



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 VII: Personal Miscellaneous, 1908-1989, undated.

Sub-series A: Biographical, 1908-1981.

Reel
211

Box
79

Folder
3b

Autobiography/memoirs, Book 2, first draft, 1963?.

On April 28, 1947, a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations opened at Flushing Meadows, New York to deal with the Palestine question which had been referred to it by Great Britain on April 2, 1947. On the merits of the referral itself, I issued a statement on May 5, 1947 in the name of the American Section of the Jewish Agency For Palestine and the American Zionist Emergency Council, in which we declared: "We are pleased that the question of Palestine is now to be reviewed by the United Nations. We did not ask for it, hoping that a solution could be reached without the long delay involved in another investigation and in protracted discussions which are so very costly both in terms of the political deterioration in Palestine and in the suffering of our refugees who are still languishing in the Displaced Persons camps of Europe."

"Great Britain asked for a special session of the United Nations after Mr. Bevin's political improvisations in this field, upon which he said he banked his political career, ended, as it was bound to, in total failure. We are pleased that Great Britain will no longer be the judge and jury in the case in which it is the accused."

Oswaldo Aranha of Brazil was elected President and Lester B. Pearson of Canada was elected Chairman of the Political and Security Committee (also known as the First Committee) in which most of the deliberations on this subject took place.

Many requests were submitted by non-governmental organizations who wished to be heard. Quite a number of Jewish bodies asked for this privilege. The motion to grant the Jewish Agency the privilege of the floor ~~to Americans~~ ^{was} by Poland, backed by the Soviet Union. The

Assembly finally decided to grant hearings to only two -- the Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

The First Committee proceeded to discuss the proposal to establish a Special Committee of Inquiry with broad powers "to ascertain and record facts, and to investigate any questions and issues relevant to the problem of Palestine and to submit such proposals as it may consider appropriate for the solution of the problem of Palestine".

Mr. Jamal el Husseini was the spokesman for the Arab Higher Committee.

On May 3, I addressed the First Committee of the United Nations as the spokesman for the Jewish Agency. The evening before, I read the draft of my address to the Executive members of the Jewish Agency, and with minor suggestions, they approved of it enthusiastically. It was agreed that I was to make the general presentation of our case and at a later stage, Mr. Shertok was to discuss in greater detail the Arab-Jewish problem. My appearance at the United Nations was an event unique in Jewish history, a moment rich in drama and in historic significance. The official representatives of fifty-five nations of the world were there, and I, as spokesman of the Jewish people, *was* *addressing them, voicing the demands of the Jewish people* for national recognition and for the right to re-establish their state in their ancestral home.

The proceedings were broadcast all over the world and millions listened in -- the Jews of Palestine especially listened in. I had written my address under pressure -- all of one night -- for until the very last moment it was not certain whether I would speak or Mr. Ben-Gurion, General Chairman of the Jewish Agency, who was on his way, flying in from Palestine.

This is what I said:

"Mr. Chairman and Delegates to the United Nations:

"I should like to say at the outset that were Mr. David Ben-Gurion, Chairman of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, here this morning, he would be making the statement for the Agency. Unfortunately, the arrival of Mr. Ben-Gurion has been delayed. He will be here tomorrow, and I hope that in the course of the deliberations he will have an opportunity to participate.

"Permit me to thank the Assembly of the United Nations for granting the Jewish Agency for Palestine a hearing on the question which is before this Committee. We are grateful for the opportunity to take counsel with you in the matter of constituting and instructing a special committee of this body which is to study the problem of Palestine and to bring in recommendations for the future government of that country. We trust that our participation in these deliberations will be helpful and will prove to be a contribution to the just solution of this grave international

~~international~~ problem which this international community is now earnestly seeking.

Such a successful solution will prove a blessing not only to Palestine and to all its inhabitants, to the Jewish people, to the cause of world peace; but it will also enhance the moral authority and prestige of this great organization for world justice and peace upon which so many high hopes of mankind now rest.

