life. If he is skillful and clever, he will exploit them well. If he is less gifted and less clever, he will not do so well. In our case it was the tremendous current which was generated by countless thousands of the unnamed soldiers of our cause in this country, that moved our Government and carried to its destination our frail vessel, freighted with the historic aspirations of our people. Without that current all on the bridge -- helmsmen, captain, pilots and sailors -- would have found themselves becalmed, manipulating instruments and steering gear, but producing no forward movement.

And now to the events since November 29th and the situation which has developed. You all realize that even the representatives of the nations dealing with this question at Lake Success were confronted with a ring of difficulty from the outset. The British Government left no room for doubt that so far as it was concerned, it was not going to help to implement the partition decision. It would not use or permit the use of its forces for implementation, and it would not hand over its administrative authority and powers to the projected Jewish and Arab States. It would not even be contaminated by contact with those forbidden things, and the sub-committee working on the subject was therefore compelled to devise a formula and procedure whereby the circle might be squared, whereby in the presence in the country of a Mandatory Government which refused to associate itself with the decision of the U.N., it would nevertheless be possible to effectuate all the complicated measures required for a smooth handing over of authority and power from the Mandatory through the U.N. to the Jewish and Arab States.

Such a program was actually devised through a great deal of difficulty and deliberation, and there were a few cardinal points upon which its success or failure largely depended under the circumstances. What were these points? First, it was realized that with this uncooperative administration in Palestine, it was necessary that a U.N. Commission be set up and that it appear upon the scene in Palestine with the least possible delay, so that it could gradually take over various functions and arrange for them to be assumed by the Jews and eventually by the Arabs. Secondly, one of the pivotal points was the plan for the evacuation, the freeing, not merely of a seaport but of a seaport area with hinterland in the Jewish State, by February 1st, so that at the earliest possible time there might be at least one corner of the country which could serve as an open door for the admission of refugees and immigration, and would make possible the bringing in of necessary equipment, even foodstuffs, in case of difficulties. A free area would thus be provided where the Jewish militia might begin to be organized and trained and have its maneuvers, and where the U.N., through its Commission, could at once assume control, temporary sovereignty. Then a third point was planned

very early; that there should be established a provisional council of government as the instrument for taking over administrative responsibilities, at least in the Jewish State. This establishment of the provisional council was a necessary prerequisite to the organization of the armed militia, because the armed militia was to be responsible to the provisional council under the general direction of the U.N. Commission.

The British Government has systematically sabotaged every one of these principle items of the recommendation. It has in the first place refused point blank to permit the U.N. Commission to enter Palestine until a week or two before the Mandate is terminated. It said: "We will continue to administer the country as a whole until a week or two before that date and then we are going to hand over this whole business to you and say, 'Now, carry on.'" It refused point blank the second point, the freeing of a port area as a base of operations. It only withdrew British soldiers and police from Tel Aviv without relaxing its control. Above all it continued to blockade the port of Tel Aviv and all other ports in order to ensure its control, so that even today if a vessel approaches Palestine with illegal -- so-called illegal immigrants -- and they are no longer illegal because, under the U.N. decision, beginning February 1st there was to be free immigration through this free Jewish port, the vessels are seized and the immigrants taken to Cyprus. If a vessel approaches carrying what the British suspect to be arms or necessary equipment, military equipment, it is seized and taken to Haifa subject to careful examination. Since the U.N. Commission could not be admitted to Palestine because of British refusal, the third point becomes most difficult to implement, namely the early establishment of the provisional council of government. Theoretically, of course, that could be done at long distance. Let the Commission sit in Lake Success and by means of cable and wireless carry on the necessary delicate negotiations for the purpose of creating in Palestine a provisional council of government. Finally, the British Government has not only refused to permit the establishment of a militia -- but has refused to permit any steps leading toward the eventual organization of a militia. No enlistment for it; no recruitment; no preparations of any kind. This is the sum total briefly of the British response to these fundamental aspects of the U.N. resolution.

I have not said a word about all the things which have been going on in the country, the lack of order, breakdown of security, the seizure of arms from Haganah defenders. The other day, you recall, after a great attack upon Kfar Etzion not very far from Jerusalem had been repelled, and news came that further attacks were being planned, the Haganah or the Jewish authority, the Jewish Agency, attempted to send to Kfar Etzion a convoy of things which they desperately needed for defense. The British authorities stopped the convoy on the grounds that the barbed wire and cement which it carried constituted military equipment and was therefore subject to confiscation or stoppage. But these harrowing details are known, and there is something very much bigger with which we have to contend. I regret that thus far in all our activity and discussion and educational campaigns, this has not been brought out as fully and forcibly as it should. In it lies the heart and crux of the whole matter. What would a faithless and disloyal Mandatory administration do if it wished to make sure that the U.N. decision should not be implemented? It would connive at the infiltration into Palestine of large armed Arab bands drawn from established military units of the neighboring

Arab countries under the guise of volunteers. It would admit bands to cross the frontiers of Palestine in increasing numbers, install them in mountain strongholds, disperse them in various parts of the country, train and drill and make plans and prepare for the great day, Der Tag, when the British administration, having been relaxed or terminated, these forces could hurl themselves upon the Yishuv at strategic points and plunge the country into the throes of war. That is what a faithless administration would do if it sought to defeat the right of the UN. That is precisely what the British Mandatory regime has now done and is doing daily.

The other day, the New York Times carried in the very same issue two news stories. One reported that a shipload of 700 refugees approaching Haifa had been intercepted by the gallant navy of his Britannic Majesty and shunted off, seized and carried back to Cyprus. That was one military, or I should say, naval operation of the Mandatory. The other story carried the report that 700 -- precisely the same number -- 700 armed Arabs crossed the Jordan on a bridge with full military equipment and many truckloads of supplies, and descended into the heart of Palestine. No one who knows Palestine, a tiny country, and the few bridges on the Jordan, and knows the kind of military establishment which the British have there and the scouting planes they have, could doubt for a moment that this large force could easily have been halted if there was a desire to do so. Moreover, the Jewish Agency had secured information about the invasion in advance: it is not so difficult to learn that a band has been formed, is just across the border, and is preparing to invade. In one instance, such information was communicated to the British Government four days ahead of the actual crossing of the frontiers by a band. The information was pigeon-holed, and Sir Alexander Cadogan at Lake Success in meeting with the UN Commission simply communicated to them the fact that by this date some 2,000 or 2,500 armed Arabs have crossed into Palestine. An armed invasion of the country is going on while it is still under Mandate, with the full knowledge and, I must say, with the full approval of the Mandatory Government. It cannot be otherwise unless they should plead imbecility: every intelligent person is presumed to intend the results of his actions. So what we are confronted with, what the UN is confronted with, what Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall are confronted with -- is the ugly and shameful fact of a gross betrayal of trust on the part of the Mandatory and a deliberate effort to deliver the Yishuv unarmed, inadequately defended and protected, to the tender mercies of Arab bands and Arab armies.

The newspapers publish pictures of meetings of the Arab League attended by prime ministers and foreign ministers of the Arab States, and record moneys paid out of the official exchequers of various Arab Governments and other matters of aid and assistance given by them to organize this invasion of Palestine. Moreover, it is notorious that the agents of the British Foreign Office, members of the Foreign Service, maintain close and intimate contact with these Arab leaders and may be presumed to be advising and guiding them. The original meeting held by the Arabs after the UN decision, was attended by Sir Gilbert Clayton, the well-known British representative in the Near East, and he must be presumed to have been an accessory to all of their plans and designs. That is the stark reality. It is almost incredible that a Mandatory Government, which has been responsible for the peaceful administration of the country and has responsibility toward 1,800,000 inhabitants, should be deliberately planning to throw the country into chaos and to permit one section of the population to subjugate, and if possible exterminate, the other section. But that seems to be the truth. It is further incredible to me that this evil design for which there is but one word -- murderous intent -- should be carried out by a government which is daily asking the United States for favors, for moral backing, for military backing.

for financial support, to save itself from bankruptcy.

My honest personal judgment -- I don't know whether it is shared by all of my colleagues -- is that all these military measures which have been taken are directed ultimately not so much by military as by political masterminds. I am inclined to believe that all this is part of a political effort -- a political campaign with the objective of bringing about a drastic revision or complete reversal of the UN decision. All that has been happening in this country in the past weeks seem to bear this out. A vast campaign has been organized and we are now in the midst of it; a campaign stretching from the Near East to Washington and San Francisco. Perhaps it is we who made America the second front, but it is that now and there is a tremendous campaign going on, directed by very good minds. They realize that reversal of the UN policy cannot be brought about without the participation or at least the acquiescence of the United States. Their campaign is clever -- I believe it is the most difficult that we have yet had to contend with despite the fact that we have a UN decision behind us. Some of us have had occasion to engage in discussions -- all of us have read articles. Incidentally, I should judge from my own modest experience in public affairs and public relations that millions of dollars are being expended on the campaign. Because of the clearly recognizable pattern that you see everywhere it is evident that all the arguments emanate from some central source, centrally directed. One typical argument is that the UN decision was after all not a decision but a recommendation, hence, quite simply, if the recommendation proves unworkable, it should be revised.

It is true that when the British originally announced that they were going to refer the Palestine matter to the UN, they spoke of getting a recommendation from the UN, but it is also true that in the course of the discussions and the proceedings of the UN, it became clear that what was happening was not a mere formality, a mere recommendation, but that a new settlement was being made, a new international settlement of the Palestine territory. It was so accepted by all concerned, except by the Arabs who insisted that the UN did not have the legal power to do so. The British Government, shortly after the UNSCOP report, in its first statement before the Ad Hoc Committee announced that it accepted the first recommendation of the UNSCOP, namely, the termination of the Mandate, and the second recommendation, namely the withdrawal of British forces. This meant that Britain was giving up its control and was prepared to have the UN take over and decide what was to be done. The UN did not merely adopt a resolution after months of investigation and acrimonious debate, but went very much further. It set up a committee to implement that report, that resolution. This was much more than recommending. It called upon the Security Council and it called upon the Trusteeship Council to carry out their respective tasks under the resolution. And Foreign Minister Bevin himself in London in an address before the House of Commons said very clearly that the highest international court had acted, had rendered a verdict and there is now a decision. He repeated these words and over again -- "the decision of the UN." Yet now there is some clever boy in the State Department who gets his advice from some clever Englishman or some Arab, who points to the text of the resolution and says "You see, it is only a recommendation."

The greatest and superficially most formidable argument which is being used all over the country is, however, the argument of national interest. "We as Americans must set our national interest above the interest of any group or section of the population -- above all pressure groups." It has been said repeatedly that it is Secretary Forrestal more than anyone else who seems to harp

upon this theme and this note of national interest. I think that not only we who are Zionists and good citizens, but every right thinking American whose thinking is not distorted by hate, by emotional bias, by anti-Zionist or pro-Arab prejudices, every straight thinking American will concede at once that if we speak of national interest it is difficult to find a higher national interest than support of the UN which our country helped to create and upon which it has based and anchored its foreign policy. Any secretary of defense who insists upon basing our national interest and national policy exclusively upon oil or upon the atomic bomb is guilty of such shortsightedness, such lack of moral perceptions, such lack of appreciation of the basis of American policy and national interests, that it is dangerous to leave the defense and security of our country in his hands.

Now, of course, there is the argument about oil. We are told that the whole world now depends upon the oil wells of Saudi Arabia and that, as a result of the partition plan, the pipeline may suffer damage somewhere along the line or there may be some delay. The whole Marshall Plan will collapse, the whole world will collapse unless the oil companies can have things precisely their way. I am not going to get into the argument at length. Much should be said about that, about the extent to which these oil companies who are salting away tens of millions of dollars beyond the reach of the American Treasury and American taxes, are trying to teach us what is American citizenship and American national interest. But the fact remains that thus far nothing is happening to curtail the oil flowing from Saudi Arabia. On the contrary, before the 29th of November, the cry that Ibn Saud would cancel the oil concessions was heard repeatedly and it was Ibn Saud himself, out of his royal mouth, who denied it and said that he has no intentions of cancelling the concessions or affecting American oil interests. The pipeline is going ahead and the other day an official of the Trans-Arabian Pipeline, a company which is actually building the pipeline, deprecated all this talk of interference or interruption of the work. He pointed out that most of the pipeline, perhaps 80% of its length, lies in Saudi Arabia, and that it will take a long time before that part is completed. And that for the present at least there is certainly no danger to it.

Then there is a particularly sinister argument about Russia. The old argument used to be that if America takes a pro-Zionist line it will drive the Arabs into the open arms of the Soviet Union. Then it turned out much to everybody's surprise that Soviet Russia took the same position as the United States, and there were no outstretched arms for the Arabs to throw themselves into. But now the argument is reversed. Just because Russia went along with us, just because Russia supported the partition policy, Russia must have had a sinister motive. Therefore to carry out partition is to carry out Russian designs whatever they are, and inevitably it means somehow installing Russia in Mediterranean bases. The second aspect of this Russian bogey is the Communist bogey; the attempt to smear us — to identify Zionism with Communism, and Jewish refugees from the Balkan countries as harboring among them Communist agents. You will recall, if you are not too young, that during the war we had the problem of bringing in Jewish refugees from Nazi Europe on the same leaky boats as now. The argument then was twisted the other way, and it was said that Nazi agents were coming in among the refugees. As if Hitler's agents or Stalin's agents, if he wished to have them in the Near East, had no other way of finding their way there than by means of leaky boats which take months to reach Palestine.

Then there is the general argument that we need the friendship of the Arabs.

There are people who simply refuse to learn from experience and history that precisely their argument of appeasing the Arabs was employed by Chamberlain and the others in 1939, when the British Government insisted it had to issue the White Paper or else the Arabs would be hostile and unhappy. The reward which the Allies reaped from the Arabs during the war is too recent and well-known to require elaboration. Today under our very eyes, the same thing is happening again. Britain has been throwing Jewish Palestine to the wolves in the hope of consolidating her influence in the Near East. And immediately upon the heels of this action of hers, she began actively to negotiate treaties with the Arab countries. She met a rebuff instantly from the very first country, Iraq. An Anglo-Iraqi Treaty was signed by the Iraqi prime minister with the result that there was a revolt, a coup. The prime minister had to flee for his life to Trans-jordan and a new government was set up which repudiated the treaty and refused to ratify it. And the newspapers said that in British circles in London, this was taken very seriously as indicating the need for revaluation and perhaps revision of Britain's whole policy towards the Arab States. There is little doubt that by playing this Arab game, the British will have as little joy from the Arabs in the future as they have had from them in the past. Our country will not gain in prestige but have its prestige trampled under foot and dragged through the mire if the Arabs find that it can be intimidated within a few weeks into reversing the stand it took publicly before the UN.

I'd like to say a word about the situation in Washington and how it reflects itself within the UN. You know there is a great deal of talk to the effect that the United States exercised undue pressure upon so many countries to get the vote through. This is also, of course, essentially a lying bit of propaganda. We who were there at Lake Success -- some who are here with me on the platform, Mrs. Rose Halprin and others -- will remember how we sweated blood trying to get the United States not to exert pressure, but to make its position unmistakably clear. It is only natural at the United Nations that a large numbers of countries take their cue in international affairs, especially on matters which are remote from them, from the United States as a leading power. If the United States is not sufficiently active in advocating a particular point of view, smaller powers tend to draw the natural inference that the United States is not interested in having the point of view prevail. They know that where it is really interested it goes all out. The whole question in the UN and the Commission and the Security Council will continue to revolve about the attitude of the United States. Certainly the United States and the others would not want Russia to take the leading role.

In Washington there has been a move on foot to bring about a change -- a reversal on Palestine. Hardly any action is required for this. All it needs is inaction -- allowing things to drift from bad to worse; drift in the Commission; drift in the Security Council; drift in Palestine; and just sit back and say "Oh my! Oh my! what a terrible mess, but there is nothing that can be done about it." All this talk about the decision's really being only a recommendation was designed to pave the way for adoption by the Security Council of some new decision. The situation in the Security Council is far from satisfactory. There are a number of countries there which did not vote for partition, which abstained, and there is Syria and Columbia which came very close to voting against partition. Unless the United States delegate in the Council takes the lead and sets the pattern, things are likely to drift there, too.

It is true, as I learned when I was here a few weeks ago and conferred with some of the congressional leaders, that leaders of both parties and significantly

leaders of the Republican Party have been approached with the idea that the time has come for taking Palestine out of politics and for evolving a bi-partisan policy. This is something which we always favored in all our efforts, and whenever we introduced a resolution or anything else, we have tried to introduce it as a bi-partisan measure. But what is now intended is a negative rather than an affirmative bi-partisan policy. Dr. Silver has been here, spent almost all of last week in Washington, and we believe that as of the moment this maneuver has miscarried and that there is no prospect at least for the time being of this kind of plot going through. But this is not enough. We have made no progress on the matter of the embargo to which apparently the United States Government lent itself as part of the Machievellian conspiracy abroad to which I have referred. For the moment at least there is no intention to revise the embargo. Nor is any other action being taken, though there is a report which for the moment is unconfirmed that our government has addressed or made representations to one or two of the Arab States.

There is a whole string of things which our country is called upon to do which it can do both within the UN and outside of it. When our government has a policy to promote in which it is vitally interested, it does not usually wait for the UN to give the cue, but acts on its own. It did so in the case of Greece and Turkey. We have a military mission -- 700 strong -- in Greece today to bolster up the Greek Government in its fight against the guerillas, and money and arms and equipment. And so when Secretary Marshall or others state that the United States has not revised its position and doesn't intend to do so, we welcome their statements, but when they add that the United States supports the UN decision and UN procedures, then we have to stop and ask what that means. It would seem to mean in the first place that we take no action on our own of any kind excepting such action as may be taking place through UN channels. Well, the embargo was not decreed by the UN. It was a unilateral decision and there is no reason why it cannot be changed by the United States alone, which made it and can now unmake it. Nor does anything prevent our government from addressing itself directly to the Arab States, who are largely dependent upon American favors and American support, and giving them a stern warning that such an encirclement and invasion of Palestine will not be tolerated, and that we will support all appropriate measures, nationally and internationally, to prevent the consummation of that crime. Nothing prevents our government, either, from addressing itself directly to the British Government, with whom it has such friendly and intimate relations. As far as we know, not a word has been said by our State Department by way of remonstrance or protest against the flagrant violation of the UN decision by the British Government.

The United States can also indicate in advance to the UN Committee and Security Council the kind of action which the United States is prepared to support. They say the UN has not yet asked for arms; there will be nothing wrong in the United States intimating publicly or privately that it is prepared to serve as the arsenal of democracy for Palestine, for Jewish Palestine, if the UN creates the appropriate channels through which to push the arms. Furthermore, the Security Council is not only empowered to create an international force (and there again the United States has to say its word), but it can also invoke other powers, sanctions against aggressive states; it can denounce any of the Arab States as an aggressor and can invoke those sanctions. The United States ought to indicate such a course of action to the Security Council. Or has our government already forgotten the case of Abyssinia and the League of Nations? Abyssinia was attacked. It was a member of the League. The League refused to act; it inflicted auto-paralysis upon itself. Abyssinia was devoured by fascist Italy

and that was the beginning of the end of the League of Nations. I think there is no hypocrisy on our part if we go forward now and warn our government that the Palestine issue is the test not only of the moral authority but of the very life of the UN. It happens that we feel this most keenly because we are closer to the situation, but we would be unfaithful to our responsibilities as American citizens if, seeing this danger approaching, we failed to raise our voices or were intimidated by propaganda from doing so. We see this danger, and we shall say forthrightly to the American people that it is not the Jews of Palestine who are threatened with murder; it is the UN which is being murdered before our eyes by several of its own members. We call upon our government to take action to prevent that murder, to restore the authority of the UN and the prestige and honor and faith of our own country upon which ultimately our national security rests.

*
* *
*

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

MEMORANDUM



To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committee **Date** February 25, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find the address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver at the Extraordinary Conference of the American Zionist Emergency Council held in Washington, D. C., on February 16, and the political analysis by Dr. Emanuel Neumann at the same Conference on February 15. This presents a wealth of material which you may apply to your current efforts.

A directive is being prepared covering our political situation in view of the address of Senator Warren Austin before the Security Council of the United Nations. This directive will go forward to you tomorrow. It will clearly indicate the need for increased efforts by our communities and our friends in the present campaign.

Regards.

AT:RB
Encs.

National Emergency Conference
American Zionist Emergency Council
Jewish Community Center, Washington, D. C.
February 15, 1948

ADDRESS BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

It has always been an enriching experience to visit that historic land where our people is building a new life. But today, particularly, a visit to Palestine is a soul-stirring experience, for one sees the Jewish nation moving forward through conflict and uncertainty, but always with an exaltation of spirit continuing to rebuild the Jewish State. One feels in Palestine -- I felt it every day that I was there -- a strange sort of exhilaration, a sense of being lifted up by some mystic national fervor, being caught up in decisive currents of history.

