



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

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

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

Reel
108

Box
38

Folder
449a

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

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL
347 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 these 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 Shach 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 materiele 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 Alfango, Chairman
9 East 40 Street
New York, 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:CH
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 Hussein, 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 Hussein, 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

Sen. Robert F. Wagner

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

Dr. Daniel A. Polling
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:EB

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.

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:RE
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 EP'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 answered

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, they demonstrated

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 Hitler'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 maintain a policy of strict neutrality in the event of any

"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 Haganah -- 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 these 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 as 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, Bahrain 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 Hussein, 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, 1943

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, 1946

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 Jurties 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 H. 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 monies 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.