"We are pleased that the Palestine problem will now be reviewed by an international body and that the thought and conscience of mankind will now be brought to bear on a situation which, heretofore and for some years now, has been made extremely difficult by unilateral action and by decisions made presumably within the terms of a mandatory trust, but actually without the sanction or supervision of the international body which established that trust and which defined both its limits and its purposes. The administration of Palestine has, since the outbreak of the war, been conducted by the Mandatory Power as if it were vested with the sovereignty of Palestine, whereas it had assumed to administer that country of which it was not the sovereign, as a trustee for carrying out the purposes of the Mandate which clearly defined its rights and its obligations.

"The problem of Palestine is, of course, of paramount importance to the Jewish people, and that fact, I take it, motivated the General Assembly of the United Nations to extend an invitation to the Jewish Agency of Palestine to present its views. We thank all those who so warmly urged our admission for their good will and their gallant action. The Jewish Agency, you will recall, is recognized in the Mandate for Palestine as a public body authorized to speak and act on behalf of the Jewish people in and out of Palestine in matters affecting the establishment of the Jewish National Home. It is the only recognized public body in the Mandate. It is recognized as such, to quote Article 4, 'for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine and, subject always to the

control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.' Under Article 6 the Jewish Agency is entitled further to cooperate with the administration in encouraging 'close settlement by the Jews on the land'; and by Article 11 it is given a preferred status in respect to the construction and operation of public works and the development of the national resources of the country.

"The Jewish Agency, which we have the honor to represent, therefore speaks, not merely for the organized Jewish community of Palestine, the democratically elected National Council of Palestine Jews, who are today the pioneering vanguard in the building of the Jewish National Home; it speaks also for the Jewish people of the world who are devoted to this historic ideal, for it was charged, by the same Article 4 of the Mandate, 'to secure the cooperation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.'

"I have spoken of 'the Jewish people' and 'the Jewish National Home.' In defining the terms of reference of the Committee of Inquiry which you are to appoint and in all the Committee's future investigations, these in my judgment should be regarded as key terms and basic concepts. They were the key terms and basic concepts of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate under which Palestine is, or should be, administered today. To proceed without relation to them would be to detour into a political wilderness so far as Palestine is concerned. To treat the Palestine problem as if it were one of merely reconciling the differences between two sections of the population presently inhabiting the country, or of finding a haven for a certain number of refugees and displaced persons, will only contribute to confusion. The Balfour Declaration which was issued by His Majesty's Government as 'a declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations', declares: 'His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.' The Mandate,

FF

in its preamble, recognizes 'the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine' and 'the grounds for reconstituting'--I call your attention to the word 'reconstituting'--'their national home in that country.!

"These international commitments of a quarter of a century ago, which flowed from the recognition of historic rights and of present needs, and upon which so much has already been built in Palestine by the Jewish people, cannot now be erased. You cannot turn back the hands of the clock of history. Certainly the United Nations, guided by its great principle proclaimed in its Charter, 'to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained', can never sanction the violation of treaties and of international law. Having this and similar situations in mind, a specific provision, you will recall, was written into the chapter of the Charter of the United Nations which deals with territories which might become trusteeship territories, and which is, therefore, especially applicable to territories now under mandate. This is Article 80 of the Charter which reads:

Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements made under Articles 77, 79 and 81 placing each territory under the trusteeship system and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any people or the terms of existing international instruments to which members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

"It is the perspective of your Committee of Inquiry on the entire problem which, in our judgment, will prove decisive. It will give direction and will greatly expedite its work, and its conclusions will prove of constructive significance if it will keep the proper perspective always in view. A generation ago the international community of the world, of which the United Nations today is the political and spiritual heir, decreed that the Jewish people shall be given the right long denied and the opportunity to reconstitute their

national home in Palestine. That national home is still in the making. It has not yet been fully established. No international community has cancelled, or even questioned that right. The Mandatory Power which was entrusted with the obligation to safeguard the opportunity for the continuous growth and development of the Jewish National Home has unfortunately in recent years grievously interfered with and circumscribed it. That opportunity must now be fully restored.