I have returned to join with you in this last and final battle which will end in our complete victory. On the eve of the implementation of the United Nations decision, it is quite natural that all the opposition forces whom we have had to fight through the years and whose determination has increased with the increase in our strength and our proximation to victory -- it is quite natural, I say, that these forces should be gathering all their strength for a final attack upon us. They are doing this now, but they will be defeated.

I want first to say a word to you about what I saw in Palestine, before discussing with you what we ought to do here in the next few days and in the next few weeks. It is very important that as far as possible we see what is happening in Palestine today in a true perspective. A true perspective cannot be achieved merely by piecing together the dramatic incidents which occur in Palestine every day and find their expression in the headlines of our newspapers. On the contrary, one is likely to get a rather distorted picture from them. Indeed, one of the great forces opposed to us is very eager that the American people at this time should get an untrue and distorted picture of what is going on in Palestine for the purpose of the opposition propaganda from whatever channel it comes, is focused on the single objective of demonstrating to the American people that the United Nations plan which was approved so overwhelmingly by the nations of the world, is unworkable that it is leading to chaos in Palestine and therefore must be abandoned or revised. There is no doubt about the fact that Palestine is a disturbed country today, a seriously disturbed country pretty much like Greece, India, China and other parts of the world, though somewhat less than some of those countries. It is a disturbed country largely because of the failure or the unwillingness of the Mandatory Government to maintain law and order, though it has claimed the maintenance of law and order as its sole right and responsibility and has not permitted anyone else to share in the task. Actually, law and order in Palestine could be maintained completely today if the Mandatory Government did not interfere with Jewish self-defense.

Palestine is an area of political tension and strife today, made increasingly so by the sabotaging role of the Mandatory and by the great uncertainty which hovers over the future plans of the United Nations with regard to Palestine. That uncertainty is due largely to the indecisive position, the hesitancy and stalling of our own Government, which as the world's greatest political power holds the key to action or inaction in the United Nations. But while Palestine is disturbed, it is very far from any condition even approximating chaos. Nothing is broken down in the Yishuv -- absolutely nothing, and the compact mass of what will constitute the Jewish State has, with relatively minor disturbances, been

carrying on a normal life. The real points of attack have been the outlying areas which are not to be included in the Jewish State, but which positions the Jews of Palestine correctly refuse to abandon. For example, by its seeming defenselessness, a point like Kfar Etzion tempted the Arabs to attack. They attacked in numbers ten times those of the defenders and were completely repulsed. Similarly, way up north, Yechiam, a settlement which, like Kfar Etzion, is not to be included in the Jewish State, proved very tempting to the Arab marauders; it, too was attacked and again the attackers were repulsed. Then there is the case of the road from Tel-Aviv to Jerusalem, the main artery of travel of the country which passes largely through what will be the Arab State and where travel was supposed to be protected by a government which assumed sole responsibility for protecting lawful traffic on the highways of the country. That highroad, little more than forty miles long, has been a favorite spot for Arab bands who lie in wait for Jewish convoys to take pot-shots at them, while the Mandatory Government which has in Palestine, they say, some 100,000 troops and the largest concentration of armed vehicles and tanks to be found in any such small area in any part of the world, has been unable to patrol those forty miles. It has refused escorts to Jewish convoys on the ground that this might be interpreted as British implementation of Partition.

On November 22, the British representative in the United Nations declared that so long as the Mandate continues to exist, that is until May 15, his Government insisted on undivided control throughout the country. This is a promissory note which the Mandatory Government is not honoring. It is not maintaining law and order and when Jewish defenders attempt to do so in self-defense, which is the first law of nature, they are disarmed and arrested. The Jewish Agency, for example, repeatedly requested permission to use armored cars for Jewish Settlement Police escorting convoys on the roads. The Jewish Settlement Police is a force recognized by the Mandatory, but permission to use armored cars was refused it. On December 11, ten members of the Jewish Settlement Police compelled to travel in an open tender to Kfar Etzion were killed by a band of some 80 to 100 Arabs armed with machine guns. A week later, the Government permitted the Jewish Settlement Police to use armored cars but only within Jewish village boundaries, where they were not needed at all, but not to protect road traffic. The reason given was that if Jewish settlement police traveled in armored cars on the open roads the Arabs would be provoked. So, traveling in open cars on the high roads on January 22, when I was in Palestine, another splendid group of seven members of the Jewish Settlement Police were killed and horribly mutilated. And a week later, British military headquarters informed the representatives of the Jewish settlements in the Jordan Valley who asked again for permission to use armored cars to protect themselves, that they must under no circumstances use armored cars outside the confines of their settlements since that would provoke the Arabs and if they did so they would be stopped by force by the British Army. Such incidents can be multiplied. The Government itself is either unable or unwilling to maintain order. It resents the charge that it is unwilling. One must therefore conclude that it is unable to maintain law and order, but it interferes with the Jews who wish to defend themselves while they are engaged in legitimate travel through the country.

Then there is the case of the City of Jerusalem which is the seat of Government and ought to be the most peaceful city in Palestine, particularly since it is not to be included either in the Jewish State or in the Arab State, but is to be internationalized, with a governor of its own. In this seat of the Mandatory where the High Commissioner lives and where there is a huge concentration of troops and equipment, the Arab gangs, as you know, have been permitted to seize control of the gates to the Old City and have besieged the Old City where there

are some 1500 to 1800 of our people who cannot go out. None are permitted to come to relieve them. The great British Empire has reconciled itself to this situation of armed bands besieging the gates to the Holy City of Jerusalem so that a British officer or a British soldier who wants to enter the Old City must show his identification card to an Arab gangster before he can enter. Only twice or three times a week do these Arabs permit a British convoy to bring in food for the besieged. Access to the Kotel Maarave -- the Wailing Wall -- which to us is our most sacred place in the Holy City, is denied to us. No protests are made -- none from our State Department. I wonder what would happen if, for example, tomorrow access to the Holy Sepulchre were denied to Christians.

In Jerusalem last Friday, four Jewish young men, members of the Haganah, were arrested for bearing arms in self-defense at a Jewish road block protecting the entrance to a Jewish quarter. They were arrested, and then they were turned loose in an Arab area only to be murdered and their bodies were discovered the next day. Outside of Jerusalem there are occasional incidents of sniping still going on in that area between Tel-Aviv and Jaffa where the two cities abut, and occasional incidents of disturbances in Haifa, but the life of the Yishuv in its hundreds of settlements and colonies goes on apace. Up to 80 or 90% of the economic life of the country is normal; the factories are working, people are employed, the harbors are crowded with shipping. There is a good citrus crop being exported. The cultural life of the Yishuv goes on. While I was in Tel-Aviv I had the pleasure of attending a magnificent concert and listen to Beethoven's 9th played by the Symphony Orchestra under the baton of the great conductor, Molinari, with a chorus of 250 voices. I attended the theatre of the Habima and saw a beautiful production of a new play. Meetings are being held daily, every evening. Life is teeming, just as in Washington or in New York or Cleveland. I say this not in order to paint a glowing picture but in order to correct the perspective.

What worries the Yishuv and what should worry us is the great potential danger which lurks in the situation. That is the danger from across the borders as Arabs infiltrate into Palestine, equipped by governments, in bands that are trained, some of them well-officered, some of them well-equipped, having arms more modern in some regards than we possess. They are coming across the border almost daily, and the border which this Mandatory Government assumed in the sight of the world to control and to patrol, is a wide open door. The Mandatory Government knows of these bands coming in. They know where they concentrate. Everybody in Palestine knows it but up to this date not a single invading Arab who comes into the country for the one purpose of murder and loot, not a single Arab invader has been arrested. Not a single Arab invader has been disarmed. No attempt has been made to break up these bands. No attempt has been made adequately to patrol those borders. One does not know as yet the number of those who have already invaded Palestine. The Mandatory Government has informed the United Nations that already there are some 2500. Some of the newspaper agencies have estimated the number at 7,000. Some at 15,000. One does not know the exact number but it is quite conceivable that, given the invitation of an open door and given immunity from arrest and immunity from disarmament, more and more will be tempted to come into the country.

This is what is giving the Yishuv great concern. Against the possible incursion of large numbers of Arabs, an unpredictable number from neighboring countries who are members of the United Nations and are pledged to observe loyally the decisions of the United Nations, our defense forces are not adequately armed, and everything is being done both by Great Britain and the United States to see that they do not get arms. I can understand the action of Great Britain, though I cannot forgive it. Great Britain has a clear policy in

Palestine -- to weaken the position of the Jew as much as possible, to strengthen the position of the Arab as much as possible, to bring about a collapse of the plan of the United Nations or to seek a revision which will be acceptable to Mr. Bevin, to please the Arabs of the neighboring countries because Great Britain at the moment is actively engaged in trying to make treaties with these neighboring countries. Though the one it completed with Iraq turned out disastrously, Bevin is not discouraged. The British line is clear. They have not accepted the partition solution. They have told the world that they have no intention of implementing it, although they did say that they would loyally abide by the decision. What loyalty means to Mr. Bevin, I cannot say; or honor for that matter, or truth. However, I do say that I can understand the position of Great Britain in wishing to keep the 700,000 Jews of Palestine as defenseless as possible; it can thus exercise pressure upon that seemingly defenseless community. So it searches every ship that comes to Tel-Aviv or to Haifa to make sure that there is not a rifle there or a gun or a bullet which might help the Jews of Palestine to defend themselves.

What is, however, absolutely incomprehensible to me is the position of our own Government. I cannot understand why, having along with thirty-two other nations resolved that there shall be set up in Palestine a Jewish State, knowing full well that this Jewish State is being menaced by Arab States that have made no secret of their intentions to destroy it, the United States of America should clamp down an arms embargo which makes it impossible for this menaced and threatened state to defend itself. I read the statement of Mr. Marshall this morning. I have high regard for Mr. Marshall. I suspect -- I don't know -- that while his signature is affixed to that document, it was written by somebody else -- I even suspect by whom. It is a document which is clever, legal, technical, formal -- if technicality and formalism are adequate for this desperate situation -- but clearly not realistic, clearly not reassuring. Thirty Republican Congressmen had asked Mr. Marshall about the shipment of arms by Great Britain to the neighboring Arab countries and as to whether these shipments might not endanger the peace in that part of the world and negatively effect the decision of the United Nations. The same question was asked in the House of Commons and the British Defense Minister, Mr. Alexander, stated that his government has no reason to suppose that arms assigned to Arab States under treaties would find their way to Palestine. For the House of Commons that is an adequate answer, but why should our State Department accept so ludicrous an answer? On December 17, 1947, seven Arab Prime Ministers of the seven Arab countries issued a joint communique in which they declared that they would supply the Arabs of Palestine with arms, money and men. We must, therefore, assume that these Arab States have very carefully separated the weapons which they received from Great Britain and their other weapons, and are making sure that those sacred weapons will never fall into the hands of the Arabs of Palestine. On January 14, 1948, the Egyptian newspaper, Al-Masri, reported -- and I am quoting -- that "all arms used by the Iraqi volunteers in Palestine are modern weapons supplied by Britain." Everybody in the Middle East knows this. But our State Department wants us to believe that it isn't so.

Our State Department also want us to believe that inasmuch as there has been no overt act in that part of the world, the question of sending an international force has really not arisen. One wonders what our State Department understands by an "overt act." When you publicly announce, as the representatives of the Arab States did at the United Nations within the hearing of all of us, that they do not accept the Palestine decision, that they will resist it; when the seven Prime Ministers of those states announce publicly that they will supply arms to those who intend to bring about a revision of the decision by violence; when they permit volunteers to train in their countries, equip

them and arm them and send them across the borders to fight in Palestine -- God in Heaven, what is an overt act, if these are not? Why does our State Department lend itself to such legalistic and technical folderol when the lives of human beings are at stake, the life of a people is at stake?

The Haganah is well able to take care of the situation, provided it is not confronted by unpredictable attack under one camouflage or another from the neighboring countries. To meet that kind of an attack it needs new equipment. Its main problem is not the problem of manpower. I have had occasion to see the youth of Palestine. There is no finer youth in the world. Splendid young men and young women with calm and courage and fine self-discipline and unquestioned loyalty. They are completely dependable. I visited some of their camps. I remember in one camp where there were some 900 of these young men and young women, they asked me to talk to them. I asked them what message they would like me to bring back to their fellow Jews in America, and in one voice they cried out: "Give us weapons; t'nu lanu neshek. We are prepared to fight, if necessary, with bare fists, but certainly you wouldn't ask that of us. Give us the weapons that we need." And so there are three things which the Yishuv would like to see done as it fights for statehood and for survival -- it is thinking at the moment in terms of both statehood and survival. First of all, it needs weapons; weapons can be had (without great difficulty) even in spite of the embargo. If they cannot be had in this country they can be had elsewhere, but money is needed; large sums of money, cash, and immediately. On May 15, it will be too late. You are dealing here with a situation where every day, every hour is an eternity for the Yishuv. The stronger it is, the easier will be the political campaign; the weaker it is, the more difficult will be the political campaign.

Next to weapons -- and here we can help -- the Yishuv would like to see the Jewish Militia brought into existence immediately. The United Nations Commission has asked for the right to establish this militia as quickly as possible. Great Britain has refused, and the United States has raised no objection. It takes time to organize a militia, to train it, to equip it. It is preposterous to assume, and the British would like to have us assume, that on May 15 they are laying down the Mandate and quitting, and on May 1 or May 7 or May 9 a Jewish Militia can be created over night and take over the defense of the country. The Yishuv is prepared to bear the brunt of self-defense but it must be given time to organize and weapons with which to arm itself. I have yet to hear a word from our State Department urging that steps be taken immediately towards the organization of a Jewish Militia so that it will be ready -- completely ready -- on May 15. Then, thirdly, the Yishuv would like to see an international force in Palestine. It need not be large, it may be merely a token force, as a symbol to the Arab world that if they persist in fighting they will not only fight the Jews of Palestine but will be fighting the whole world. Evidently this request will be made of the Security Council. It is a logical request. The United States Government up to this moment has not indicated what its position will be. I couldn't understand the statement which I read this morning on that particular subject. The inference seems to be that the United States is waiting to see what the Security Council will decide. Well, in Heaven's name, the United States is a member of the Security Council. It has a voice in the making of the decision and a not insignificant voice -- perhaps the most significant voice there. What is it waiting for?

The idea has arisen in certain circles or is being circulated that if there is to be an international force, it must be made up of the great powers. That would include the Soviet Union and -- the argument runs -- if the Soviet Union sends some soldiers to Palestine, if one out of every five in the international force is a Soviet soldier sent there for a definite period of time under the

direction of the United Nations, that will mean Soviet penetration into the Middle East, for once Soviet soldiers get there they will not get out. This cheap propaganda has been spread far and wide throughout the circles of government. Actually, we have in the Palestine decision one issue on which the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed. Why then should they not be permitted to carry out their decisions together, along with the other nations. But all you have to say today is "communism" and that ends the argument. There is no rhyme or reason -- a slogan is enough. Since there is this opposition to an international force of big powers, you quite naturally suggest an international force of the smaller powers. Other objections are raised, all aimed at the same end: that the United Nations shall not act effectively in the situation and that it shall collapse.

I want to say one word in connection with a new line which has begun to make itself heard in the last few days. We thought on November 29 that the long debate which had gone on, not merely for months but for years, about Palestine, had finally ended with the decision of the United Nations. Ten weeks later the whole debate is being reopened, and all the hackneyed arguments that were repeated time and again through the long months of the debate preceding the decision and all the arguments which we heard at the time of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, are now being trotted out as new arguments, as though something new has happened in the world in the last ten weeks. The intention is of course to force the abandonment of the plan or a revision. Pious voices tell us: There is shooting in Palestine; some people have been killed; it is terrible; this plan of the United Nations is unworkable. Though nobody has yet taken the first step to convert the plan from paper to some form of reality, it is concluded that the plan is unworkable and therefore a new compromise should be found by calling together the moderates of the two camps. One hears the plea for a compromise from Dr. Magnes, from Dorothy Thompson, from magazines of all kinds -- and I stand absolutely bewildered. I had thought that the plan of partition was the supreme compromise to end all compromises; that is how the UNSCOP Commission clearly envisaged it. The Commission met with all the groups concerned, listened to all proposals, weighed all plans, and found none of them acceptable. It finally said that the only practical and feasible solution, which would satisfy neither of the two parties, would be partition. The UNSCOP report read: "It was recognized by all members of the Commission that an effort must be made to find a solution which would avoid meeting fully the claims of one group at the expense of committing great injustice against the other."

Thus this compromise solution was found, and Herschel Johnson speaking for the United States delegation on November 22 said: "I think that there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented either to this Assembly or to the Mandatory Government which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews... No such plan," he said, "has ever been presented and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem it cannot be done without the use of the knife. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs will ever be completely satisfied with anything we do and it is just as well to bear that in mind." And so he stated for the United States Government ten weeks ago that "this plan of partition offers in the view of the United States delegation, the best practicable present opportunity and possibility of obtaining in a future foreseeable to us now a peaceful settlement in Palestine."

Now partition is being presented as a Jewish proposal, as the proposal of the Zionist extremists. I remember this same Miss Dorothy Thompson going after me with tongs because I opposed partition and therefore was the extremist -- a

violent extremist -- while those who favored partition were the statesmen, the patient moderates, praised to the skies. Now that partition has been accepted by the Zionist movement, the partitionists are the violent extremists, and another type of moderate has to be found for another compromise. And nothing is said about what this compromise is to be and what will happen if the Arabs in keeping with their long line of resistance to any compromise resist even this last one. At this late stage when the nations of the world, after months of research and investigation, heart-searching, study and discussion, have finally arrived at this solution, those who now propose that the solution be scuttled and new compromises be sought are thinking -- consciously or unconsciously -- in terms of compromises which will force the Jewish people to make still further concessions, to reduce a country which was to have been a Jewish National Home covering 40,000 square miles, from the 5,000 square miles now allotted it, down further to some little minuscular Vatican City. If that is not in their minds, then they are simply thinking of endless delays as a means of frustrating any solution of the problem, and thereby catapulting Palestine into endless chaos. Beware of our friends -- if you can call them that -- bearing gifts in pious baskets.

I want to say one word to you, my friends, about what we ought to do. What is it we are asking of our Government? Nothing new -- absolutely nothing new. We are asking it to stand by its commitments. It made its decision after long years of promises. Now suddenly I read in the papers that the United States Government exerted pressure upon other nations on behalf of partition. You and I know better. We know with what great difficulty our own Government was finally persuaded to remain true to a quarter of a century of tradition, Congressional resolutions and party commitments. When it voted for partition, it joined the Governments of other nations which cannot conceivably be accused of having been influenced by a Jewish vote at home; indeed, in many cases, their Jewish populations were either insignificant or almost non-existent. All four British dominions were among those which voted for partition, and only two Christian countries in the world opposed the plan. To assert, as is often done, that American support came through pressure of the Jewish vote is a contemptible defamation of America. Of course, the Jews of America are deeply concerned with this problem. The Jews in Palestine are blood of their blood, and flesh of their flesh. Of course, we want to see our Government help the Jews achieve the Jewish State, but the basis of our claim is not the pressure of votes. It is the pressure of morality, the pressure of law; the pressure of justice; the pressure of the spirit.

Whenever I have sat down to discuss our problem with Mr. McCormack or with other members of Congress, as I have done through these long years, I have yet to recall, and I am sure Mr. McCormack will bear me out, a single instance in which I raised the question of the Jewish vote. But once having stamped the seal of American approval upon this plan which is to solve one of the greatest international problems, which is to give the Jewish people at long last a chance to rebuild its life in its ancestral home, finding peace, security and dignity for a storm-tossed and life-buffed nation, once we have come to this glorious consummation as we did on November 29th and the road is open for this realization, have we not the right to ask of our Government to see the thing through, to give it the authority and the prestige of this great democracy and to facilitate, not to make difficult or obstruct or delay, but to facilitate the implementation of the plan? When our Government becomes earnest about any of its foreign policies, ladies and gentlemen, it knows exactly what to do, and does it with dispatch, with a full heart and a full hand, without waiting for any sanctions or mandates from the United Nations. When we resolved on a certain policy in Greece and Turkey, right or wrong, it became our policy. We sent Greece money, weapons, a military

mission, naval detachments, marines -- that is how this Government backs up a foreign policy about which it is in earnest. In the case of the Palestine decision which should normally now be part of our foreign policy, the only actions our Government has so far taken are the embargo and the threat to take away their passports from Jewish boys -- not those who are going to Palestine -- but those who are in Palestine, who are being attacked just like all the other Jews in Palestine, and who joined up with our defense units to protect their lives. I was in Palestine when the American Consul received instructions from the State Department to announce that these brave American boys, G.I.s, who had fought for America in the Second World War, are in danger of having their passports taken away from them. I was ashamed of myself as an American citizen. I couldn't explain to my fellow Jews in Palestine what was happening in Washington.