"When will the Jewish National Home be an accomplished fact? The answer to that question may well be given by the man who was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the time when the Balfour Declaration was issued. I am quoting the testimony of Mr. Lloyd George given before the Palestine Royal Commission in 1937:

There could be no doubt as to what the Cabinet then had in their minds. It was not their idea that a Jewish state should be set up immediately by the Peace Treaty . . . On the other hand, it was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them . . . and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth. The notion that Jewish immigration would have to be artificially restricted in order to insure that the Jews would be a permanent minority never entered into the heads of anyone engaged in framing the policy. That would have been regarded as unjust and as a fraud on the people to whom we were appealing.

"The same answer could also be given by Mr. Winston Churchill who was an important member of the Government which issued the Balfour Declaration; by General Smuts who was a member of the Imperial War Cabinet at that time, who foretold an increasing stream of Jewish immigration into Palestine and 'in generations to come a great Jewish State rising there once more'; by Lord Robert Cecil and by many others. American statesman shared this view of the Jewish National Home. Thus, President Wilson on March 3, 1919 stated: 'I am persuaded that the Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations

of a Jewish Commonwealth.'

"That the Government of the United States does not consider the Jewish National Home is already established is clearly stated in the letter of President Truman to King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia, dated October 29, 1946.

He wrote:

The Government and people of the United States have given support to the concept of a Jewish National Home in Palestine ever since the termination of the first World War, which resulted in the freeing of a large area of the Near East, including Palestine, and the establishment of a number of independent states which are now members of the United Nations. The United States, which contributed its blood and resources to the winning of that war, could not divest itself of a certain responsibility for the manner in which the freed territories were disposed of, or for the fate of the peoples liberated at that time. It took the position, to which it still adheres, that these peoples should be prepared for self-government and also that a national home for the Jewish people should be established in Palestine. I am happy to note that most of the liberated peoples are now citizens of independent countries. The Jewish National Home, however, has not as yet been fully developed.

"It should, of course, be clear—that I regret that statements made by certain representatives in recent days have tended to confuse what should be clear—that when we speak of a Jewish State, we do not have in mind any racial state or theocratic state, but one which will be based upon full equality and rights for all inhabitants without distinction of religion or race, and without domination or subjugation.

"What we have in mind by the Jewish State is most succinctly stated in a resolution adopted in 1945 by the British Labor Party—which requested this special session of the United Nations. I am quoting:

Here we halted half-way, irresolutely, between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish National Home unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war, and there is an irresistible case for it now.

"When your Committee of Inquiry will come to consider proposals for the future government of Palestine, this inescapable and irreducible factor—the

international obligation to insure the continuous development of the Jewish National Home—should be kept, in our judgment, constantly in mind.

"I believe that it would be extremely helpful to the Committee of Inquiry if the Mandatory Government would present the account of its stewardship of the Palestine Mandate to it, rather than wait for the next Assembly of the United Nations. It would assist the Committee in thinking through the problem and in arriving at helpful recommendations for the future government of Palestine. It is illogical, I fear, to ask of the Committee of Inquiry to consider the future government of Palestine without first making a thorough study of the present government to discover what was faulty in the present administration, what neglect and what deviations occurred to have brought about a condition so dangerous and explosive as to necessitate the convoking of a special session of the United Nations to deal with it.

"I believe that the Committee of Inquiry should most certainly visit Palestine. Written documents are important, but infinitely more instructive are the living documents, the visible testimony of creative effort and achievement. In Palestine they will see what the Jewish people, inspired by the hope of reconstituting their national home after the long, weary centuries of their homelessness, and relying upon the honor and the pledged word of the world community, has achieved in a few short years against great odds and seemingly insurmountable physical handicaps. The task was enormous—untrained hands, inadequate means, overwhelming difficulties. The land was stripped and poor—neglected through the centuries. And the period of building took place between two disastrous world wars when European Jewry was shattered and impoverished. Nevertheless, the record of pioneering achievement of the Jewish people in Palestine has received the acclaim of the entire world. And what was built there with social vision and high human idealism has proved a blessing, we believe, not only to the Jews of Palestine, but to the Arabs and other non-Jewish communities as well.