We have the right to go to our Government, to the administration and to the head of the Government, for it is the head of a Government who is responsible for the foreign policy. We have the right to ask in the name of America, in the name of American honor, in the name of the U.N. which America helped to bring into existence, and in the name of the Jewish people here and in Palestine, that our Government do its utmost quickly because time is of the essence. Any delay contributes to disintegration and anarchy; action must be taken quickly, decisively, to see that this decision is fully carried out. There is a time schedule -- one date has already been missed, and our Government did not protest. That was February 1st on which, according to the plan of the United Nations, the Port of Tel Aviv was to be declared an open port and turned over to the incipient Jewish State. When that day approached Great Britain said, "No," and our Government said nothing. There is another day coming -- April 1st -- when the provisional government is to be established. During these critical weeks the militia has to be created, equipped. The State must be prepared for any eventuality, for May 15th when the Mandatory lays down its Mandate. We have a right to ask of our Government the lifting of the embargo, the modification of the embargo. The U.N. did not recommend the embargo. It was a unilateral act of our Government. It must be lifted if a Jewish militia is to be created in Palestine. We have the right to ask of our Government that when the Palestine case goes to the Security Council this week or next week, it should not sit idly by and see what other governments will do and perhaps allow the request for an international force to go by default. That may quite easily happen in the Security Council especially if the most powerful nation on earth remains silent and gives no guidance to the others. We have the right to ask of our Government that it take a position of affirmative leadership and back up the request of the U.N. Commission in the Security Council.

We, the United States, helped to destroy the League of Nations by refusing to join it and thus prepared the way for the Second World War. I spoke with a very high personage in the Council of the U.N. recently and he said to me: "There is every possibility that if this decision of the U.N. is scuttled, then the U.N. will collapse. There will be no reason for its continued existence if any of its decisions taken after months of work can be undone simply by threats and intimidation on the part of certain nations. The U.N. might as well fold up. And the responsibility," he said, "regrettably will again be at the doorstep of the United States, because everybody knows that whatever the United States will say or do in this matter will be decisive."

Good friends, when you go to see your congressmen and your senators, as I hope you will do, and unfold to them the story as I and others have tried to do, bring this fact to their attention: that much more is involved in this than Palestine. There is involved the sole hope of mankind for a more decent order of society in the years to come. The prestige and authority of the United Nations will be fully established if the Palestine decision is loyally carried out. The collapse of the United Nations may not come next week or next month, any more than the collapse of the League of Nations took place immediately after its failure to check Japanese aggression in Manchuria. But that failure made the League's fall inevitable. For there is a chain of inevitable events in history. And so the U.N.'s failure to act on Palestine would hurt mankind, even as it would hurt the Jewish people.

We are on the eve of the last battle. With all my criticism of the American Government and of its policies, I have always believed -- and I do now -- that when the final moment of decision comes, as it came on November 29th, the American Government will express the sentiments of the American people. We must make those sentiments heard in Washington and throughout the country in the next days, in the next critical weeks. Be on the alert, be mobilized, exercise every ounce of energy and influence you possess in every sphere of influence that you know of! Stand on guard with our brave sons and daughters of Judea in Palestine, and with God Almighty we will win through!

Straddling the Issue

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1948

The Straddle

It is difficult to read Mr. Austin's opening statement to the Security Council as anything save a last—a really stupendous—effort to straddle an issue which can be straddled no longer. In its elaborate legal niceties the statement is correct. The General Assembly's decision for partition was a "political" decision; it could have the force only of a recommendation, not of law. To enforce such a decision is no part of the Security Council's duty or authority; it is empowered only to keep peace. It cannot impose the partition plan or any other plan; all it can do is to determine whether Palestine presents a threat to international peace, and then take action necessary to avert that threat.

In suggesting that under the circumstances the first step on the part of the Security Council should be the appointment of another committee to "look into" the matter and further to "consult," the Austin statement, if not correct, is at any rate logical. The Assembly's partition plan was expected to be in effect self-enforcing; the fact that it has not proved so means that in this important respect the plan is a failure and therefore it is a fundamentally new situation which confronts the Council, in which "consultation" is appropriate. The validity of all this careful reasoning must be recognized. Unfortunately, its futility is too obvious even for comment.

The Austin statement does go so far as to say that "if" the Council should decide that

in order to maintain peace it is necessary to use armed force "in connection with" Palestine, the United States will be ready to "consult . . . with a view to such action as may be necessary to maintain international peace." This wobbling stand is unlikely to impress the Arabs, or the other members of the Security Council. It will not counter-balance the proposal for another committee, which can only convince the Arabs that they have partition on the ropes and that with a continuation of their present tactics they may even finish it for good.

The Truman administration has made a mighty attempt to straddle this issue, which it has itself helped to develop into a chasm too deep and wide and dangerous for any straddling. The practical alternatives are as before: either to enforce partition upon the Arabs or abandon Jewish Palestine. As the British learned long ago, one cannot attempt to straddle without seeming to favor one side or the other and earning the bitter enmity of both. The British, speaking through Sir Arthur Creech-Jones, were at least completely forthright. They are through, once and for all; they will spend no more blood on this thankless business and will have nothing whatever to do with enforcement of any kind. If the United States is not to stand by while Palestine slides into chaos, carrying the United Nations with it, then the United States must say with equal forthrightness what it will do and what it will urge the Security Council to do.

New York Post

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1948.

Betrayal

By T. O. THACKREY

An Editorial

Stripped of platitudes, the statement of the United States before the United Nations Security Council yesterday cancelled out the plan for the partition of Palestine the United States fought to secure last November 29.

This is betrayal, though quick study of the statement does not disclose it—as it was intended not to disclose it.

The statement is intended to make us believe the United States is merely seeking a method of carrying out the partition decision.

The United States asks the Council to determine whether there is a threat to peace; it offers to consult with the other great powers on the formation of an international army to enforce the peace, if it is found to be threatened; it pledges to support whatever action the Council takes.

This has the sound of a constructive policy, particularly when coupled with intimations that, if the Council decides an armed militia is required to enforce the peace, a way would be found to supply arms.

It was intended to sound constructive.

But it was betrayal.

The first of the significant statements—an outrageous statement containing the very essence of betrayal—was this from the United States:

"The Council's action . . . is directed to keeping the peace and not to enforcing partition."

But if enforcement of the partition decision is not the business of the Council, the only United Nations organ empowered to use force, then it is the business of nobody and is meaningless.

The United States' statement is not content with nullifying the partition decision by conspiring to negate any possibility of its enforcement, however; it goes further.

"The Charter does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement whether it is pursuant to

a recommendation of the General Assembly or of the Council itself," is what the U. S. delegate said.

This statement terms the action of the General Assembly a recommendation, which it is not, rather than a decision, which it was.

It also embarks on the most dangerous of all concepts—that whether the General Assembly or the Security Council or both, reach political decisions, the United Nations under no circumstances is empowered to enforce them.

Since every question involving a threat to peace is a political question, what the United States has actually said in its anxiety to avoid enforcement of the partition decision is that no decisions can be enforced.

This is another way of stating that the way to nullify any decision is for the opposed group or groups to attack, threaten the peace, and then have the Security Council maintain peace by nullifying the decision that caused the attack.

The United States also proposes a five-power Security Council Commission to study the Palestine problem.

This commission supersedes, of course, the Palestine Commission empowered by the General Assembly to implement a decision which we now deny was a decision.

What really was done at Lake Success yesterday by the United States was to do these things:

1. Kill the partition decision reached by the General Assembly.

2. Take the whole Palestine problem away from the Assembly and place it effectively in British and Arabian hands for "settlement."

Next, we shall no doubt see the spectacle of the United States urging that Great Britain be begged to remain in Palestine "to keep the peace."

It would have been more honest to state flatly that we have placed our foreign policy in the tender hands of the British Foreign and Colonial offices, and have empowered the Nazi-Arab war criminal the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, our new Secretary of State for Palestine.

If no other course can restore us to honor, perhaps it is not too soon to raise the question of impeachment.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

342 Madison Avenue

New York 17, N. Y.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date February 26, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The statement made by Ambassador Austin on behalf of the United States in the meeting of the United Nations Security Council on February 24, is replete with ingenious formulas which lend themselves to diverse interpretations. More important than the actual wording is the intent behind the deliberately vague text.

The purpose behind this document is to embark upon a procedure which, while supporting the United Nations Assembly plan in principle, will lend itself to delays and may lead, in the guise of consultations, to the reopening of the question of Palestine's political future.

Indeed, under the consultation procedures envisaged in the statement, the time-limits of April 1st and of May 15th, set by the General Assembly for the establishment of a Provisional Council of Government and for the termination of British rule, can easily be reached without a Council of Government having been constituted, without an international force having been brought into being, and with chaos reigning in Palestine. This would lend apparent justification to a last-minute request to the British Government to continue ruling Palestine beyond May 15th, a request which the British Government would "magnanimously" grant if its conditions and desires were agreed to.

Another thought which may well have been present in the minds of the real authors of the statement made by Mr. Austin is that in the course of the consultations with the British Government, the Jews and the Arabs, opportunities would present themselves further to whittle down the United Nations plan.

This attempt to arrive at an eventual revision of the United Nations plan through the device of consultations and negotiations should be fully exposed. It represents an inadmissible departure from the position of the United States as defined by Mr. Herschel Johnson in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 26, 1947, as follows:

"Much has been said during the course of these debates on the desirability and necessity of presenting to the General Assembly a plan which would command the agreement of both the principal protagonists in this situation. I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented, either to this Assembly or to the Mandatory Government during its long years of tenure, or in any other place, which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No

such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem, it cannot be done without the use of the knife. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs will ever be completely satisfied with anything we do, and it is just as well to bear that in mind..."

This was the basis on which the Government of the United States decided to support the Partition Plan. The question before us is whether the Administration will cooperate in the implementation of that plan or whether the Administration is becoming an instrument in the hands of those who seek to upset it. The circuitous and equivocal stand expressed in the Austin statement unfortunately lends credence to the latter interpretation.

All available evidence indicates that the equivocal position which found expression in the Austin statement has been engineered by career officials whose bitter hostility to the United Nations Plan is notorious, and by oil company lobbyists who seek to change American policy to suit their private interests. [It is deeply disturbing, however, to observe to what extent the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Chief American Delegate to the Security Council are influenced by these groups and are lending themselves to so iniquitous a policy.

It is equally disturbing to observe that this policy is pursued despite the danger which it connotes to the future effectiveness of the United Nations, mankind's principal safeguard of peace. If carried on, this policy would constitute a disastrous betrayal of the ideal of the United Nations.]

Against this performance, you should at once raise your voice in protest. You are, therefore, requested

- 1) to take urgent steps to explain the facts to the newspaper editors, radio commentators, politicians, clergymen, teachers, and other moulders of public opinion in your locality;
- 2) to request all our friends, both Jewish and Gentile, to express their views and their indignation in letters and telegrams to the President and the Secretary of State;
- 3) to request all our friends to express their views in letters, telegrams and telephone calls to their Senators and Representatives, urging their immediate intervention to stop this latest device to upset the United Nations plan.

AT:BEF

cup

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees Date February 26, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The statement made by Ambassador Austin on behalf of the United States in the meeting of the United Nations Security Council on February 24, is replete with ingenious formulas which lend themselves to diverse interpretations. More important than the actual wording is the intent behind the deliberately vague text.

The purpose behind this document is to embark upon a procedure which, while supporting the United Nations Assembly plan in principle, will lend itself to delays and may lead, in the guise of consultations, to the reopening of the question of Palestine's political future.

Indeed, under the consultation procedures envisaged in the statement, the time-limits of April 1st and of May 15th, set by the General Assembly for the establishment of a Provisional Council of Government and for the termination of British rule, can easily be reached without a Council of Government having been constituted, without an international force having been brought into being, and with chaos reigning in Palestine. This would lend apparent justification to a last-minute request to the British Government to continue ruling Palestine beyond May 15th, a request which the British Government would "magnanimously" grant if its conditions and desires were agreed to.

Another thought which may well have been present in the minds of the real authors of the statement made by Mr. Austin is that in the course of the consultations with the British Government, the Jews and the Arabs, opportunities would present themselves further to whittle down the United Nations plan.

This attempt to arrive at an eventual revision of the United Nations plan through the device of consultations and negotiations should be fully exposed. It represents an inadmissible departure from the position of the United States as defined by Mr. Herschel Johnson in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 26, 1947, as follows:

"Much has been said during the course of these debates on the desirability and necessity of presenting to the General Assembly a plan which would command the agreement of both the principal protagonists in this situation. I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented, either to this Assembly or to the Mandatory Government during its long years of tenure, or in any other place, which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No

such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem, it cannot be done without the use of the knife. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs will ever be completely satisfied with anything we do, and it is just as well to bear that in mind..."

This was the basis on which the Government of the United States decided to support the Partition Plan. The question before us is whether the Administration will cooperate in the implementation of that plan or whether the Administration is becoming an instrument in the hands of those who seek to upset it. The circuitous and equivocal stand expressed in the Austin statement unfortunately lends credence to the latter interpretation.

All available evidence indicates that the equivocal position which found expression in the Austin statement has been engineered by career officials whose bitter hostility to the United Nations Plan is notorious, and by oil company lobbyists who seek to change American policy to suit their private interests. It is deeply disturbing, however, to observe to what extent the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Chief American Delegate to the Security Council are influenced by these groups and are lending themselves to so iniquitous a policy.

It is equally disturbing to observe that this policy is pursued despite the danger which it connotes to the future effectiveness of the United Nations, mankind's principal safeguard of peace. If carried on, this policy would constitute a disastrous betrayal of the ideal of the United Nations.

Against this performance, you should at once raise your voice in protest. You are, therefore, requested

- 1) to take urgent steps to explain the facts to the newspaper editors, radio commentators, politicians, clergymen, teachers, and other moulders of public opinion in your locality;
- 2) to request all our friends, both Jewish and Gentile, to express their views and their indignation in letters and telegrams to the President and the Secretary of State;
- 3) to request all our friends to express their views in letters, telegrams and telephone calls to their Senators and Representatives, urging their immediate intervention to stop this latest device to upset the United Nations plan.

AT:BEF

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date March 4, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find several reprints which I am sure you can use to good advantage in the present campaign. The editorials from the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Post are especially timely, and the analysis by Senator Owen Brewster of the embargo on arms to Palestine contains excellent material which I believe you can use effectively. Please feel free to apply these items to your community activities in any way deemed advisable. Should you wish additional copies, we will be glad to send them to you.

* * *

We cannot repeat too often or too strongly the need for continued activity to bring about a change in the attitude of our Government. The recent statements of Senator Austin before the Security Council have added greater confusion to the situation. Meanwhile, large bodies of armed Arab marauders are being organized and are steadily infiltrating into Palestine, while the Yishuv is denied arms for its own defense.

Americans have no other recourse but to make their Government feel the weight of their displeasure over the delaying maneuvers which seem to stem from those in the Administration who wish to scrap the UN decision on Palestine. It is clearly our duty to let the Administration know how we feel about this.

Another important element in this work is the maintenance of the closest possible contact with your Representatives and Senators. I hope that by this time those who visited their Congressmen in Washington on February 15th and 16th have already written to them and will do so again whenever it is advisable to make members of Congress aware of new factors in the Palestine situation. The delaying tactics implicit in the U.S. Delegate's statement before the Security Council is such a new factor and should be made the subject of letters to Congress.

Kindest regards.

AT:RB

Brewster Calls Palestine Arms Ban Illegal

Charges State Dept. Has Usurped Legislative Power

By I. F. STONE
Washington Editor

WASHINGTON

In an exhaustive legal memorandum made public here, Sen. Owen Brewster (R., Me.), calls the State Dept.'s action in denying export licenses for arms shipments to Palestine, "a high-handed, arbitrary, and wholly unwarranted usurpation of legislative authority."

Sen. Brewster disclosed that in the course of his investigation he questioned the chief of the Munitions Division of the State Dept., E. T. Cummins, who is also executive secretary of the National Munitions Control Board, in charge of arms export licenses.

"Mr. Cummins," the Senator reported, "was unable to cite any specific law or any treaty which would be violated by arms shipments to Palestine."

Challenges Sincerity Of 'Neutrality'

Sen. Brewster not only attacked the legality of the embargo but the sincerity of the "neutrality" policy advanced as its excuse.

Sen. Brewster cited three cases "to show that our State Dept. has not always stood on the sidelines as an impartial observer":

¶ "The assignment of 50 destroyers to Great Britain before our entry into the war, but after Great Britain had declared war on Germany."

¶ "The shipment of arms and ammunition to the Finns during their encounter with the Russians in 1939."

¶ "The Flying Tiger episode [before the U. S. A. entered the war.—Ed.] in connection with which we

supplied large numbers of airplanes, equipped with machine guns and bomb racks, set up a factory for the manufacture of military aircraft for the Chiang Kai-shek government, and continued to supply this factory with the machinery and tools for the construction of military aircraft."

State Dept. Obligated To Grant Licenses

Sen. Brewster—firing the first gun in what may become a major battle on the Senate floor—pointed an accusing finger at President Truman's message of April 15 last, transmitting a proposal for legislation to control exports and imports of arms.

That message, Sen. Brewster said, "admits that the Secretary of State must grant every application for a license for the exportation of arms unless such action would be in violation of a treaty."

The Senator declared that since Congress had yet to act upon the President's request for stricter controls, the State Dept. "proceeds to exercise that control without authority."

Reasons For Which Exports Can Be Banned

Sen. Brewster quoted the language of the existing law to show that arms licenses for export may be denied only under two circumstances:

¶ If such export were in violation of "any treaty to which the United States is a party."

¶ If the President had issued a proclamation declaring that the export of arms to any specified country or area "would be con-



Sen. Brewster Gives Legal Brief

trary to the interest of the United States."

Past proclamations of this kind have barred shipments at various times to China, Honduras, Nicaragua and Cuba.

"No such proclamation has been issued," the Brewster memorandum declared, "precluding the shipment of arms to Palestine."

State Dept. Cites 'Inter-Office Memo'

Sen. Brewster said he had "quizzed the officials of the Munitions Division of the Department of State specifically and exhaustively on this point" but that the only authority they could cite for their embargo action was an "inter-office memorandum from the Secretary of State."

The Brewster memorandum opens the Administration to imputations of hypocrisy, by pointing out that the principal reason cited by the President for asking greater power over arms shipments from Congress last April was to be able to support UN decisions.

"We have committed ourselves," the President said in that message, "to international cooperation through the United Nations. If this participation is to be fully effective this Government must have control over traffic in weapons which will permit us to act in accordance with our position and in the United Nations and will be adaptable to changes in the international situation."

UN Hasn't Asked Ban on Shipments

Sen. Brewster in comment on this plea asserted: "The United Nations has not, however, by resolution or other action directed or requested its member nations to withhold shipments of arms to Palestine."

The Senator said he had "checked this point thoroughly with the local office of the United Nations."

Sen. Brewster said the discretionary powers asked last April had not been granted, but that "nonetheless the State Dept., presuming to know what is good for the world and this Nation far better than the Congress, proceeds to exercise that control without authority."

The Senator said the State Dept. had not even published an order or regulation as required by law, but had merely issued a press release on Dec. 5, 1947, putting the embargo into effect.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council *Date* March 4, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The enclosed memorandum with attachments was sent today to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

AT:LD
Encs.

Peace in the Holy Land

Mr. McDonald Dissents From the Gildersleeve Report

To the New York Herald Tribune:

My reading in the New York Herald Tribune today of the statement of the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land and the explanation of the Chairman, Miss Virginia C. Gildersleeve, has left me with a feeling of amazement and consternation: amazement that the group of American educators and religious leaders who have endorsed the new Committee should ignore the realities of the Palestine problem and basic Christian interests in the Middle East; and consternation that these leaders should in the name of "peace and justice" invite the United Nations to commit suicide by yielding to Arab aggression and to Arab threats of war.

The sponsors of the Committee are quoted as contending that "the Palestine problem must be solved through conciliation or some sort of compromise agreeable to both the Arabs and the Jews." This is tantamount to asking the Jews to surrender their hopes and their rights in Palestine. The Arab leaders when they appeared to give testimony before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry (of which I was one of the American members) were unanimous and unyielding in their demand that the Jews should relinquish all special rights or claims to such rights in Palestine. Unashamedly, these Arab leaders demanded the scrapping of the Balfour Declaration with its clear and solemn pledge to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish Homeland in Palestine. They demanded, too, the scrapping of the League of Nations Mandate which incorporated the Balfour pledge and which had made that pledge the international law of the civilized world for decades. In short, the Arab spokesmen would agree to nothing less than that the Jews become a helpless and defenseless minority in their historic, their promised homeland. In the two years since the Anglo-American Committee concluded its hearings, Arab intransigence has not diminished. Instead, if that were possible, it has increased.

In view of this Arab defiance, the call of the Committee for "compromise agreeable to both the Arabs and the Jews" must have the effect of bringing pressure to bear upon the Jews to yield to Arab intransigence. How such pressure can contribute towards "peace and justice in the Holy Land" is a mystery which neither the Committee's statement nor the explanation of its Chairman does anything to clear up. The amazing fact is that the Committee and its sponsors could have so completely disregarded the obvious pro-Arab effect of their call for "compromise."