FF

"That the return of the Jews to Palestine would prove a blessing, not only to themselves but also to their Arab neighbors, was envisaged by the Emir Feisal, who was a great leader of the Arab peoples at the Peace Conference following the first World War. On March 3, 1919, he wrote:

We Arabs . . . look with the deepest sympathy on the Zionist movement. Our deputation here in Paris is fully acquainted with the proposals submitted yesterday by the Zionist Organization to the Peace Conference, and we regard them as moderate and proper. We will do our best, insofar as we are concerned, to help them through. We will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home . . . I look forward, and my people with me look forward, to a future in which we are mutually interested may once again take their places in the community of civilized peoples of the world.

"Your Committee of Inquiry will conclude, we are confident, that, if allowed to develop uninterruptedly, the standards of life which are being developed in Palestine, the concepts of social justice and the modern scientific methods will serve as a great stimulus to the rebirth and progress of the entire Near East with which Palestine and the destinies of the Jewish National Home are naturally bound up.

"Your Committee of Inquiry should also consider the potentialities of the country which, if properly developed, can, according to the expert testimony of those most qualified to speak on the subject, sustain a population much greater than the present one. Many more projects, which will result in great economic and social improvement not alone in Palestine but in all the neighboring countries, are awaiting development pending a satisfactory political solution.

"Your Committee of Inquiry should, while in Palestine, also look into the real—the fundamental—causes of the tragic unrest and violence which today mar the life of the Holy Land to which our Jewish pioneers came not with weapons, but with tools. They will inquire, I am sure, why a peace-loving community whose sole interest was in building a peaceful home and future for themselves and their children, is being driven to a pitch of resentment and tension and lamentably driving some of its members to actions which we all deplore. They

will ask themselves, I am sure, why shiploads of helpless Jewish refugees, men and women and children, who have been through all the hells of Nazi Europe, are being driven away from the shores of the Jewish National Home by a Mandatory Government which assumed as its prime obligation the facilitation of Jewish immigration into that country. They will also investigate, I hope, how the Mandatory Government is carrying out another of its obligations, which is to encourage close settlement of the Jews on the land. In actual practice it is today severely restricting free Jewish settlement to an area less than 6 per cent of that tiny country, and is enforcing today in the Jewish National Home, discriminatory racial laws which the Mandate, as well as the Charter of the United Nations, severely condemns.

"By way of digression, let it be said, if it need be said at all, that we are not engaged nor shall we be engaged in any criticism or condemnation of the people of the United Kingdom. We have no quarrel with them. On the contrary, we have the highest regard and admiration for that people and for its monumental contributions to democratic civilization. We shall never forget that it was the United Kingdom which, first among the nations, gave recognition to the national aspirations of the Jewish people. It is only a wrong and unjustifiable policy which contradicts and tends to defeat the far-visioned British statesmanship of earlier years, which we condemn.

"We hope most earnestly that the Committee of Inquiry will also visit the Displaced Persons' camps in Europe and see with their own eyes the appalling human tragedy which mankind is permitting to continue unabated two years—it is exactly two years today since V-E Day—after the close of a war in which the Jewish people was the greatest sufferer. While committees of investigation and study are reporting on their sad plight, and while inter-governmental discussions and negotiations are going on, these war-ravaged men and women are languishing in their misery, still waiting for salvation. They ask for the bread of escape and hope; they are given the stone of inquiries and investigations. Their morale

is slumping terribly. A spiritual deterioration, I am afraid, is setting in among them. It is only the hope that tomorrow—perhaps tomorrow—redemption may come, that keeps their spirits from breaking utterly.

"Most of them are deperately eager to go to the Jewish National Home. I hope that the conscience of mankind, speaking through you and through your Committee of Inquiry, will make it possible for these weary men and women to find peace at last and healing in the land of their fondest hopes, and that their liberation will not be delayed until the report of the Committee is finally made and the action of the Assembly is finally taken, but that pending ultimate decisions and implementations, these unfortunate people will be permitted forthwith to migrate in substantial numbers to Palestine.