Similarly, the Committee ignores the miracle of re-creation which the Jews have worked in Palestine under the Mandate and the beneficent effect of that re-creation upon the welfare and the feelings of the masses of the Arabs in the country.

That the Arab worker and peasant are not unaware of the benefits of Jewish enterprise, modern techniques and devotion to the land is evidenced by the fact that in the recent outbreaks of violence the masses of the Palestinian Arabs have had little or no part. On the contrary, the Arab attacks have been spearheaded by guerrillas or members "on leave" of the armed forces from across the frontiers. Surely if the rank and file of Palestine Arabs were as violently anti-Jewish as their self-appointed leader, there would be no need—since the Arabs outnumber the Jews two to one—for assistance from Syria, Iraq and other neighboring Arab states.

Among the sponsors of the new Committee is such a large proportion, if not a majority, of Protestant religious leaders that the reader naturally concludes that Christian interests in Palestine and the Middle East would be advanced by the proposed surrender to the Arabs. Precisely the opposite would be the more likely result of such un-Christian sacrifice of the Jews to Arab fanatical nationalism.

During the investigation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in Palestine and the neighboring Arab states, we were given many opportunities to hear either in open session or private interviews, the opinions of Christian leaders. Of all these leaders none impressed me as deeply as did the Patriarch of the Maronites. This venerable head of one of the most important Christian sects in the Middle East was unqualified in his support of the Zionist aspirations in Palestine and in his denunciation of those Moslem leaders whom he charged were, in the name of Arab nationalism, preparing the way for a frontal attack upon Christianity in that area.

The Patriarch's statement made to me in the presence of his advisers was in substance as follows: "In Palestine the Zionists are synonymous with rebirth and fertility; the Arabs have been synonymous with aridity and decay. The only menace to Christianity in this part of the world is from the success of inflamed Moslem nationalists. Tell your American Christian friends this truth about the danger which threatens Christianity here." Very respectfully I suggest to the Christian leaders sponsoring the new Committee that they take account of the Patriarch's warning.

Recently one of the official organs of the Church of England, "The Record," put the case incontrovertibly: "There can be no impartiality between right and wrong, between justice and injustice. . . . The only consistent course would be for the U. N. to declare the Jews as allies and defenders of the world conscience. The Haganah might logically be appointed as the international force in Palestine."

In all fairness is not this approach at once more realistic and Christian than that of the new Committee, which by urging appeasement of Arab aggression, invites the United Nations to commit suicide?

JAMES G. M'DONALD.
New York, March 3, 1948.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council *Date* March 16, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The enclosed memorandum with attachments was sent today to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

AT:LD
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees Date March 16, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

Enclosed you will find a reprint of an advertisement published in New York and Washington, D. C. newspapers on Saturday, March 13th under the sponsorship of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

You will find this a timely analysis of the political situation, embodying, at the same time, suggestions for a solution of the critical problem which faces us.

It would be extremely helpful if you could find the means to place this advertisement in your local press. If you do so, we suggest that you add the names of several outstanding Christians in your community who are associated with us in the struggle for the establishment of a Jewish State. The material may also be used for letters to editors, news stories, columnists, radio commentators, etc.

In publishing this advertisement please bear in mind that the passage of time makes it necessary to change the text slightly. The first paragraph should now read:

"This is a fateful week for Palestine -- and for the peace of the world. Soon we should know whether the United Nations shall henceforth be regarded merely as an international debating society, whose decisions and considered judgments may be lightly shunted aside, or whether it is to be an effective instrument for the settlement of disputes -- and the hope of mankind. It is our firm conviction that upon the action to be taken by the Security Council with regard to Palestine rests the future of international organization to preserve and maintain peace."

Point One of the three-point program at the end of the advertisement should now read:

"That the United States Representative to the Security Council take . . . ", etc.

We are enclosing, at the same time, a reprint from the New York Times of March 3rd in which Mr. James G. McDonald discusses the statement of the so-called "Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land," of which Miss Virginia C. Gildersleeve is the chairman. Mr. McDonald's comment should be helpful to you.

Kindest regards.

AT:RB
Encs.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council *Date* March 17, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

The enclosed memorandum with attachment was sent today to the
Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

AT:RB
Encs.

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

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees *Date* March 17, 1948

From Abe Tuvim

In a memorandum submitted on February 9th to the UN Palestine Commission and made public by UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie on March 9th, the leading United Nations legal authorities presented their opinion on the major questions which have arisen in the course of the Security Council's discussions on Palestine.

The legal experts declared that the Security Council has the power to implement partition and that it does not have the power to alter the partition plan. These findings reject the position taken by the United States delegation in the Security Council and are of great importance in the present situation.

We are sending you a copy of this significant memorandum and trust that you will find various means to call it to the attention of molders of public opinion in your community.

AT:RB
Enc.

MEMORANDUM

May the Security Council Implement the United Nations Palestine Partition Plan?

The Security Council of the United Nations is now considering the Palestine problem referred to it by the Palestine Commission of the General Assembly.

Two major questions have arisen in the course of its discussions.

Does the Security Council have the power, under the Charter, to take action to carry out the plan envisaged in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly, November 29, 1947?

Does the Security Council have the power to alter the Assembly's recommendations and order a new solution of the Palestine problem?

These questions have been answered by the legal experts of the United Nations Secretariat.

In a memorandum submitted on February 9 to the Palestine Commission and made public by Secretary General Trygve Lie on March 9, the leading United Nations legal authorities hold that:

The Security Council has the power to implement partition.

It does not have the power to alter the partition plan.

These findings are of great importance, for they reject the position taken by the United States delegation in the Security Council. The representative of the United States has insisted that the Security Council may take action only in the event of a threat to the peace, but may not, under the Charter, carry out a decision of the General Assembly. Moreover, by proposing new consultations between all the parties, the United States has implied a willingness to depart from the General Assembly's recommendations and to explore new proposals.

The Powers of the Security Council

The legal experts of the United Nations hold that while the Palestine Commission has primary responsibility for the implementation of the partition plan and is intended to be the supreme administrative and legislative authority in Palestine in the period between the termination of the Mandate and independence, the Security Council has been given certain powers of a supervisory character over it.

Thus the Security Council was requested by the General Assembly to take the necessary measures as provided in the plan for its implementation. It was also requested to take measures connected with its functions as the executive organ of the United Nations, if circumstances require.

The working paper states:

"3. The Plan specifies that the Security Council may:

(a) issue instructions to the Palestine Commission as it may consider necessary:

(b) take such action as it may deem proper with respect to that state for which a provisional council of government cannot be selected by 1 April 1948, or if selected, cannot carry out its functions.

"4. In connection with (b) above, the Security Council is free to take any action that it deems proper. In connection with (a) however, the powers of the Security Council have some limitations:

The Security Council may not issue instructions altering the essence of the Plan of Partition. Its instructions should always aim at the implementation of this Plan. This would follow from the fact, that the scope of the Security Council's collaboration was limited in the General Assembly's request to taking the necessary measures, whatever they may be, for the implementation of the Plan, as provided in the Plan. It is obvious that the General Assembly, having arrived at a certain Plan, wished the Security Council to assist in the smooth functioning and implementation of that concrete Plan.

"5. Except for the above limitation, it is suggested that the Security Council on its own motion or at the request of the Commission, may issue any instructions it considers necessary. These instructions may be either substantive or procedural in character, of a general nature, or connected with some specific matter. They may elaborate or supplement the Plan. They may add, clarify, adjust or replace a detail which would prove to be unworkable. They may also deal with a completely new question, not foreseen by the General Assembly. They may cover not only the functions expressly specified in the Recommendations but also those implied."

May the Security Council Accept the Responsibilities Assigned to it by the General Assembly?

The basic principle governing the role of the Security Council is to be found in Article 24 of the Charter, paragraphs 1 and 2 of which read as follows:

"In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility, the Security Council acts on their behalf.

"In discharging these duties, the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII, and XII."

While there is nothing in the Charter specifically defining that the Security Council may accept the responsibilities assigned to it under the partition plan, it does not follow that the Security Council has not been conferred sufficient power to assume new responsibilities.

As a precedent, the UN legal experts cite the case of the Free Territory of Trieste.

Under the Italian Peace Treaty, the Council of Foreign Ministers requested the Security Council to accept responsibilities in connection with the

administration of Trieste.

When the matter came before the Security Council, the Australian representative raised a legal objection. The Secretary General then cited Article 24 as a grant of power sufficiently wide to enable the Security Council to act. The Council vote was 10 in favor, with one representative abstaining.

The document continues:

"By its decision, it recognized the principle that it has sufficient power, under the terms of Article 24 of the Charter, to assume new responsibilities, on condition that they relate directly or even indirectly to the maintenance of international peace and security, and that in discharging these duties, the Security Council acts in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Article 1 and 2 of the Charter).

"In the light of the Trieste precedent, it may be assumed that the Security Council has the power to accept the responsibilities that the General Assembly requested it to accept with regard to Palestine.

- "7) In that connection, the Security Council may take into consideration;
- (a) that Palestine is a territory which has been for many years under international administration, the future integrity and independence of which is a matter of international concern. Internal disorders in Palestine might lead to international friction and might endanger peace;
 - (b) that the General Assembly, by more than two-thirds majority, concluded that the present situation is one which is likely to impair the general welfare and friendly relations among nations, and that any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by its Resolution constitutes a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression;
 - (c) it may be anticipated that the situation in Palestine will undoubtedly deteriorate further if adequate armed forces do not take possession of Palestine on the withdrawal of the Mandatory. Any deterioration, involving also the existence of the City of Jerusalem-territory under Special International Regime - may eventually endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.
- "8) It is suggested that such considerations as the above, bring the Palestine question within the scope of Article 24 of the Charter, as interpreted in the case of Trieste, and that the Security Council has the power required to accept the responsibilities assigned to it by the General Assembly. It is submitted that if the Security Council deemed that it was within its competence to accept responsibilities for the carrying out of certain provisions of a treaty negotiated and concluded outside of the United Nations, it is still more appropriate that it should accept responsibilities for the implementation of a plan adopted by the General Assembly."

The Question of an International Police Force.

The UN legal experts consider that it is obvious that order and security in Palestine are necessary not only for the implementation of the plan "but also generally for avoiding anarchy and chaos and for minimizing bloodshed and to prevent breach of international peace."

The Security Council may employ an international armed force in Palestine either under Article 42 of the Charter or in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly, in conjunction with Article 24 of the Charter. To use military force under Article 42, the Security Council should first determine the existence in Palestine of a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of

aggression.

"It is clear that the construction given by the General Assembly was that a challenge to the peace may take place not only through action against the territory of Palestine, even without outside assistance; not only action against the territorial integrity of Palestine but also against the settlement envisaged by the Resolution," the memorandum said.

Citing the power of the Council, under Article 24, the experts declares:

"In a general manner, it may be conceived that the Security Council might consider that outside the Resolution of the General Assembly, outside the specific powers conferred upon it by the Charter, it has a duty inherent in Article 24 of the Charter, especially, as interpreted in the Trieste case, to assist substantively in the implementation of a Plan considered by more than a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly as conducive to general welfare or friendly relations among nations.

"It is obvious that the Security Council would base its action on such grounds only after previously having reached the conclusion that no threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression had occurred. An international armed force set up on this basis would not be one in the sense of Chapter VII of the Charter. It would have the character of an international police force for the maintenance of law and order in a territory for which the international society is still responsible."

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council *Date* March 24, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

The enclosed memorandum with attachment was sent today to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

HLS:LD
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees *Date* March 24, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Attached is a statement issued on March 22 by Dr. H. V. Evatt, Australian Minister for External Affairs, who was Chairman of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Palestine during the last meeting of the General Assembly.

The statement is sharply critical of the "Trusteeship" proposal made by the United States when it repudiated the Partition decision of the General Assembly. Inasmuch as it comes from so important an international figure as Dr. Evatt, this statement is highly significant at this time. Will you do your utmost to see to it that it is reported in full by your local newspapers? It will aid us greatly in building public opinion at this juncture.

Regards.

HLS:EF
Enc.

PALESTINE CRISIS

TRUSTEESHIP SUGGESTION

COMMENT BY AUSTRALIAN MINISTER
FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (DR. H. V. EVATT)

Chapler will pay POST
on copy part of
TIMES cost
- can raise about 1000

The following is the text of a statement made at 11:00 P.M., Monday, March 22, 1948, by the Australian Minister for External Affairs and Deputy Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Dr. Herbert V. Evatt:

Decisions of a competent international conference should be accepted after there has been full enquiry and fair debate and a just settlement has been reached. Accordingly any setting aside of the United Nations Assembly decision on Palestine must be closely scrutinized. It is impossible to examine the new plan in detail because nothing definite is known about it. It is said the 'Trusteeship' will be the new solution. But the word itself is ambiguous. What does it mean? It certainly seems to imply that the peoples to be placed under 'Trusteeship' are not sufficiently 'advanced' for selfgovernment. Such a suggestion would seem to be untenable in relation either to the Palestinian Arabs or to the Palestinian Jews. If however what is now proposed is a temporary United Nations Trusteeship merely for the purpose of carrying out the Assembly's decision it would be a very different matter. But is that intended? The final decision was reached in December last after two General Assemblies had dealt most carefully and exhaustively with the matter after all parties were heard and after a special Commission involving very heavy United Nations expenditure had visited Palestine and reported in favour of the principles of the plan ultimately adopted in the Assembly. The plan adopted is inappropriately labeled 'partition' because it involves four separate points: First, economic union of the whole of Palestine under the control of an authority with a majority of United Nations membership; second, political division of Palestine into two new states, Jewish and Arab; third, United Nations Trusteeship over Jerusalem and Bethlehem; and fourth, full safeguards for the holy places and especially for the Christian churches throughout the whole of Palestine. The only alternative plan suggested to the Assembly was to establish a unitary state under Arab domination with no adequate safeguards for the protection either of the Jewish people or of the Christian churches. This alternative was plainly inadmissible and was rejected by an overwhelming majority. The United Nations decision was reached by more than a two-thirds majority, the only dissentients being the Arab States and certain nations very closely associated with them. The decision was a just and impartial one and must not be lightly set aside.

The United Nations did not intermeddle in the Palestine matter. It intervened only after the United Kingdom Government had especially requested the United Nations Assembly to handle the matter as all previous efforts at reconciliation between the Arabs and Jews had entirely failed. At the United Nations the British Government did not itself propose any solution and announced it would accept the United Nations decision. In these circumstances Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand all supported the proposal finally adopted. After all that had occurred to throw the solution into the melting pot again may be very damaging to the authority of the United Nations. It has been contended that the 'enforcement' of the Assembly's decision is not possible. Had the great powers who supported the proposal at Lake Success, New York,

adhered firmly to it there probably would have been little difficulty. In any event under the Assembly's decision the New Jewish State and the new Arab State was each to be entitled to establish its own militia forces for the defence of the new territory and this decision clearly carried with it the right of Jews as well as Arabs to import arms and equipment for the purposes of defence. It is impossible to pass final judgment on the new proposal because no one has explained it as yet. I was Chairman of the Committee which worked assiduously to obtain a just solution. The Committee repeatedly modified its proposals at the suggestion of the Mandatory Power in order that the United Kingdom should be able to withdraw its forces after its long, its thankless, but on the whole, successful development of the Palestine area since it was captured from the Turks by the British and Australian forces in 1918.

In my opinion, the United Nations decision has been gradually undermined by intrigues directed against the Jewish people. It would be little short of a tragedy if the fundamental rights of selfgovernment were to be denied to both the Jews and Arabs as it is guaranteed to them under the Assembly decision just as religious freedom is also guaranteed to the Christian churches throughout Palestine. The only considerations that influenced the United Nations Assembly were those of justice and fair dealing to all concerned. It would be most disturbing if more considerations of power politics or expediency were allowed to destroy the decision. However, if a Special United Nations Assembly is called it is hardly likely to accept any plan which involves the annihilation of the previous decision unless new facts of overwhelming cogency are proved to exist.

I need hardly add that under the United Nations Charter the Security Council has no power whatever to overrule the recommendation of the Assembly."

*
* *
*

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date April 13, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Yesterday the General Council of the World Zionist Organization (the Zionist Actions Committee) issued a proclamation which will go down in history as the Jewish Declaration of Independence. The text of the Declaration, adopted unanimously, follows:

On this, the third day of Nissan, the General Council of the World Zionist Organization, its highest unit, announces to the civilized peoples of the world, to the representatives of the United Nations and to the Jews scattered throughout the world that it has been decided to set up an organ of supreme authority of our national independence in Palestine.

In pursuance of this purpose, we declare that we refuse to remain a minority dependent on the sufferance of others. The mandate is about to end. On May 15, His Majesty's Government will surrender to the United Nations the trust it received from the League of Nations twenty-seven years ago and which it has failed to fulfill. It departed from the spirit of the mandate and replaced it with the selfish purpose of furthering its Middle East interests.

As a result of this policy, our refugees were refused entry in the hour of their direst need. They were interned instead and condemned to lead a life of danger, humiliation and helplessness while the mandatory treated with our sworn enemies, the friends and allies of the Nazis. And while refusing entry to Jews striving desperately after a last refuge, they opened our frontiers to hordes of invaders come to make a mockery of the decision of the United Nations. And now the mandatory is proposing to destroy the very foundation of our existence and leave the country in utter chaos.

To prevent this we have resolved this day that the termination of the mandatory government of Palestine shall in fact mark the end of all foreign domination in this country. With the termination of this mandatory rule, a government of the Jewish state shall come into being.

In this hour we turn to the Arab citizens of the Jewish state and our Arab neighbors. We offer peace and friendship. We desire to build our state in common with the Arabs as equal citizens. Our freedom is their freedom. Their future and ours rest on common endeavor.

Sure in the justice of our cause, we are ready to give our all to its achievement and we call on the Jews of all lands, and especially in Palestine, to close their ranks for the carrying out of this, our sublime task. Assured in our faith, we appeal to all nations to grant us this right to our own salvation, and rest our trust in God, the Lord of Israel.

At the conclusion of the Actions Committee meeting, the following declaration was read:

Whereas, after twenty-seven years of an oppressive foreign regime that had received Palestine as a trust on behalf of the world to establish a national homeland for the Jews, that trust was not fulfilled;

Now, therefore, the Jewish nation will establish its own state and independence in its homeland.

The Jewish state to be established will be ruled by justice, freedom and equality for all inhabitants, regardless of race or creed.

We call upon the Arabs of Palestine and the neighboring states for an alliance of peace and cooperation. Together we shall build a state as citizens with equal rights and in mutual respect, for our freedom is your freedom.

Our lives are dedicated to defense, and the Lord of Israel will be our mainstay.

A five point political resolution which categorically rejects the recent proposal of the U.S. Government and which makes it clear that the Jewish people will have no part of the so-called trusteeship formula was also adopted, which reads as follows:

The General Council has learned with regret and astonishment of the attitude now adopted by the American representative in the Security Council concerning the U.N. decision on Palestine:

1. The Jewish people and the Yishuv of Palestine will oppose any proposal designed to prevent or postpone the establishment of a Jewish State.
2. We categorically reject any plan to set up a trusteeship regime for Palestine even for a short period of time. Trusteeship would necessarily entail the denial of the Jewish right to national independence and would leave Palestine under a foreign military regime.
3. The failure and disintegration of the Mandatory administration, the continuation of which was unanimously rejected by the United Nations, necessitates recognition without delay of the Jewish Provisional Council of Government by the U.N. Commission so that authority may be transferred to it as envisaged in the U.N. decision.
4. Upon termination of the Mandatory administration, and not later than May 16th, the Provisional Council of the Jewish Government will commence to function in cooperation with U.N. representatives then in Palestine. In the meantime we shall do the utmost to minimize the chaos created by the present government and shall maintain, so far as lies in

our power, the public services neglected by it.

5. The Jewish people extend the hand of peace to the Arab people. The Jewish State will be glad to cooperate with the neighboring Arab states and to enter into permanent treaty relations with them to strengthen world peace and to advance the development of all countries in the Near East.

The Actions Committee also ratified the military accord between the Haganah and the Irgun Zvai Leumi.

Another resolution, on Jerusalem, was adopted. It reads:

The General Council, representing the world Zionist Movement, calls the attention of the world and all religions to Jerusalem which is now under artillery fire. With the setting ablaze of the commercial center of Jerusalem, and looting it under the eyes of the Government which declared that it takes sole responsibility for law and order in Palestine, the Arabs began their siege of Jerusalem which has already lasted months without intervention by the Government or the military. The Arabs laid siege upon the Jewish quarters of the Old City and now have started to bombard with artillery various other quarters. In the spiritual capital of the world and the capital of the Mandatory in Palestine, Jews have for weeks been denied access to their holy places; have been prevented from bringing their sick to the hospital and to bury their dead in their ancient cemetery. The streets of Jerusalem are under constant fire from snipers and roads of supply are blocked in order to starve out the population. This happened not because the Mandatory hasn't enough power to deal with the situation, but because aggressors have been given free rein and the Government which is responsible for law and order in the city does not want to differentiate between the attacker and the attacked. In these circumstances the General Council feels obliged to convey to the entire civilized world its protest against abandoning Jerusalem, which, according to the resolution of the U.N. Assembly, is an international city, to murder, looting and destruction, in order to make the U.N. resolution null and void.