"There is a desperate urgency about this tragic human problem, my friends, which brooks no delay. An immediate relaxation of the restrictive measures on immigration into Palestine and a return to the status which prevailed before the White Paper policy of 1939 was imposed, will not only be a boon to these suffering humans, but will greatly relieve the present menacing tensions in Palestine, will wash out much of the bitterness, and will enable the deliberations of your Committee of Inquiry and of the next Assembly to be carried on in a calmer spirit, in an atmosphere of moderation and good will. We are all eager for peace. We must all make a contribution to achieve it. But the decisive contribution can be made only by the Mandatory Government.

"I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I have not abused your patience and the patience of the representatives of the United Nations here assembled. Permit me to conclude with this observation: The Jewish people places great hope upon the outcome of the deliberations of this great body. It has faith in its collective sense of justice and fairness, and in the high ideals which inspire it. We are an ancient people and though we have often, on the long, hard road which we have travelled, been disillusioned, we have never been disheartened. We have never lost faith in the sovereignty and the ultimate triumph of great moral principles.

In these last tragic years when the whole household of Israel became one great hostelry of pain, we could not have builded what we did build had we not preserved our unshakeable trust in the victory of truth. It is in that strong faith and hope that we wish to cooperate with you in this task which you have undertaken.

"The Jewish people belongs in this society of nations. Surely the Jewish people is not less deserving than other people whose national freedom and independence have been established and whose representatives are now seated here. The Jewish people were your Allies in the war and joined their sacrifices to yours to achieve a common victory. The representatives of the Jewish people of Palestine should sit in your midst--the representatives of the people and of the land which gave to mankind spiritual and ethical values, inspiring human personalities, and sacred texts which are your treasured possessions. We hope that that people, now again rebuilding its national life in its ancient homeland, will be welcomed before long by you to this noble fellowship of the United Nations."

The address, from all accounts, made a fine impression. Many of the United Nations delegates crowded around me to congratulate me. Mr. Trygve Lie thanked me for raising the tone of the discussion at the United Nations to such a high level. The head of the British delegation, Sir Alexander Cadogan, praised me for the fairness of my presentation. Messages poured in from all parts of the United States and from abroad, especially from Palestine. The Executive of the World Zionist Organization cabled cordial congratulations on "the excellent presentation of our case."

FP

~~SECRET~~

I was very pleased, but I knew that a good speech was not yet victory. Many months of hard work and uncertainty lay ahead.

A very surprising and ^{welcome} ~~satisfactory~~ event at the session of the United Nations ^{was} the speech of the Soviet delegate, Mr. Andrei Gromyko (on May 14, 1947). He stated that the legitimate interests of both the Jewish and Arab peoples in Palestine can be properly protected ~~only~~ by the creation of an independent democratic Arab-Jewish State but, failing this solution, consideration should be given to the division of Palestine into two independent states--Jewish and Arab.

← insert

The position of the United States Government was not declared. To a letter from twenty-nine members of Congress which was addressed to Secretary of State George C. Marshall requesting the Administration to declare its policy with respect to Palestine, Secretary Marshall replied that it would be premature for the United States to outline its Palestine policy before the report of the Inquiry Committee is issued.

date?

The Assembly appointed a special eleven-member Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) to study the problem. The Committee spent three months on its investigation. It surveyed the situation in Palestine and in the Displaced Persons camps in Germany and Austria and made its report on August 31st, 1947. The Report contained eleven general principles which were unanimously agreed upon by the Committee and a Majority plan which proposed partition of the country into Jewish and Arab States in an economic union. The Minority plan recommended the creation of a federal state of Palestine, with two autonomous Arab and Jewish enclaves or states within the federal state.

The Arabs rejected both plans. The Zionist General Council (Actions Committee) which was meeting at the time of the publication of

publication of the Committee Report in Zurich, and which I attended, welcomed the Majority plan. I, too, voted in favor of it as a basis of negotiation. Here, finally, was a definite proposal which held the promise of a settlement, put forward by a responsible international body representing the United Nations. This was in keeping with the position which I had taken at the Basle Congress and the Convention of the Zionist Organization of America in 1946.