To all peoples and states in whom the name of Jerusalem inspires a feeling of holiness, we address our appeal and "ask for the peace of Jerusalem". We the representatives of the Jewish people, repeat the oath of our forefathers: "If I forget thee O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning".

The text of the economic resolution follows:

With a view to ensuring victory on the economic front and continuation of the peaceful task of rebuilding the Jewish Homeland, the Zionist General Council charges every Zionist individual everywhere, every Zionist body in the world, and calls on every Jewish organization wherever it may be, to mobilize without delay, and in the most effective manner, all its resources with a view to consolidating the economic front of Palestine; Assume maximum funds to ensure the speeding up of

supplies and equipment and everything required for defense and upbuilding of Palestine; Support immigration in every form and on a scale commensurate with the urgent needs of the Jewish masses requiring a home and the imperative requirements of Jewish man-power in Palestine for productive work and defense; Toil unceasingly to increase the national land possessions and implement the resettlement program; Further industrial enterprise and harness it for defense needs.

Victory depends upon the speed with which supplies and equipment are mobilizable. The General Council demands that every Zionist Jew in diaspora make the fullest possible contribution for the defense and establishment of the Jewish State and considers the adaptation of Palestine economy to war needs as the condition of ultimate victory.

HLS:RB

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council **Date** April 16, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

The enclosed memorandum with attachment was sent today to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

HLS:LD
Encs.

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees

Date April 16, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Attached is the Jewish Agency's reaction to the truce proposals at the Security Council, as delivered by Mr. Moshe Shertok yesterday.

Please read this statement carefully and try to have its major points stressed locally via editorials and letters to your newspapers. The unfairness of this proposed truce is reflected in the fact that Jewish immigrants who come to Palestine to settle are dealt with on the same basis as members of Arab bands, who come to Palestine to fight a decision of the United Nations.

HLS:RB

JEWISH AGENCY STATEMENT ON TRUCE PROPOSAL

The question of truce in Palestine was raised in the Security Council as part of a general proposal to set aside the plan adopted by the General Assembly for the future government of Palestine and to substitute for it an entirely different solution of the Palestine problem which the Jewish Agency found utterly unacceptable.

Actually the resolution calling for a truce was adopted by the Security Council in conjunction with the decision to convene a special session of the Assembly for the purpose of undertaking the revision of the plan. Thus the truce proposal in its very inception appeared to load the dice very heavily against Jewish interests.

Moreover, the wording of the resolution on truce, by referring merely to a truce between the Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine, ignored the major aspect of the present disturbed condition of the country, which is its invasion by armed forces from outside, organized by the governments of the neighboring Arab states, members of the United Nations and, in the case of Syria, member of the Security Council itself, and tolerated by the mandatory power.

The resolution of the Security Council called upon Arab and Jewish groups in Palestine to cease acts of violence. It addressed no admonition to the neighboring Arab states to discontinue the recruiting, training and arming of military contingents on their territories for armed intervention in Palestine, and the actual sending of such forces across their frontiers into Palestine. According to reliable press reports, further large-scale incursions of armed units and further importation of war materials from the neighboring countries into Palestine took place only within the last two or three days as the first installment of a new wave of invasion.

Nevertheless, the Jewish Agency declared itself willing to enter into a truce arrangement so that an end may be put to the bloodshed and destruction which is now ravaging the life of Palestine and claiming a mounting toll of victims. In its readiness to contribute its full share to the immediate restoration of peace in Palestine, the Jewish Agency was concerned to safeguard two main objectives:

First, that the truce should be an effective one and that it should not serve as a mere cover and protection for the preparation of further aggression. Secondly, that the conclusion and observance of the truce should not jeopardize legitimate long-term Jewish interests and should not prejudice the main issue which is now at stake.

Accordingly, the executive of the Jewish Agency in Palestine on April 4, 1948, adopted the following resolution regarding the truce proposal:

"The Jewish Agency welcomes the efforts of the Security Council to produce a cessation of hostilities in Palestine and to prevent a continuation of bloodshed in the future. The Jews of Palestine were forced to defend themselves against the series of attacks launched against them by the Arabs since December 1, 1947. Responsibility for the situation in Palestine falls also upon the mandatory power, which, despite its duties and its public declarations, failed to preserve law and order, failed to prevent the invasion of Palestine by organized Arab guerrilla bands from neighboring states, provided arms to Arab states which have been sending these guerrilla bands into Palestine and suffered these foreign invaders to establish themselves in military camps in Palestine, to disrupt communications in various parts of the country, and to besiege the city of Jerusalem.

"The Agency will gladly agree to a military truce which will put an effective and immediate end to all acts of violence, re-establish freedom of movement throughout the land on all roads and highways, restore free access to the holy places, withdraw all foreign troops and guerrillas, remove all units of the Trans-Jordan Arab Legion to Trans-Jordan, and prevent the incursion of such foreign forces and armed bands into Palestine in the future. To make such a truce effective, provision must be made for an international commission to supervise its execution. The Jewish Agency cannot rely in this respect upon the British authorities.

"It must be clearly understood that such a military truce shall not impede Jewish immigration and shall not affect preparations now in progress to assure essential public services, and for the establishment of an autonomous government in the area of the Jewish state immediately after the termination of the mandate on May 15."

This remains the attitude of the Jewish Agency.

The Jewish Agency was subsequently honored by an invitation from the distinguished President of the Security Council to attend a conference with a view to discussing the terms of the truce. There was only one brief formal meeting, attended by representatives of both the Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, after which the President of the Security Council held a series of informal talks with the representatives of those two bodies separately. In reply to the President's question as to the conditions under which we would be prepared to conclude a truce, we defined our attitude in the following terms:

Had the aggression against the Jews been confined to the Arabs of Palestine, we would have been ready for a truce unconditionally. In actual fact, in that eventuality, the question of a formal truce and of negotiations in that regard need not have arisen at all, as it would have been enough for the Arabs to cease fire in order to produce an immediate cessation of all armed reaction against them on the part of the Jews. But the military situation in Palestine has been completely transformed by the invasion of the country from outside.

The very presence on the soil of Palestine of foreign armed forces is a permanent act of aggression against the Jews. Unless these forces are removed and further armed incursions prevented, the truce would be a godsend to the aggressor, for under its cover and without the fear of any interference on the part of the Jews, the Arab command would be able to bring up further reinforcements, to occupy points of vantage, to perfect its military organization and to be ready for renewed assault under much more advantageous conditions.

We, therefore, have to put forward, as essential conditions of the truce that the armed units which were brought into Palestine from outside be withdrawn and that no further incursions should be tolerated. This is the summary of our position as explained by us to the President of the Council.

It would be observed that the two stipulations which we have made are purely military in character. They are intended to insure that the truce should be a real truce and not a sham. We have put forward no political conditions in connection with the truce. We gathered, however, from questions put to us by the President of the Security Council that political conditions had been put forward by the other side. These conditions we had to resist.

In the light of these general observations, I now propose, Mr. President, with your kind permission, to deal in some detail with the provisions regarding the truce included in the draft which was communicated to us yesterday and which now lies before the Security Council.

As a first general observation, I would point out that the scheme of the truce here outlined is founded on the assumption that the present mandatory administration in Palestine would discharge its functions under the mandate to preserve law and order. Quite apart from the question whether the present mandatory can be relied upon to do so in view of its recent record, it is clear that the truce arrangement proposed is thus by its very terms limited in its duration to the very short period which remains between now and May 15, on which date, according to the mandatory Government's decision which it announced to be irrevocable, the mandate is to be terminated. It is on this definite assumption that we now discuss the truce proposals.

I now address myself to the preamble of the draft resolution. Its third recital states "that the United Kingdom Government, so long as it remains the mandatory power, is responsible for the maintenance of peace and order in Palestine and should continue to take all steps to that end." We must, with all due respect to the Security Council, take exception not merely to the word "continue" which implies that the mandatory administration in Palestine has hitherto discharged its responsibilities in maintaining peace and order -- this is most lamentably not the case -- but to raise objection to the mandatory administration being given the sanction of the Security Council in advance for whatever step it might deem fit to take in the field of security.

The recent record of the mandatory administration makes it impossible for us to repose any trust in it in that regard and we would regard it as nothing short of calamitous if in the light of that record it were thus formally assured of full international support for whatever, in its own wisdom, it might do or leave undone. We would, therefore, urge that the recital should be limited to the recognition of the fact that the mandatory power is responsible for the maintenance of peace and order while the mandate lasts, and that the remaining part of the recital after the word "Palestine" should be deleted.

In regard to sub-paragraph (A) of paragraph 1, I would observe that the requirement that all activities of a military or para-military nature should cease is far too wide to be practicable. It may be interpreted as involving the discontinuation of all normal defense arrangements without which the Jewish population of Palestine will be seized by a feeling of insecurity which will be inimical to any truce. The Jewish Agency would therefore propose that the clause should read "cease all acts of violence, terrorism and sabotage."

A point of fundamental importance arises in connection with sub-paragraph (B), which contains the most important and welcome injunction against the bringing in to Palestine of armed bands or individuals from outside. With the injunction so formulated we are heartily in agreement, but what we cannot accept is that it should be extended to include "individuals capable of bearing arms," as this would affect Jewish immigration. We cannot possibly agree that Jewish immigrants into Palestine, whatever their age group or physical condition, should be put on the same footing with those elements who are now being sent into Palestine in violation of its land frontiers with the deliberate purpose of upsetting the peace of the country and committing acts of aggression against the Jews and against the authority of the United Nations.

These people have not a vestige of any legal or political right to be in Palestine. They come there with the avowed object of breaking the law and disturbing the peace. By contrast, Jewish immigrants come to Palestine by virtue of an internationally recognized right. Palestine is their home in which they come to live. The equation of the two categories is untenable. We would urge that the words "capable of bearing arms" be deleted and that instead the wording should be "armed or entering Palestine with the deliberate purpose of taking part in the fighting."

Coming to sub-paragraph C, I would point out that as worded it goes much too far in a most sweeping manner and may be interpreted as imposing during the truce period a world embargo on the acquisition of arms for future Jewish defense, while leaving it free to Arab states to accumulate any quantities of arms they may be able to purchase for future fighting in Palestine. We, therefore, urge that the sub-paragraph should read "refrain from importing weapons and war materials" and that all reference to acquisition should be deleted.

A point of most far-reaching significance arises in connection with sub-paragraph (D). Here each party is called upon to refrain pending further consideration of the future government of Palestine by the General Assembly "from any political activity which might prejudice the rights, claims or positions" of either community.

The mere introduction of a political subject into the question of a military truce is liable to vitiate the issue. And we should urge that this whole sub-paragraph be deleted. Should its deletion not commend itself to the Council, we would urge that it be amended. To begin with, the term "political activity" seems inappropriate. It is too loose and might be taken to refer to any meeting, any public address, any article in the press, any resolution.

We would suggest to substitute the word "action" for the words "political activities." Further, the question of prejudicing claims does not arise at all. My claim can be prejudiced only if I myself renounce or compromise it. It cannot possibly be prejudiced by whatever the other party does. We suggest, therefore, that the word "claims" should come out altogether. But the main difficulty arises in connection with the word "rights."

The position as far as rights are concerned cannot be left in its present vague form, liable to be interpreted at will. The Arab community may claim as its right the spreading of its dominion over the whole of Palestine and the subjugation of the Jewish community. Can the Jews be expected to refrain from any action which might prejudice that alleged right which they categorically deny and whose exercise would affect the very roots of their existence?

An objective, internationally recognized, criterion is here imperative. We therefore suggest that the paragraph should be amended to read "refrain, etc., from any action which might prejudice the rights or position of either community under the mandate and the resolution of the General Assembly." It cannot be a moot point in an organ of the United Nations that pending further consideration of the future government of Palestine by the General Assembly, the existing resolution of the General Assembly stands and is fully valid.

With regard to sub-paragraph (E), I must state that the mandatory administration, by its own record and by what we would describe as its sins of omission and commission, about both of which enough has been said in our previous statements to the Security Council, has forfeited its title to Jewish cooperation.

Nevertheless, in the interest of preservation of life we would be prepared to cooperate with the various organs of the present Palestine Government in certain spheres where we would regard cooperation as necessary and warranted, but there can be no question of our pledging general cooperation to the British administration of Palestine which has so manifestly disregarded and even acted contrary to its most basic responsibilities.

Sub-paragraph (F) seeks to secure the safety of the holy places. We submit that this is not enough. What has to be secured is also free access to all shrines and sanctuaries for those who have an established right to visit and worship at them. It is not enough, for instance, to lay down that the Wailing Wall might not be blown up. Free access to the Wailing Wall must be guaranteed for the Jews in accordance with the immemorial practice which has been internationally sanctioned.

I now come to Paragraph 2. Despite the unquestionable default of the British mandatory administration in the maintenance of law and order and its particularly lamentable and most alarming failure to prevent the invasion of Palestine by armed forces from outside, this paragraph proposes to charge that administration with the duty of supervising the execution of the truce provisions. The Jewish Agency cannot possibly agree that the mandatory administration is impartial in the present conflict and can properly be entrusted in this highly responsible task which requires complete objectivity. If the draft is left in its present form and no authoritative United Nations organ is set up to supervise and ensure the observance of the truce, we could consider that no adequate provision at all has been made in this record.

Paragraph 3 seeks to prevent further infiltration into Palestine of armed forces from outside. What I said in regard to the expression "capable of bearing arms" with reference to sub-paragraph (B) of Paragraph 1, applies equally to the same phraseology in Paragraph 3. The injunction itself against the mere entry into Palestine of armed bands, etc., does not go far enough.

We would urge that the Governments of states neighboring to Palestine should be called upon to prohibit in their territories the recruitment and preparation of forces for eventual incursions into Palestine. Moreover, there is no reference in the paragraph or anywhere else in the draft, to the fate of the foreign armed units already in Palestine. They all live in special camps, the location of which is common knowledge.

By omission, the draft resolution suffers them to remain where they are, or even to change their location and select better sites for their future activities. I have already stated that the mere presence of these bands on the soil of Palestine is regarded by the Jews as a permanent act of aggression. They are, indeed, a constant irritant and a perpetual source of danger. The absence of a clear provision to evacuate or at least to immobilize these bands, forces the Jewish Agency to reserve its position in this regard.

In conclusion, I would take the opportunity of emphasizing again that foreign invasion is the crux of the whole difficulty, and the fact that the mandatory government has allowed it to proceed unchecked mars its record more than anything else.

The Security Council has not so far deemed fit to place on record in clear and unequivocal terms the responsibility of either the Arab Governments or the Government of the United Kingdom for the present intolerable situation which has been created in and around Palestine by this continued process of invasion.

No doubt, encouraged by such inaction of the Security Council, the governments of the Arab League are now reliably reported to be preparing plans for the occupation of the whole area of Palestine by their armies, which would cross its frontiers from north, east and south immediately after the termination of the British mandate. To face this issue squarely is, I submit, the most urgent duty of the Security Council.

* * * *

National Headquarters
Jewish War Veterans
of the United States of America
50 West 77th Street
New York 24, New York

April 19th, 1948

HEADQUARTERS RELEASE NO. 56

IMPORTANT!

Palestine and Partition are in the hearts and on the minds of every Jewish War Veteran. The extreme gravity of the present crisis must be brought home to members of the Congress and the Senate in the most immediate and forceful terms.

The Policy Committee has approved a program, which, if successful, may bring our Government to revert to its original position on Palestine.

Simply stated, the program calls upon every Jew in America to ask each of his non-Jewish friends to "Write a Line for Palestine" to his respective Congressman and Senator. If Jews in every section of our country undertake this obligation immediately, Congress and the State Department should be flooded with individual letters from non-Jews, bringing home the vital fact that the partition of Palestine is not primarily a Jewish problem--that it is fundamentally a problem of basic justice and honor that concerns all Americans, regardless of religious belief. If each letter is different; if it is in the individual handwriting of a Congressman's non-Jewish constituent, the impact of the total effort--which should produce a flow of no less than 1,000,000 letters to Washington--cannot go unnoticed by even the most indifferent of public servants.

Your National Commander has appointed Comrade Burton Cooper of the Lt. Robert Bernstein Post, Brooklyn, National Chairman of the "Write a Line for Palestine" program. I now take this opportunity to appoint to the Committee for this project each Post Commander.

Program suggestions for putting this plan into effect on a scale designed to inspire the writing of letters by the million will reach you shortly. Meanwhile, the following preparatory steps should be initiated at once:

1. Post Commanders, as members of the National Committee of the "Write a Line for Palestine" program, should call an emergency muster for the purpose of informing all comrades of the basic facts of the project. These involve the widest possible contacts by all comrades with non-Jewish acquaintances--veteran and non-veteran alike--to request that they write individually to their Congressmen and Senators urging a return by our Government to its original position on partition.

2. Post Commanders should appoint immediately a special sub-committee to administer Post participation in the program. The name and address of the chairman of the sub-committee should be forwarded promptly to Comrade Cooper at National Headquarters so that maximum savings in time may be effected on all communications with respect to this program.

3. The sub-committee should take immediate steps to obtain the cooperation of all other Jewish organizations in your community so that the program may be given added impetus among non-veterans in your community.

4. The sub-committee should compile a list of all comrades who hold membership in the Legion, VFW and other general membership groups and insure that these comrades present the program to their fellow-veterans of non-Jewish faith with the least possible delay.

SPEED IN GETTING THIS PROGRAM UNDER WAY IS THE FIRST ESSENTIAL. That is why this release is being held to a minimum. That is why all JWV units are being urged to make this program the subject of an immediate emergency muster.

JULIUS KLEIN
NATIONAL COMMANDER

DIST:
All Posts
All Counties
Departments
NEC members

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

MEMORANDUM

To Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees **Date** April 20, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Enclosed is an analysis of the trusteeship proposal which the United States is reportedly preparing to present to the UN General Assembly. The final form which the United States plan will take is not known, but it will in all likelihood be similar to the proposal which was published last week.

In order to understand what is involved in the trusteeship proposal, you should read the attached memorandum carefully. You will find that it includes good material for editorials, articles, radio speeches, etc. It can be most useful in your public relations activities.

Regards.

HLS:RB

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council **Date** April 20, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

The enclosed memorandum with attachment was sent today
to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees.

HLS:RB
Enc.

THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

OBSERVATIONS ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES REGARDING A TEMPORARY TRUSTEESHIP
FOR PALESTINE FORMULATED BY THE UNITED STATES (APRIL 5, 1948)

In discussing the United States proposal for a temporary trusteeship, it is necessary to examine:

- A. The general applicability of the trusteeship system to Palestine;
- B. The particular circumstances in which it is proposed to institute a trusteeship at this time;
- C. The specific provisions for temporary trusteeship contained in the document submitted by the United States to other members of the Security Council on April 5, 1948.

A. THE APPLICABILITY OF TRUSTEESHIP TO PALESTINE

1. It may be assumed that the authors of the Charter did not draft its trusteeship provisions with the purpose of prolonging foreign rule indefinitely over peoples inspired by a sense of maturity and an urgent desire for national freedom. Nor does international opinion favor further tutelage for Palestine.

2. It is significant that during the second regular session of the General Assembly not a single voice was raised in favor of a solution involving any postponement of independence. In its report to the General Assembly the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine unanimously declared:

- "a) Although sharply divided by political issues the peoples of Palestine are sufficiently advanced to govern themselves independently.
- b) The Arab and Jewish peoples after more than a quarter of a century of tutelage under the Mandate both seek a means of effective expression for their national aspirations.
- c) It is highly unlikely that any arrangement which would fail to envisage independence at a reasonably early day would find the slightest welcome among either Arabs or Jews."*

None of these propositions are open to question. They are endorsed by all available experience and judgment.

3. The trusteeship system is designed either for the government of territories whose inhabitants are not yet sufficiently advanced to operate self-governing institutions or for strategic areas. To apply it to Palestine is thus to pervert its true function and to involve the system itself in the discredit arising from inevitable disorder. The movement to set aside the Resolution of the General Assembly has already weakened its moral authority, and has revealed the Security Council as a body unable either to secure Charter observance or to resist aggression. It is now proposed to embroil the Trusteeship Council in an effort to subject mature populations, placed by the General Assembly on the threshold of statehood, to outside rule of indefinite duration. Thus the prestige of the United Nations as a whole and the efficacy of its principal organs are likely to be impaired through this attempt to replace a solution involving independence by a solution involving tutelage, in a territory where the principles and procedures of trusteeship appear to have no relevance at all.

4. Moreover, the maturity of the population is not the only reason why the trusteeship provisions of the Charter are incongruous in the context of a Palestine settlement. The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, as defined in Article 76 of the Charter are "to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of trust territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence." Thus the trusteeship provisions of the Charter have no reference to the unique position of Palestine in history and law as a territory in which the interests of the present inhabitants are not the sole or even the predominant object of international concern. In contradistinction to other Mandates in neighboring countries, the Palestine Mandate acknowledged rights in Palestine not only for the country's

(*) Report of the United Nations Special Committee, Vol. 1, p. 43.

inhabitants, but also for the Jewish people throughout the world. Indeed it has been established that "unquestionably the primary purpose of the Mandate as expressed in the preamble and its articles is the establishment of the Jewish National Home." (*) Under Article 80 of the Charter, Jewish rights derived from the Mandate were preserved until such time as the Mandate was replaced by a new agreement. Later the General Assembly confirmed the validity of those rights and gave them formal expression through the establishment of a Jewish State. Thus during three decades the special rights and interests of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine have three times been upheld through successive international instruments. No legal competence exists anywhere by which these rights can be annulled. It is quite inadmissible to brush them aside by assimilating Palestine to a political system in which they have no place. Yet such is the effect of basing the government of Palestine on the trusteeship provisions of the Charter which acknowledge nothing but the interests of the country's present inhabitants as the guiding principle of administration.

5. The sui generis character of Palestine arising from its unique historical associations and its special relation to the purposes of Jewish national rehabilitation and freedom has been acknowledged on innumerable occasions by the United States through Presidential and Congressional statements. Indeed, its acceptance forms the cornerstone of the United States policy on Palestine as hitherto expressed.

6. This distinction between Palestine and those neighboring countries in which the advancement of the inhabitants was the paramount consideration is completely obscured if Palestine is torn out of its legal and historical context and forced into the inappropriate framework of the trusteeship system. The special relation of Palestine to the Jewish people formally disappears if Palestine comes under the proposed trusteeship. But it will not disappear in actual fact. Palestine cannot be forced by an act of will to resemble Togoland or the Cameroons or the Pacific Islands, nor can it possibly respond to the processes and principles of government designed for those territories. The trusteeship provisions do not fit -- and were never intended to fit -- the most distinctive historical, cultural or ethnic realities affecting Palestine.

B. CIRCUMSTANCES AFFECTING TRUSTEESHIP TODAY

7. Palestine has been governed under a form of trusteeship (i.e. the British Mandate) for twenty-six years. Recently the conditions under which the British Mandate operated proved so intolerable to Jews, Arabs, British and American public opinion and the community of nations as a whole that the replacement of the Mandate by a form of immediate independence became the only common aspiration of all the parties concerned. The prospects of the new trusteeship cannot be unaffected by the discredit and unworkability of the old.

8. Those prospects would be particularly tragic if the trusteeship were built on or around British participation. British policy in the Near East is firmly wedded to the alliance with the Arab League, and has for that reason been sharply directed against those fundamental Jewish interests which the General Assembly has recently approved. It follows that any prolongation of British rule must involve a resumption of the "squalid war" whose disastrous effects forced the Palestine issue upon the attention of the United Nations. The war will be all the more squalid because both British and Jewish opinion have been recently buoyed up by the hope of imminent separation. The Jews would face British repression in the aftermath of a historic moment in which their independence was

(*) Report of the Royal Commission on Palestine, pp. 38-39.

solemnly promised. The British Government, if it at all complied with American pressure in this regard, would have to fight its own public for the "right" to remain in Palestine and sustain a burden which the British people passionately longs to relinquish. The Arabs would also be deprived of substantial advantage, however anti-Jewish the conditions of the trusteeship agreement might be. Under partition they were to obtain independence in a large part of the country; under trusteeship they obtain no independence at all. Even if there is Arab acquiescence in trusteeship on immediate tactical grounds, it must, by the very logic of Arab national sentiment be shortlived.

9. In this atmosphere it would be an irresponsible fantasy to imagine a trusteeship government establishing genuine authority throughout the country by May 15. Moreover the lesson that a General Assembly Resolution can be revised by violence will further undermine the moral force of the new regime. If the General Assembly accepts a trusteeship policy in response to force, the Trusteeship Council will hardly come with increased authority to the task of administering an unwilling and restive population, to whom independence was promised but four months ago.

10. Although the prospects of disorder are greatest if the present mandatory power is pressed, against its judgment, to prolong its tenure they are formidable enough irrespective of the identity of the trustee. The Jews will regard the trusteeship, to whomever it may be entrusted, as robbing them of their independence to which they had looked forward poignantly after a quest of many centuries. The Arabs will find themselves saddled with a trustee after three decades of national struggle in the Near East against the maintenance of western control.

11. It is quite unrealistic to plan a new trusteeship regime on a clean slate, without regard to the effect of November 29 or the implications of May 15. The situation in Palestine has been radically transformed since November 29th as a result of the General Assembly's Resolution; and the transformation is entirely hostile to the prospects of trusteeship. The turn of events in the past four months has had both a psychological and a practical effect. The United Nations having recognized the Jews of Palestine in November as a nation fit for imminent independence, is now being asked to regard them in April as a minority within the population of a non self-government territory to be held in tutelage for a period of "indefinite duration." The Jews themselves however are unlikely to adapt their thinking to this violent reversal. Nothing will ever divest November 29 of its significance as a momentous day in their history. Henceforward they will never again think in any other political idiom but that of national sovereignty; and the trusteeship regime will be separated from the Jews by a widening gulf of mental and spiritual distrust. The Arabs too may awaken early to their loss of an objective which they had at least partially gained by the award of statehood in a part of Palestine on November 29.

12. But the trustee will not merely be called upon to swim against every current of political sentiment in the country. He will be faced with a process of virtual partition which has gathered such momentum in recent weeks that not even considerable armed force could now arrest it. This process has for long been inherent in the political and social realities of Palestine. Ten years ago the Royal Commission was already able to report that: "to maintain that Palestinian citizenship has any moral meaning is a mischievous pretence. Neither Arab nor Jew has any sense of service to a single State... There is little moral value in maintaining the political unity of Palestine at the cost of perpetual hatred." UNSCOP and the General Assembly merely recognized and expressed this political separation. They did not create it. Palestine is inhabited by two peoples. They have separate

political aspirations, though common economic interests. The scheme of partition with economic union is such a full response to these basic realities that having once begun to operate it has inevitably crystallized very quickly into the receptive framework of Palestinian life.

13. The disintegration of the Mandatory regime since November 29th has given a spectacular impetus to this partition tendency, both in its functional and its territorial aspects. As the Mandatory relinquishes an essential governmental service in the Jewish area, the Jews begin to operate it. As the Mandatory virtually evacuates a certain zone, Jewish authority asserts itself. There are large populated areas of the country, both Jewish and Arab, in which the writ of the central administration does not run at all. The degree to which this process had developed can be appreciated from the fact that the Jews themselves exercise full responsibility in their community for the most vital governmental function --- that of defense. Meanwhile an existing tendency of Jewish autonomy has been accentuated in every field. In the coming days and weeks the Mandatory's disintegration will leave a widening vacuum in food supplies, communications, postal and telegraphic services, currency, police, etc., etc. The Jews, anticipating chaos, have worked out plans and prepared machinery to assure continuity and order in the daily routine of life. The entire Jewish population reposes its trust and obedience not in any central government of the entire country, but in its own authorities, on the understanding that they will set up an administration for the Jewish State area. The provisional Jewish authorities are already endowed with that effective internal recognition which is the most vital test of independent nationhood.

14. In the Arab community a similar though less conscious or centralized process has taken place. In the central part of the country the invading forces of the Arab League under Fawzi al Kawukji exercise full administrative as well as military control. In other areas the local municipalities are becoming increasingly independent of the central government. The incoming trustee will thus find the country already organized into independent compartments of control and allegiance. The incentive of November 29th and the logic of May 15th, both drawing their force from the facts of the situation, have done their work. Palestine is moving forward inexorably towards Partition in a pattern of growing decentralization.

15. In this situation, the United States proposal comes on the scene in an attempt to galvanize a dying mandate into life or to build a new trusteeship on the wreckage of the old. There is no precedent for such a tour de force. All other trusteeships have arisen as a smooth continuation of mandates previously held under conditions of unity and peace. To impose foreign rule by newly-arrived administrators over these two autonomous societies is technically far-fetched; and to create a new focus of authority and allegiance to which both Jews and Arabs will give the slightest attention is beyond human resource. The only United Nations authority which might play a constructive role in the new pattern of life would be one which is guided and animated by the logic of this spontaneous partition and by a desire to facilitate it.

16. It is because the very concept of trusteeship is so flagrantly out of accord with the general principles and current realities of the Palestine situation that no improvement of the United States proposals can make them a useful starting point in the quest for a political settlement. With this reservation, however, it may be useful to comment on the fifteen general principles now before us.

C. COMMENT ON UNITED STATES PRINCIPLES FOR TEMPORARY TRUSTEESHIP

Comment on Paragraph 1 (Non-prejudice of Rights)

There is no device whereby a temporary trusteeship can fail to "prejudice the rights, claims or position of the parties concerned"; nor can the trusteeship fail to determine "the character of the eventual political settlement." The rights of all parties are affected by the very institution of a trusteeship at this time. For example, the General Assembly recognized the Jewish claim to statehood, conferred certain rights on the basis of that claim, and envisaged a position of full sovereignty by October 1. Under the new proposal, October 1 will find the Jews of Palestine not as a State within fixed frontiers, but as a minority within the Arab population and under outside rule. The theory that such a spectacular change from imminent independence to indefinite subjection leaves the "rights, claims and position" of the Jews unprejudiced is untenable. "The character of the eventual political settlement" is also bound to be affected at every turn by the operation of the trusteeship regime. Even if there is substantial Jewish immigration and land settlement the prospects of Jewish statehood will still be prejudiced by postponement. If there is not, the growth of Arab population will cause a proportional weakening of the Jewish position and adversely affect Jewish prospects when "the eventual political settlement" is determined. There can be no stand-still in a process of life; each party is either becoming relatively stronger or weaker at every moment. The effect of this paragraph is merely to define the effects of the trusteeship proposal in misleading terms. The constitutional provisions of Paragraph 6 are sufficient to show how drastically Jewish rights are prejudiced by this plan.

Comment on Paragraphs 2 and 15 (Duration of Trusteeship)

The Trusteeship is defined in paragraph 1 as "temporary" and in paragraph 2 as of "indefinite duration". Since according to paragraph 15 it can only be terminated by Arab-Jewish agreement, the word "permanent" would perhaps give a more realistic view of its duration. It is a fact that 25 years of tutelage have failed to produce agreement. On November 26, 1947 the representative of the Mandatory Power stated in the General Assembly:

"After years of strenuous but unavailing effort, His Majesty's Government have reached the conclusion that they are not able to bring about a settlement in Palestine based upon the consent of both Arabs and Jews, and that the Mandate is no longer workable."

On the same occasion the representative of the United States declared:

"No plan has ever been presented either here or in any other place which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No such plan has ever been presented and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented."

It is not a mere coincidence that agreement has not emerged from a long period of trusteeship. The very fact that a third party stood between Jews and Arabs while the respective limits of Arab and Jewish independence were not finally determined, created the conditions of perpetual discord. It is an axiom of the Palestine question that political uncertainty is the enemy of Arab-Jewish agreement. The Arabs will seek no agreement until they are confronted with the Jews as a permanent and equal factor with which they have to come to terms. The Jews will accept no position of subjection to the Arabs and will continually press on

towards independence. In abandoning a settlement which gave partial satisfaction to the desire of each party for independence the United States has thus set back the clock of Arab-Jewish agreement. The termination of the trusteeship is made dependent on conditions which can never mature as long as trusteeship lasts. The unpopularity of trusteeship will be greatly increased in both communities by the fact that it is of indefinite duration with no visible end in view. This has an obvious bearing on the question of enforcement.

Comment on Paragraph 4 (Jerusalem as Analogy)

The statute of Jerusalem was not bound in any way by the trusteeship provisions of the Charter. Its authors had complete freedom to determine its conditions according to the realities which confronted them. Because it was not based on the trusteeship provisions of the Charter, the Statute did not have to be initiated by the Mandatory Power. It is difficult to see how the authors of a trusteeship agreement, bound as they are by the Charter's specific procedures and requirements, can be free to embody at will the features of the Jerusalem Statute. Nor is it clear how a trusteeship agreement can legally be initiated by the United States. This casual reference to the Statute of Jerusalem does not make it clear whether or not the Statute would remain in force if a trusteeship agreement were recommended by the General Assembly for the country as a whole. The Statute of Jerusalem in any case rests on the exceptional basis that the city's population is called upon to let the city's universal association have precedence over its civic and secular interests. This unique arrangement obviously provides no precedent or justification for establishing permanent foreign rule over the country as a whole.

Comment on Paragraphs 3, 5 and 6 (Constitution)

These paragraphs contain the constitutional provisions of the projected trusteeship. It is proposed that a new regime called the Government of Palestine should be established forthwith in order to assume the "administrative, legislative and judicial powers" which have either become inoperative during the mandatory's disintegration, or were to have devolved automatically upon Jewish and Arab authorities. The Government is to act in accordance with the principles of Trusteeship as defined in the Charter, and with instructions from the Trusteeship Council which must in the nature of things be in conformity with those principles. This may amount to an injunction to the Government to ignore or suppress the rights of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine, since these are not covered explicitly or implicitly in any of the Articles dealing with the Trusteeship system.

The provision for a "democratically elected legislature" is the gravest feature of the entire proposal, and raises disquieting questions as to its intentions. This provision appears to involve the application of majority rule to Palestine as a whole, and to ignore the dual character of its national composition. The most widely accepted principle in the Palestine question is the irrelevance of formal democracy, based on majority domination, to a country composed of two separate nations which do not hold the ends of life in common or agree on the central purposes of the state. In such conditions, to apply democracy to the population as a whole is to deny it to the Jews entirely, by subjecting them to minority status. The essence of the Palestine question lies in the need to apply self-determination not to a fictitious single entity, but to the two separate groups, so that each is free and sovereign within the widest limits compatible with the freedom and sovereignty of the other. The Royal Commission, the Permanent Mandates Commission, the Anglo-American Committee, UNSCOP, and the General Assembly have all emphatically rejected the application of a

unitary majority principle to the constitution of Palestine. Its revival here illustrates the degree to which these proposals are cut adrift from all the accumulated lessons of history and experience.

The position would be in no way improved if a Chamber based on parity were set up alongside the Chamber based on "democracy" with a virtual power of veto. The objectives most essential to the Jews all require authority for positive action (i.e. immigration, development, settlement). If one Chamber obstructs these measures and the other reaches deadlock, the result is that those measures are not authorized. The noes have it. Deadlock and a negative decision are identical with reference to any scheme of positive action. The constitutional provisions of this proposal are thus a complete surrender to the Arab desire to block all change and development required in the Jewish interest.

The provision that the Governor-General may have "to legislate by order" in the almost certain contingency that the "legislature could not be assembled" emphasizes the dictatorial implications of this proposal. A Governor-General placed between the opposing pressures of Jews and Arabs and therefore tending to yield to the strongest pressure and to the status quo, is an exact replica of the conditions which led the Mandate to chaos and disorder.

Comment on Paragraph 7 (Enforcement)

Since neither the Arab nor the Jewish community seems inclined to help impose a trusteeship upon itself, it is unlikely that the Governor-General will be able to rely on locally recruited forces. It is clear therefore that a heavy and permanent burden of enforcement will fall upon such member States as may voluntarily adhere to the protocol envisaged for this purpose. This burden will probably not be less than that which the Mandatory Power has been called upon to bear in circumstances very similar to those arising from this trusteeship proposal. It will certainly be a heavier burden than that involved in the implementation of the General Assembly's Resolution, which had elements of self-enforcement through its militia provisions. Moreover, enforcement of the partition resolution would only have been necessary until such time as the two States were firmly established and functioning. In the trusteeship proposal, on the other hand, there is no end of enforcement in sight. The question arises whether member States who were unwilling to use their forces to establish independence for Jews and Arabs within authoritatively defined limits will now commit their forces to military rule "of indefinite duration" for the purpose of suppressing aspirations for independence recently approved by the United Nations. The scope and spirit of this enforcement task are an ironical commentary on the plea that partition had to be set aside because it involved enforcement.

The problem of enforcement will be most acute in the months immediately following May 15. The whole basis for this plan therefore collapses unless it can be shown capable of producing adequate forces by that date. The protocol will presumably be open for the adherence of member States only when the General Assembly has accepted the principle of a trusteeship regime. Even then it is not clear whether the General Assembly or the Trusteeship Council will automatically accept the services of any member States which choose to volunteer for participation in enforcement. It is conceivable, for instance, that the Arab States may be the only states to adhere to the protocol. If their adherence were accepted, the trusteeship would merely legalize the existing Arab invasion of Palestine and future invasions contemplated.

It would be extravagantly sanguine to expect that the procedure laid down in Paragraph 7 will lead to the recruitment and dispatch of forces within a

matter of weeks. It is significant that no agreement between member States on the use of armed forces in accordance with Article 43 has been reached during three years of continuous negotiations. It is a legitimate conclusion that this plan contains no enforcement provisions likely to take effect from the date of the termination of Mandate.

Comment on Paragraph 8 (Existing Arrangements)

The existing arrangements in Palestine insofar as they relate to central governmental machinery are rapidly falling apart; and the only orderly processes of government on May 15 may well be those organized by the Jewish State. The main problem facing the Government of Palestine, even on the remote assumption that it could be called into existence by May 15, would be that of recapturing the allegiance of the population from the Jewish and Arab authorities which now command it.

Comment on Paragraph 9 (Immigration and Land Settlement)

The association of the Arab community in the task of fixing a basis for Jewish immigration and land purchase is a grave prejudice to the existing claims, rights and position of the Jews. Under the Mandate there was a positive injunction to facilitate Jewish immigration and encourage close settlement by Jews on the land, irrespective of Arab political consent. Under the General Assembly's Resolution full control of immigration and land settlement was conferred upon the Jewish Provisional Council of Government for the area under its jurisdiction. In other words there is an established international practice which denies any formal validity to the Arab desire to obstruct Jewish immigration.

The provisions envisaged for immigration and land purchase are not specified in this proposal. The scheme as a whole, however, would seem to determine that those provisions will be meagre. In the first place, the constitutional provisions of paragraph 6 give predominance to the Arabs in all legislative and consultative processes; and this alone must operate against the authorization of any substantial immigration or land purchase by Jews. In the second place, mere formal provisions for immigration can have no real effect unless there is a regime in Palestine which is able to so shape economic and development policies as to create conditions in which mass immigration can be absorbed. Immigration is encouraged not by the mere issue of permits, but by the opening up of economic opportunities and facilities. This fact explains the inseparable connection between the concepts of Jewish statehood and Jewish immigration. Recent Palestinian history proves that a government torn indecisively between two pressures, the one claiming and the other opposing immigration, cannot be the agent of a progressive development policy. Still less can conditions favourable to immigration be created by a legislature whose majority is concerned to make immigration impossible. Experience has conclusively proved to the Jews that the only effective guarantee of continued and substantial Jewish immigration lies in the placing of immigration and development policies under Jewish control.

Comment on Paragraph 10 (Standard of Living)

The effort to peg down Palestine's standard of living and public services to that "which can be supported by the resources of Palestine" is particularly remarkable at a time when sixteen countries in Europe have been declared as unable to subsist on their own resources. Palestine's budgetary independence and relatively high standard of living derive largely from the interest of world Jewry in the development of an expanding society in Palestine. The whole trend of the present proposal is to withdraw recognition of that interest and thereby impoverish

the resources of Palestine, arrest its development and force down its living standards.

Comment on Paragraph 14 (Immunity of Holy Places)

The guarantees contained in the General Assembly's Resolution for the protection of the Holy Places and the assurance of free access are now likely to be violated through the failure of the United Nations to assume its responsibilities in Jerusalem. It would be more fruitful at this stage to provide for the effective carrying out of those guarantees than merely to repeat them in the texts of a new agreement.

*
* *
*

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

MEMORANDUM

To Members of American Zionist Emergency Council **Date** April 22, 1948

From Harry L. Shapiro

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the statement of Sir Carl Berendsen, delegate of New Zealand, before the Political and Security Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, April 20, 1948 which was sent to the Chairmen of Local Emergency Committees throughout the country.

HLS:CLD

Enc..

STATEMENT OF SIR CARL BERENDSEN, DELEGATE OF NEW ZEALAND,
BEFORE THE POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS, APRIL 20, 1948

It is a sombre, indeed a tragic, occasion which has led to this meeting, and it is a heavy responsibility that falls upon each and every delegate in this Chamber. The occasion calls for the most complete integrity of thought and action, and it is clearly the duty, as well as the right, of every Government represented here to express its thoughts on the incredible and shocking situation that has developed. It is a time for plain speaking, and I am sure that none of my colleagues will take offence if I do, in fact speak plainly.

The problem with which the Assembly was called upon to deal last November was admitted by all to be most difficult and intractable. The situation as it presented itself then was the cumulative result of a long series of events stemming perhaps from the dim ages of the past, but for most practical purposes originating in the Balfour Declaration of 1917. That document like -- most regrettably like -- the vast majority of international documents, is not notable for clarity or definition. All, I think, agree that it is open to more than one construction, and the exact intent of its meaning has been a matter of repeated and lengthy debate and discussion in the ensuing years. Nor indeed have those portions of its intent, which are common ground to all, been free from dissent from its very inception. I have no intention of entering into any analysis of what the Balfour Declaration did mean or what was the ethical basis even for that portion of its intent upon which all agree, as a minimum, it must mean. Even that aspect is perhaps beside the point. The Mandate over Palestine was entrusted to the United Kingdom -- with the definite approval of many of those nations represented here -- and for a very lengthy period the British have been administering that territory with what any impartial observer must agree has been a commendable degree of material success, and certainly at all times with the highest motives and intentions. But it may well have been that throughout the whole of that period they have been attempting to reconcile the irreconcilable, that the conflicting rights and interests in that Holy but unhappy land -- of the Arabs on the one side and the Jews on the other -- were not at any time capable of acceptable compromise. From time to time blood has been shed in the course of this long and acrimonious dispute, and I would remind my colleagues of what I fear many of them are too often inclined to forget, that on very many occasions the blood that has been spilt has been the blood, not of the two principal contestants in this unhappy quarrel, but British blood, the blood of those who were, as trustees for humanity, endeavouring to carry out a thankless and perhaps impossible task. Finally, the British decided that they could no longer bear this burden, that the problem had become, if it had not always been, an international problem, that not only was it unfair that the burden and the odium of this task should fall upon the British alone while others at all times have felt free to offer advice and criticism from the sidelines without, of course, shouldering any portion of the responsibility for themselves, but also because of this factor, that the UK, having devoted its all to the prosecution of that great war for liberty, justice, peace and order which has just concluded, had found itself as the result, as the direct result, of its efforts during that conflict in a position of great difficulty. I think no one will disagree that Britain's temporary weakness -- because, believe me, it is temporary only -- and the sacrifices in blood, in treasure and in repute that she has been called upon to make in this thankless and perhaps impossible

task, proved to be too much and the United Kingdom, as you know, last year announced its intention of relinquishing the mandate and laying the whole matter before the United Nations where, as a world problem, it unquestionably belongs.

I am not one of those who believe that the UK has deserved the criticism it has received for its administration of the Mandate. I am not about to suggest that every step that the British have taken on the matter in Palestine has been wise or well-considered. But I do assert that what they have done from the inception of the Mandate until they were forced to the conclusion that the problem was beyond them, and laid the question before the United Nations, they have done with the highest motives, and that no other state represented here, even had it been willing (which it was not) to accept these obligations, would, or indeed could, have done any better in the circumstances as they existed.

But last year Britain agreed that Britain had failed, and the United Nations, in Special Assembly, undertook the responsibility of finding a solution. You all know what happened. After very lengthy debate a Special Committee of the Assembly was sent to Palestine. It conducted exhaustive enquiries and on its return produced a report to the Assembly which I have no hesitation in characterising as a model of moderate and constructive thought.

The views of this Special Committee -- and other views -- were considered at very great length at the General Assembly meeting in September, and after most careful consideration, and after hearing the representatives of both parties principally concerned in this tragic conflict of rights, the Assembly decided, by the requisite majority of two-thirds, that the course which appeared to offer the best chance of success in the circumstances was that of partition with economic union. Let me repeat that this was decided after the most lengthy and anxious consideration, and let me repeat that it was agreed to, that it was supported, by the requisite majority of the members of this body. Allow me to read the list of those delegations who placed themselves affirmatively on record as supporting the proposal for partition with economic union. They were as follows:

Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Byelorussia, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Liberia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Sweden, the Ukraine, South Africa, the Soviet Union, the United States, Uruguay and Venezuela.

That, then, was the considered decision in November last, the considered decision of the Town Meeting of the World, the expression of the conscience of this forum of the nations of the world, in a most earnest effort to solve this tragic problem.

Now I do not think that any delegation which voted in favor of this decision felt that partition was a perfect solution. I think most people were of the opinion that the problem was susceptible of no perfect solution, that any decision at all must inevitably be the cause of injustice and hardship to very many thousands of worthy people, and that the best that could be done, and the least that should be done, was to decide upon that solution which offered the least injustice, the least departure from principle and the least practical difficulties in the circumstances as they had arisen during the course of the past thirty years.

The New Zealand Government believed then that partition was the best solution, and it believes the same thing today. It is our view that the Assembly decided to do the right thing in the wrong way, and I am not expressing that view only now, with the all the advantages of hind sight. On behalf of my delegation and

my Government, I expressed the same view when the matter was being considered last November, and if my colleagues will do me the honor of recollecting or reading what I said then, they will find that throughout the whole course of the discussion the New Zealand delegation took the view that while partition with economic union was the best course to adopt, nevertheless if the Assembly assumed the right -- as we believed it should -- to divide that country into a Jewish state and an Arab state, the Assembly must at the same time assume the duty of ensuring an orderly and peaceful implementation of that decision. And up to the very last moment I expressed New Zealand's grave and anxious apprehensions as to the efficacy of partition without enforcement and called -- unhappily without avail -- on the members of the United Nations and particularly the Great Powers, to face this question of enforcement. Up to the very last moment. I asked whether the Assembly was prepared to gamble with the lives of innocent people in Palestine. The appeal fell on deaf ears. You were prepared so to gamble; we did gamble and we lost. But we do not pay. You know today who is paying. The gambler's loss is being paid by the people of Palestine; it is being paid in part by British boys dying at their post of duty, but for a much greater part it is being paid, and will continue to be paid, by the people of Palestine, be they innocent or guilty, be they Arab or Jew. And the situation that has arisen today, incredible and disgraceful to us as it is, was, to any one who faced the facts and who was not deaf and blind, as clear and as obvious and as inevitable as night following day. They were many in November who professed to believe -- they will allow me to doubt whether they did believe -- that enforcement would not be necessary. That is an order of simplicity which is quite beyond my comprehension, and if there were such as did in fact believe this to be a possibility then they must certainly have paid no heed to the protests and warnings of our Arab colleagues. Nobody who heard these debates as I have heard them could fail to be impressed with the warmth and the emotion and the conviction with which the representatives of the Arab states expounded their cause and warned the Assembly of the consequences. Nobody could have failed to realize the justice of much of what the Arabs represented to us. Nobody doubted that whatever decision was arrived at in connection with the Palestinian problem it would inevitably bring some degree of hardship, some degree of injustice to a substantial number of people. The problem, I repeat, was susceptible of no perfect solution. But if there were in this room any who believed that the partition of Palestine could be accomplished peacefully and with good will on all sides and without enforcement, then I must say that that is a degree of naivete which did them little credit. But of course, in human affairs, there is always an inclination to hope, which in turn leads to a belief, that all will be well. Quite often it is well, but it is seldom well unless somebody is working hard and with careful forethought to ensure that it is so. And the Assembly's solution could have been effective had we taken the necessary steps to ensure that it was.

There were others last November who, apprehensive, and justly apprehensive, that this great, and it was hoped, final attempt, to solve the Palestinian problem could not be carried out without force, were nevertheless content to believe that that force had in fact been provided. Those who answered New Zealand's repeated appeals for means of implementation told us of two sources of enforcement power which, by implication, they suggested were adequate. We were told in the first place that there was to be an Arab militia and a Jewish militia and that these two militias would be able to keep order. Well, that again shows an order of simplicity which is quite beyond my comprehension, and I pass that over for what it is worth. And finally, we were told that there was always the Security Council which would see to enforcement. Well, all that one needs to say in this connection is to ask delegates to regard the situation as it exists today and the steps that the Security Council has found itself able to take.

I repeat that the Assembly in its November decision did the right thing, but by reason of its failure to provide for implementation, it did the right thing in the wrong way, and because of our error then, as the result of our error then, we have the situation today. The result of our error is death, bloodshed, murder, outrage and agony in Palestine. The result of our error then is a grave risk that the Assembly of the United Nations, is in serious and humiliating danger of losing the public confidence upon which its authority in the last resort depends. We have today, therefore, an additional problem, not only how to do justice to both Jew and Arab, but how to avoid wrecking the authority and the influence of the Assembly. I say to you that neither this organization nor indeed any of its members can hope to give to the world the lead of which the world is so sorely in need, unless that lead is steady and consistent, unless the course that is set yesterday is the course that is followed steadily today and tomorrow. The alternative is inevitable confusion and dismay.

I am far from suggesting that where circumstances have altered policies must remain immutable, but the submission of the New Zealand delegation is this, that if partition with economic union was right in November, it is right today, and indeed, I have heard no logical suggestion to the contrary. The circumstances have not changed in the slightest. The only new factor that has arisen in respect of Palestine since the matter was so carefully considered and decided in November is a detestable series of murders and outrages in Palestine. And by both sides, for there is no one who can defend or explain or excuse the violence for which it seems clear certain sections of the Jewish community have been responsible, any more than it is possible to defend or explain or excuse the violence for which certain sections of the Arab community have been responsible. Both call for the strongest censure, the utmost detestation; both call for repression by lawful force. And if an attempt is made, as in logic no doubt it can be made to draw a distinction between Jewish activities as intended on the whole to support the decision of the United Nations in favor of partition, while the activities on the side of the Arabs are intended to destroy that decision, I say that an outrage is an outrage, and a murder is a murder, and it is our plain and obvious duty to see to it that outrages and murders are stopped.

And we are, I submit, clearly bound to ask ourselves, what, if anything we have done to further the objectives which we laid down last November, and to counter the opposition which we all knew would, and which in fact did, arise. I fear the answer is nothing. It is certainly very little, despite the earnest efforts of the Commission, and much quite obviously has been done with the contrary object.

It is now suggested, as I understand it, though the proposal is far from clear in some of its implications, and the various statements that have been made do not always appear to me to have been consistent, that because of this series of murders and outrages partition at this state has become impossible. I say to you not only that these abominable incidents should have been foreseen and prevented, but that to put them forward as a reason for abandoning the decision arrived at after most careful and anxious consideration only a few months ago seems to the New Zealand delegation to be a most fantastic distortion of logical thought. If, indeed, the considered decision of the General Assembly is to be stultified, to be defeated by the application of illegal and reprehensible violence, if the Assembly allows its decision to be abandoned because it is challenged and opposed by force, then the Assembly will be taking upon itself a responsibility which will bear tragic fruit for many generations to come.

But one is entitled to ask how is the Assembly to go about it to provide

force if force is necessary, as of course it is. I will not content myself by saying, as I am fully entitled to say, that force should have been provided last November, but I would venture very gravely to doubt whether the force that would be required to implement trusteeship would be any less than the force that would be required to implement partition. And if the members of the United Nations should be willing each to take its proportionate part in enforcing a decision of the United Nations in respect of a trusteeship for Palestine, those members should, on any logical basis, equally be willing to provide their proportionate share of a United Nations force to implement the decision to which it pledged itself last November.

That is the policy which the New Zealand Government has instructed me to support at this meeting. We still believe that, with all its defects, however imperfect we may all agree that solution is, the decision of last November is nevertheless the best solution that the situation offers. We believe that, having made the decision in November we should, undeterred by lawless violence, proceed to enforce that decision by the united action of the members of the United Nations.

And I call upon my colleagues to take thought, to take serious thought, before they abandon their decision of principle as the direct result of outrages and murders which might well have been foreseen and indeed, I believe, were foreseen before that decision was made. I call upon my colleagues in this Assembly to take thought, careful thought, before they strike that tragic, perhaps irreparable blow to the United Nations that would be involved in capitulation by the world to threats and violence. It is the old, old problem which the League of Nations was not prepared to face, and which the United Nations has not yet shown itself ready to face, whether we can hope to preserve peace and order in the world by words alone. We cannot, and anybody who contends to the contrary is not facing the facts. There is no place now for wishful thinking. While the New Zealand delegation will continue to support the enforcement of partition through the joint action of all members of the United Nations, we shall nevertheless join in the consideration of any proposal which offers prospects of ending the strife in Palestine and achieving a just settlement between the Jews and the Arabs within a reasonable period. And if it is found possible to achieve a truce between the contending parties on just and reasonable terms, I need not add how warmly such a development would be welcomed by the New Zealand Government.

But here is a test case, and believe me, the future of this organization and the future of the world may indeed depend upon the way in which it is decided. What the world needs today is not resolutions, it is resolution. And it is the most earnest hope of the New Zealand Government that the Assembly will adhere to the principles it accepted last November, and show that resolution which the situation demands. We must not, we dare not, add to the irresponsibility of our November decision for partition without enforcement, the further and final irresponsibility of a surrender to illegal force.

Will you allow me to conclude by commending to your attention one of the rules laid down by a very great American for the conduct of his life, a rule which is as true for this organization as it is true for any nation or any individual. Benjamin Franklin said "Resolve to perform what you ought; perform without fail what you resolve."

*
* *
*

STATEMENT OF MOSHE SHERTOK,
HEAD OF THE POLITICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE JEWISH AGENCY
BEFORE COMMITTEE I OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
April 27, 1948

The present session was convened for the purpose of giving further consideration to the question of the future government of Palestine. This euphemistic phrase "further consideration" clearly portended a revision of the solution previously adopted. Though it was not sought formally to abrogate the Assembly's Resolution of November 29, 1947, the proposed trusteeship arrangement was tantamount to its complete reversal. The Resolution had stemmed from the recognition of two basic facts: first, that Palestine is ripe for independence; second, that within it exist two nations. Accordingly the Assembly decreed the creation in Palestine of two independent States linked in an Economic Union. Trusteeship does violence to both these basic realities. Palestine is forced back into subjection, to outside tutelage and the duality of its population is ignored.

From the standpoint of the Jews the proposal is totally unreal. For not only are the Jews expected to forego the independence and statehood accorded them by the Resolution. They are invited to accept a status which is no status at all; whatever the constitutional formulae, without any of the shields forged for the Jews by the Mandate, the Arab majority is bound to assert itself at their expense. None of the fundamental provisions of that document, which were designed to promote and safeguard the development of the Jewish National Home, is reproduced in the United States draft trusteeship agreement. The recognition, with all its corollaries, of the connection of the Jewish people throughout the world with Palestine is swept away.

Above all, the right of Jews, as Jews, to immigrate and settle in Palestine is no longer to be valid. The wording of the United States proposal on immigration alone would be enough to condemn the entire project in the eyes of the Jewish people. Presumably in an attempt to overcome these insuperable obstacles to Jewish acceptance of trusteeship, the honorable representative of the United States has painted a glowing picture of an era of economic prosperity and progress to be ushered in for Palestine by that regime—big irrigation works, attraction of capital, agricultural and industrial development, and what not. May I recall that Ambassador Austin has visited my country. He has had the opportunity of ascertaining at first hand that the progress of Palestine in our time has been primarily due to continued large scale Jewish immigration and to constructive Jewish initiative and capital investment which drew its strength and inspiration from but one source, the hope of rebuilding a free Jewish commonwealth. To deny to the Jewish people the fulfillment of that hope is to destroy their initiative and arrest the progress of Palestine. Trusteeship and economic progress in the context of Palestine are a contradiction in terms. A tree bears no fruit after its roots have been severed.

The Resolution of the Assembly, by establishing a Jewish State, albeit in a part of Palestine, provided for the fulfillment of the fundamental concept of the Palestine Mandate; it sought to realize in 1947, against the background of existing circumstances, what was originally conceived in 1917. It was true to the creative trend of modern Jewish history which has its roots in Jewish national independence in the ancient past and in age-long Jewish martyrdom. The United States trusteeship proposal disregards the past, flies in the face of present day realities and darkly beclouds the future.

The Jews of Palestine and the Zionist movement have rejected the trusteeship idea. The executive of the Jewish Agency and Jewish National Council in Palestine have declared their uncompromising opposition to any proposal which would prevent or delay the establishment of the Jewish State. In fact, it may be asked whether an attempt to revise or to set aside the Assembly's Resolution is not at variance with international law. Much has been said by opponents of the Resolution of its allegedly non-binding character in view of the fact that technically it is no more than a "recommendation." It is of course a truism that resolutions of the Assembly in matters which concern the national sovereignty of the members of the United Nations are mere recommendations which with all their moral and political weight have no binding character. But the Resolution on Palestine is different in essence. The problem here is not one of a conflict between two sovereign states in regard to which the Assembly can do no more than "recommend" a settlement. At stake in the case of Palestine is the future of a territory which is subject to an international trust, and which therefore constitutes a direct responsibility of the United Nations. It is not within the jurisdiction of any member of the the United Nations, but solely within that of the United Nations as a whole to determine the future of that territory, and that decision has a binding force. Moreover, we believe it to

be arguable that the decision of November 29, 1947 cannot legitimately be revoked or altered. That decision conferred statehood upon the Jews of Palestine as it did upon the bulk of the Palestine Arabs. Each group acquired rights under the Resolution which it cannot now be forced to renounce. It is significant that the Resolution throughout refers to the two states in terms which imply that they already exist. Now to go back on the Resolution and to re-impose on Palestine some form of international tutelage is to legislate out of existence an established fact.

But whatever the legal aspect of the situation, there can be no doubt as to its political realities. During the eight months, April to November, when the Palestine problem formed the subject of continuous and active examination by the General Assembly and its organs, the political status of Palestine was in suspense; but this has by no means been the fact since the end of November. The passage of the Resolution has released a process of change which has grown apace from week to week, and even from day to day, with the progressive liquidation of the Mandatory regime. While the present special Assembly deliberates, the position of Palestine does not remain static. Systematically or otherwise, the plan of partition is being implemented. It is not merely a question of setting up a central authority to administer the area of the Jewish State upon the termination of the Mandate on May 15. Such authority is already in operation, filling the vacuum, territorial and functional, which is produced by the shrinking of the Mandatory Administration. The Jews, in building up their government, are not merely striving to uphold and exercise their rights under the Resolution; their present course of action is imperatively dictated by the necessities of civilized life, and of life itself.

It is no longer a question of whether and when and with whose help will the militia of the Jewish State be set up. The Jewish militia is already in existence and in action, fighting its battles day in and day out. To impose a trusteeship is no longer a matter of substituting one resolution for another. It will have to contend with the compelling forces which produced partition and which have in turn been vastly accelerated by the acceptance of partition by the Assembly.

That the process of the establishment of the Jewish State had been made unnecessarily and tragically difficult needs no elaboration. When distinguished delegates speak of peaceful implementation as of a hope unfulfilled, they seem to forget that the Assembly's Resolution was adopted in the teeth of persistent threats to defy it by force, that the question of an international force to give effect to the Resolution had been discussed at considerable length on various occasions, and that no such force was provided, not because it was unnecessary, but because it was found impracticable. During the last regular session of the Assembly, the Jewish Agency had pointed out that if trouble in Palestine were localized, the Jews would be able to cope with it alone, but if the country were invaded by forces from the neighboring states, an international force would be called for, primarily because such an invasion would be an open revolt against the authority of the United Nations which it would be the duty of the United Nations to put down. We refer to the deterrent effect which the mere existence of an international force would exercise because there is no contradiction between peaceful implementation and availability of force. On the contrary, it is an axiom of international politics that readiness to use force is an indispensable condition of the maintenance of peace. At the same time the Jewish Agency declared that should formation of an international force prove, for any reason, impracticable, the Jews would be ready under any contingency, to carry the burden of defending themselves and their State alone, but in that event they would require and deserve assistance in arms.

Our fear that armed forces from neighboring countries might invade Palestine has materialized. The invasion is officially and publicly organized and financed by the governments of the Arab States, members of the Arab League and of the United Nations, in deliberate obstruction of the Assembly's plan. Documents which we have submitted to the Security Council contain conclusive evidence of our contention. The incursions of military formations from the neighboring countries into Palestine have proceeded in broad daylight under the very eyes of British military and civil authorities. The British navy has continued to blockade Palestine's seaboard against the arrival of visaless Jewish immigrants, but the land frontiers, north, east and south, were left open to the aggressor. Inside Palestine the British forces proved either unable or unwilling to put down Arab violence and to

protect Jewish settlements from attack. Sometimes they were of help; more often they turned against Jewish defenders; in most cases they stayed aloof. The United Kingdom Government continued to supply arms to Arab States under the existing treaties in disregard of the active part played by these governments in the invasion of Palestine. On the other hand, no armed assistance was provided to the Jews and they were left to fend for themselves. The appeals of the Jewish Agency for the relaxation of the United States embargo in favor of those defending themselves and the Assembly's Resolution were fruitless. So was our appeal to the Security Council for an international arms policy in defense of an international decision. The Security Council even found itself unable to declare the invasion of Palestine a threat to the peace within the terms of the Charter and of the Resolution on Palestine.

Encouraged by the Council's inaction and by the absence of any military assistance to the Jews by the United Nations, the Arab Governments and the Palestine Arab Higher Committee intensified their campaign of violence. The blustering commanders of the so-called Arab Liberation Army promised their followers the loot of Tel Aviv, the razing of all Jewish settlements to the ground and the hurling into the sea of the Jews who survived. Jewish Jerusalem found itself besieged. The Old City within the walls, with all its shrines, was allowed by the Administration to fall into the hands of fanatical Arab guerrillas. Its small Jewish community owed its survival only to the gallantry of its own defenders. The 100,000 Jews of Jerusalem were cut off from food and other supplies, and their communications with the outside world were disrupted by Arab bands operating outside the city. Jerusalem was shelled for the first time in its history.

In all these circumstances, the entire Jewish people of Palestine rallied to the supreme task of self-defense - defense of its life and property, of its rights and future. The defense organization of the Jewish community, the Haganah, came out into the open. It enrolled new members, improved its organization, increased its equipment as best it could. It had to be on the alert night and day in more than 300 Jewish villages and towns, never knowing where and when the enemy would choose to muster an overwhelming superiority of forces for a decisive blow. As a result, large proportions of manpower and equipment were immobilized in purely static defense. Inevitably the Haganah was compelled to assume the counter-offensive to tie up the enemy's resources, to forestall attacks and to strike at menacing concentrations of foreign troops. Above all, there was the imperative need to relieve isolated Jewish settlements and to save Jerusalem. To this day, every Arab attack against Jewish settlements has been repelled and not a single Jewish village or defense post has been evacuated anywhere in the country. As time went on, the Haganah in successful counter-thrusts scattered the attacking forces and drove the enemy back to its bases. It occupied Arab strongholds, including villages and hilltops, commanding the main road to Jerusalem, which was thus reopened to food convoys. This daring enterprise was undertaken by the Haganah after every hope had to be given up of inducing the British authorities to protect the access to Jerusalem, and as the only means of saving the Jews of Jerusalem from starvation. But the position inside Jerusalem remained critical. The most revolting chapter of the present Palestinian situation is the fate of the great Hadassah hospital on Mount Scopus, adjoining the Hebrew University. The Arab command had converted an Arab quarter lying athwart the route from the hospital to the city into an armed stronghold from which all Jewish convoys, whether medical or otherwise, were attacked. On April 13th, after an assurance of safe conduct by the British authorities, a convoy carrying medical and university staff was blown up by land mines and attacked with machine-gun fire: 74 Jews, mostly doctors, nurses, university professors and students, were butchered, some of them burned to death. Though the massacre went on for hours, a British army unit stationed nearby took no action, while a Jewish defense unit was held up on the way to the scene. After the disaster, the hospital found itself completely cut off. British military authorities proceeded to negotiate - yes, to negotiate - with the bands entrenched in the Arab quarter to let food and hospital equipment through. The Arabs refused, insisting on the total evacuation of the hospital, and the British took no action. Again the Haganah had no choice but to act on its own, and on Saturday night, April 24th, after a fierce battle, the Arab bands were ejected and the Haganah forces occupied the Sheikh Jarrah Quarter. Promptly, British troops intervened and proceeded to shell the Haganah posts. The present situation in that quarter is obscure and the fate of the hospital hangs in the balance.

When British troops evacuated Haifa, the Haganah forces moved in to prevent the main part of the city, placed by the Resolution in the Jewish State, from falling into the hands of foreign Arab bands which had already infiltrated into it and attacked the Jews. By and large, we have broken the first wave of Arab aggression. It depends largely on international reaction whether the second wave will begin.

When I hear Arab spokesmen bemoaning the fate of Palestinian Arabs as innocent victims of wanton and brutal attacks allegedly perpetrated by the Jews, I am reminded of the old Arab proverb: "Darabani wa-baka, sabaqani wa-shtaka," which means, "He beat me and wept, ran ahead of me and complained." The Arabs are suffering from the boomerang effects of their own mischief, and their distress is self-inflicted. Were it not for the onslaught against the Jews initiated by the Arab Higher Committee and magnified to its present proportions by the Arab States, Palestine would today have been a peaceful country. Plagued by defeat, Arab representatives have sought refuge in wildly exaggerated allegations against the Jews. Typical was the report of the Syrian delegate about the events in Haifa. According to the formal statement presented to the Security Council by Sir Alexander Cadogan, the engagement in Haifa was started by the Arabs who attacked Jews for several days before the Jews took the action which brought the town under their control. The number of Arabs killed in the operation, according to official British sources, was about 100, and there was nothing to justify the term of massacre. I would add that a high ranking British officer in Haifa, in describing the events to a well-known foreign press representative, commended the smoothness with which the Haganah carried through the operation and the high regard its fighters had shown for human life.

The Arab spokesmen before this Committee have also distorted the facts about Arab civilian evacuation. It is by no means the policy of the Jews to drive Palestinian Arabs out of their towns and villages. On the contrary it is both our desire and our interest to show that Arabs can be perfectly secure within the Jewish State. Even before the Haifa engagement there had been a large-scale Arab exodus from Haifa, running into tens of thousands. The reason was that these people had no heart for the fighting and did not want to be involved in trouble. The subsequent mass evacuation was dictated by Arab commanders in a military demonstration - with one eye on the Arab world and the other on this Assembly. In Tiberias there had been a truce between local Jews and local Arabs which lasted several weeks. It was broken by armed men who came in from outside and when the Jews counter-attacked, again it was the Arab command which called upon the people to leave.

In Jaffa, which is outside the Jewish State, truce negotiations initiated by the local Arabs were in progress two months ago when the town came under the command of an Iraqi officer who promptly ordered their discontinuance. When warned by the Arab mayor, he replied: "I don't mind the destruction of Jaffa if we secure the destruction of Tel Aviv." Arab attacks from Jaffa against Tel Aviv were resumed, as were the Jewish counter-attacks, and here too Arabs proceeded to flee.

We have made it clear in the Security Council that we would most sincerely welcome a truce provided it was not a mere sham, to be used as a mask for the preparation of further and more violent aggression. The conditions for a real truce must include an effective prevention of further armed incursions from outside and the removal of foreign bands already in Palestine. Nor must our rights under the Resolution be prejudiced. But even before the truce resolution was adopted by the Security Council, we offered to cease fire as soon as the other side did. Yet Arab attacks have not stopped, and judging by what we hear of conferences and preparations in the neighboring Arab capitals, we must be ready for graver ordeals. Arab heads of governments and military chiefs are assessing the results of the first wave of invasion, which was a fiasco, and are preparing for a new phase of their military adventure. Forces composed of guerrilla volunteers with a mere sprinkling of regular officers have failed, they are now considering the dispatch of regular armies across the frontiers. For a long time past, there has been a plan for the invasion of Palestine by the armies of Saudi Arabia and Egypt from the south, Iraq and Transjordan from the east, and Syria and Lebanon from the north, possibly with a view to eventual partition of the territorial spoils between Palestine's neighbors. Iraq is now in the throes of an acute

economic and financial crisis and is reported to be urgently appealing for outside help, yet notwithstanding internal difficulties, she is reported to be ready to dispatch for direct and overt intervention in Palestine.

But the spearhead of this new campaign of aggression is to be, according to reports, the Arab Legion, the army of Transjordan. Units of this Legion have for a long time past been stationed in Palestine as part of the British garrison. Their presence has been a constant menace. Of late they have taken an increasing part in Arab aggression in Palestine. The other day we were assured by the representative of the United Kingdom in the Security Council that the Legion would be removed from Palestine before May 15th. Yet only yesterday we read that the main airport of Palestine at Lydda which belongs to the Jewish State was, upon the withdrawal of British personnel, occupied by the Arab Legion. So were the British barracks in Jerusalem. At the same time the King of Transjordan is reported to have stated officially that his troops would soon march into Palestine, bent on conquest. He is now being credited with the intention of himself marching into Jerusalem, at the head of a composite column of troops of the Arab League, to be crowned as King of Palestine.

It is obvious that the Legion can move into Palestine, whether before or after the 15th of May, with the same ease and facility with which the invading Arab forces have hitherto moved in. The Transjordan Government jointly with the Government of the United Kingdom would then be responsible for a most critical situation. Though the Transjordan Government is seeking admission to the United Nations, it apparently feels free to violate the Charter with impunity. Certainly the United Nations is not powerless to halt this flagrant move to open warfare. The responsibility of the Government of the United Kingdom is equally unmistakable. The Anglo-Transjordanian Treaty which has just been renewed provides for full military alliance between the two countries and the establishment of a Joint Defense Board. Under the treaty, the Government of Transjordan receives an annual subsidy of \$8, 000, 000 from the United Kingdom for the maintenance of the Legion. The commander and other senior officers of the Legion are appointed by the British Government, and the Government of Transjordan may not undertake offensive operations outside its own territory without consulting its ally. We understand that British evacuation plans include the supply of all operating requirements for the next eight months. If Transjordan brings war to Palestine, the British Government will be responsible, and if the whole issue is not placed on the agenda of this Committee and of the Security Council, then it cannot be said that the United Nations is dealing with the realities of the Palestine crisis.

I ought to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that while we believe that this threatened invasion of Palestine by the regular armies of the Arab States around us calls for very firm action by the United Nations, we ourselves are making every possible preparation to meet the next phase of the onslaught with our own forces. We certainly do not regard the Arab Legion as invincible and we are prepared to join issue with it. Our strength may be limited but there is nothing that a people conscious of its past and cherishing its future will not do in defense of its life and liberty, if forced to. We know we shall be helped by Jews throughout the world, wherever they may be. We are as appreciative as any other people of the boon of peace. But like any other freedom-loving nation, we do not set peace above everything else in life. Peace is a means to higher ends, not an end in itself. Moreover, the terms of the Arab Higher Committee or the Arab League, would place us on the precipice of national as well as of physical extinction. That would certainly not mean peace.

This debate is already twelve months old, yet it keeps reverting to the roots of the problem and to its most fundamental aspects. Notably, the distinguished delegate of the Lebanon has made a renewed intellectual effort to probe the problem to its very foundations. I appreciate the honesty of his purpose, but I deplore the mental or psychological obstacle which he has not managed to overcome. That obstacle is the refusal, conscious or otherwise, to concede to the Jews what is regarded as the natural and elemental birthright of any other people under the sun, namely, its right to a country which it can call its own, its right to a complete mastery over the conditions of its life, its right to accommodate within that country as many of its sons and daughters as it can, its right to a seat in the family of nations and its right to make its own distinctive contribution in all fields of endeavor to the common stock of mankind. The delegate of the Lebanon is prepared to concede us many things: full civil and political rights, complete freedom of

religious worship, full opportunity to develop our Hebrew language and culture, and so on. He denies us only one thing: equality - not individual equality, which he grants - but collective equality - equality of status for the Jewish people with all other nations. So long as you do not realize that the Jewish people as a people is homeless and that homes for individuals, happy and prosperous as they may be - if they are - are no substitute for a home for the people, you do not begin to touch the core of the Jewish problem and it is idle for you to attempt a solution.

Dr. Malik seems to forget - or maybe he does not - that all the blessings he would bestow on us in the Palestinian state of his conception are fully enjoyed today by Jews as individuals in every democratic and progressive country. Nevertheless, the yearning for Zion persists, for here the soul of the people seeks its redemption, and only here can the body of the people as a national entity achieve its renaissance. Dr. Malik assures us that in the Palestine State, in which the Jews would give up their claim to a separate collective identity, they would be able to hold the highest offices, including appearance as delegates of that State to the United Nations. Does he really imagine that such a prospect is so startlingly novel in Jewish history? There was a time when the Foreign Minister of the Second German Reich was a Jew and he appeared in that capacity in the highest international councils. It is not so long ago that the Prime Minister of France was a Jew who, by virtue of his position in French life, may at any time be called to fill that office again. In modern times, there have always been Jews in the governments of Great Britain. In the United States, Jews have held and are holding state positions of the highest dignity. All these honors and distinctions, of which those directly concerned and other Jews were rightly proud, did not advance the Jewish people one step towards the solution of its problem as a people. Only a territory of its own, in whose history the people has deep roots and over whose future it has the unchallenged mastery - in brief, statehood in its own country - can solve the problem.

This is the historical aspect. But what of the practical problem as it affects today the 700,000 Jews of Palestine and those hundreds of thousands who are determined to settle there? Dr. Malik appealed to us, Palestine Jews, to seek integration into our Arab environment and abandon all claims to "separate existence". If by "integration" he means that we should seek to get closer to our environment, that we should study its language and its ways of thought, that we should forge links with our neighbors near and far, then he is right and this is exactly what we are trying to do. But if by "integration" he means that we should strive to dissolve in our environment, then he asks for the impossible, and what is more, he commits an injustice for he seeks to do to us what he does not want done to himself. His own country, the Lebanon is far less sharply differentiated from the rest of the Levant than we in Palestine are from our Arab neighbors, yet the Lebanese people rightly regard an independent political status as an essential condition of their harmonious integration into the Arab world as a whole.

For us no question of integration into the Arab world exists, for we are not nor do we wish to be Arabs. It is the essence of our return to Palestine that there, and there alone, we can live as Jews and nothing else. We do not cut ourselves off from the world around us; on the contrary, we are anxious to be connected and associated with it as closely as we can; but we do not give up our corporate identity; rather are we anxious to develop it to the highest level attainable, as our neighbors do, as do all nations. We believe that the very process by which each of the countries around us has attained its separate independence and sovereignty makes our claim to statehood unanswerable. We also know that we are already a nation and that the process of our complete emancipation as a sovereign state in the part of Palestine assigned to us will prove irresistible.

We do not base our claim on any cultural or economic superiority. But it is indeed singular that a man of Dr. Malik's intellectual stature should be prompting us to conform to the patterns of life which characterize the countries of the Arab East - some of which are centuries behind us in education, social structure and economic development - and yet should deny us equality of status, even with the most primitive of them. It is equally singular, if not absurdly incongruous, for the United States to endorse the claim of these relatively primitive societies to sovereignty and membership in the United Nations and yet advocate further tutelage for both peoples of Palestine.

In all his admonitions to us, Dr. Malik appears to assume that the Jews by a mere act of will can surrender their independent existence and renounce immemorial aspirations to the reconstitution of their State. He reveals how profoundly even most cultivated Arab minds persist in misunderstanding or underestimating the historic motives and all the strains and stresses of Jewish life. The idea that a people should rest content with a disembodied culture and give up its claim to free political institutions would sound too ridiculous to merit any serious thought if applied to any other nation. The United Nations itself is conclusive proof that the independent sovereign state is the only normal unit of national activity - the only recognizable constituent part of the international world.

That the attainment of statehood by the Palestine Jews would have been infinitely easier if it did not involve the inclusion in the Jewish State of 350,000 Arabs living today within its area, is axiomatic. But the retention in the Jewish State of this Arab minority is by no means such an enormity in ethics and in practical politics as some of the more violent critics of the plan of partition would represent it to be. As has been pointed out time out of number, justice and practicability are relative concepts in the highly complex and most closely integrated international scene of today. The question is, in which case would injustice and practical difficulty be greater: if less than one-third of the Palestine Arabs were left in the Jewish State while remaining surrounded by masses of their kith and kin in the neighboring countries, all of which, including the newly to be formed Palestine Arab State, would enjoy full sovereignty and independence, or if twice that number of Jews were left as a permanent and completely isolated minority in an Arab State with the Jewish people as a whole deprived of statehood forever?

It would appear that the coupling of an economic union with partition should have been regarded as a further safeguard for the Arab minority, added to its ethnic unity with the wider Arab perimeter, its geographic contiguity with independent Arab states and the self-interest of the Jewish State to mete out to it the fairest treatment possible. Yet the Lebanese delegate repeats the theses of the distinguished representative of Pakistan that there is something absurd or anomalous about the idea of economic unity combined with political separation. In reality, this is one of the most advanced conceptions which modern political thought has produced. It would be worthwhile in this connection to recall the following extract from the speech of the representative of the Netherlands at the General Assembly on November 26, 1947:

"We are convinced that the establishment of a unitary state would not be the appropriate solution for the United Nations to preach now. Historically speaking it is a fact that nearly always in all parts of the world where there was to be found a historically formed difference between peoples whom destiny brought together, no solution in the direction of a unitary state has proved to be workable. After the Napoleonic Wars, Belgium and the Netherlands were brought together in one unitary state. Although our two peoples had very close ties, relations and interests...this unitary state ended rapidly and unsuccessfully. The differences between Arabs and Jews now are much greater.. than those between Belgium and the Netherlands in 1830. Now, together with Luxembourg, those countries are reunited, not politically but economically, and now what counts is not our political separation but our union for economic purposes...History has taught our three countries this valuable lesson of independence combined with unity for certain important but limited purposes. We try to apply this lesson earnestly because we believe strongly that this is the best way to freedom, prosperity and the safeguarding of minorities. We believe this not only because it is our own way, but because it is also a very human and intrinsically democratic way."

Failing to learn this lesson, Dr. Malik denies both principles - separate political independence and economic unity. He calls upon the Jews to commit political suicide and then proceeds to brandish over their heads the threat of economic boycott. It was astounding to hear the President of the Social and Economic Council uphold as a "sovereign right" this expedient of economic warfare which every provision of the Charter enjoining economic cooperation, and full collaboration between nations generally, implicitly condemns.

To divert in this context to the trusteeship idea, it is no paradox to say that the plan of partition with economic union leads through separation to the eventual

highest degree of attainable unity, whereas trusteeship, by the imposition of artificial unity, is bound to widen the gulf between the two peoples and is liable to make it eventually unbridgeable. For under trusteeship as under the Mandate, the two parties will seek their self-expression by a continuous pressure and counter-pressure on the third party, that is the trustee, and will thereby pull apart and sharpen their differences; whereas under partition they will face each other as equal partners, bear the full brunt of direct responsibility and be driven by the impact of their own interests to accept their mutuality and come to terms, both within the economic union and beyond it.

Incidentally, the representative of the Arab Higher Committee again tried to assail the plan of partition on legal grounds by invoking the arbitrary theory that the termination of the Mandate can only result in the conversion of the mandated territory into a unitary state. Not only is there no vestige of evidence in support of this theory in the Mandate itself, but the actual course of events which has so far attended the liquidation of mandates has produced two major precedents in support of partition. France was granted one mandate by the League of Nations for the Levant territory, yet that territory comprises two states, Syria and Lebanon. The Palestine Mandate itself is another case in point. There was one mandate for Palestine and Transjordan, yet its oneness did not prevent the first partition of Palestine, the setting up of Transjordan as a separate Arab Kingdom, nor has any Arab national institution ever voiced a protest against this procedure.

The delegate of the Lebanon concluded by inviting the Jews to face an either/or. But the alternative which he commends- that of collective renunciation by the Jews of the very essence of their ideal- is a purely imaginary one. The sooner Dr. Malik and his friends give up this peice of wishful thinking and accept the reality of Jewish nationhood, the better for all concerned. It is thus the Arabs who are faced with an either/or, and in their case the positive alternative is fully practicable and entails, comparatively speaking, a very small sacrifice for which a peaceful and more prosperous future will be an ample compensation. Either they will pursue a sterile campaign which will absorb all their best energies to no constructive purpose or conclusive result, with the vain object of crushing the Jewish nation- that stiff-necked people- out of existence; or they will acknowledge the Jewish right to Statehood, based on history and on the facts of today, and will then accept the Jewish Palestine as an equal partner in the great enterprise of regenerating the Middle East. The choice is between perpetual, aimless discord and immediate, fruitful peace.

Above all, let it not be forgotten that history has seen few more impressive proofs of mass determination than that provided by the transports of Jewish refugees which, despite all hardships and hazards, continue to cross the sea on the way to Palestine. Will the Arab navies stop them?

Mr. Chairman, we shall never cease to offer peace to our neighbors and to pledge our cooperation and association with them, provided our elementary claim to equality of status is accepted and our need for growth and development within a reasonable part of Palestine- the part assigned to us by the Assembly's Resolution- is satisfied. We shall accept nothing else than a State. We shall accept nothing less than that area. But as a State within that area, we shall solemnly undertake to respect its boundaries, scrupulously to observe the obligation of full equality of civil, religious and political rights to all our co-citizens, and effectively to cooperate with the neighboring states within such organized framework as may be found acceptable for the common benefit of all. An alliance based on mutual non-aggression and on joint economic and development activities would find in us a most willing partner. But the starting point must be equality of status. Our claim for statehood is inherent in our elementary human dignity. Our striving for it draws its strength from the eternal bond between us and our country and from the centuries of exile and persecution. Our urge to attain it now is the direct result of the impact of world events upon the position of the Jewish people in Palestine and in other parts of the world. For all those who have eyes to see, the Jewish State already exists. Jewish control of the Jewish State area is a growing reality. Arab rule over the Jewish area is a flight of fancy. The full-fledged development and international recognition of the Jewish State cannot be long delayed. All the energies of the Jewish people are mobilized to bring about that consummation.