As long as there was no official proposal before the Zionist Movement, Zionists had no reason to discuss it, certainly not to propose it. However, "When proposals will be made to us at any time by Governments which we shall find truly reasonable and which will meet our fundamental needs and satisfy our national aspirations and our sense of justice, our Movement will be prepared, I am sure, to give them serious consideration. Sound and just proposals are bound to be made to us sooner or later if we do not lose our nerve and our perspective."

On September 23, the General Assembly of the United Nations voted to establish an Ad Hoc Committee, composed of all ^{the} member nations, to study and report on the UNSCOP recommendations. Dr. Herbert V. Evatt of Australia was elected Chairman. On September 29, Jamal el Hussein, in addressing this Committee, announced that the Arabs

will not accept either Report and threatened to drench the soil of Palestine

if attempts were made to implement either of them
in blood. On October 2, I appeared before the Committee and gave the official

Zionist reactions to the ^{Committee} Reports in considerable detail. The Reports had been *over* carefully examined and studied, as may well be imagined, by the Zionist Executive.

We gave our reasons for rejecting the Minority Report. As far as the Majority Report was concerned, I stated:

"As regards the ^{majority} report, we wish to make the following observations. These proposals are those of the Committee. Needless to say, they are not the proposals of the Jewish Agency which, in fact, were ruled out by the Committee. They do not represent satisfaction of the rights of the Jewish people. They are a serious attenuation of these rights. At the hearings of your Committee we fully defined these rights and their justification. I will not here impose upon you by restating them.

"Partition clearly was never contemplated by the Balfour Declaration or the Mandate. It was intended that Palestine, the whole of Palestine, shall ultimately become a Jewish State... The Royal Commission of 1937 declared that 'the field in which the Jewish National Home was to be established was understood at the time of the Balfour Declaration to be the whole of historic Palestine.' That area has already been partitioned.

"The first partitioning of Palestine took place in 1922 when Transjordan, representing three-quarters of the original area of Palestine, was cut off and has since been set up by the British as an Arab kingdom. Thus, one Arab state has already been carved out of the area assigned to the Jewish National Home. It is now proposed to carve a second Arab state out of the remainder of the country. In other words, the Jewish National Home is now to be confined to less than one-eighth of the territory originally set aside for it.

"This is a sacrifice which the Jewish people should not be asked to make. The legitimate national aspirations of the Arab peoples have been fully satisfied...

(over) We had taken counsel with other Jewish
organizations in the United States on the nature of
our reply - The American Jewish Committee, the Jewish
Labor Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the
American Jewish Archives, the Agudat Israel and the
bodies

FF



"The Arabs possess today independent monarchies in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Egypt, Iraq and Transjordan, and independent republics in Syria and Lebanon. A population of 17,000,000 in Arab Asia occupies an area of 1,290,000 square miles, enormously rich in resources and potentialities. This area, which formerly belonged to the Ottoman Empire, and which, together with Egypt, was liberated by the Allied nations, includes all the centers which are primarily associated in history with Arab and Moslem traditions. Palestine, the historic home of the Jewish people, which the nations of the world after the last war declared to be the Jewish National Home, is, after the loss of Transjordan, only 10,000 square miles in extent, and it is now proposed, in the majority report, further to reduce the area of the Jewish National Home by almost one-half.

"It is not our intention at this time to enter into a detailed discussion of the many territorial provisions in the proposals of the Majority report. But we feel constrained to point out at least two features which are open to most serious objections. The Majority report eliminates western Galilee—that is, most of Galilee—from the Jewish State. The Peel Commission included western Galilee in the Jewish State. For reasons which we shall endeavor to explain more fully at a later stage, we regard the proposed exclusion of western Galilee as an unjustified and a particularly grievous handicap to the development of the Jewish State.

"Under the terms of the Majority proposal, the City of Jerusalem is set up as a separate government unit. We would not question the propriety of placing the old city of Jerusalem, which contains the holy places, as well as the holy shrines, which may be outside the walls of the old city, in the custody of an international trustee. But outside the old city a modern new city has grown up which contains a compact Jewish section of approximately 90,000 inhabitants. This new city includes the central national, religious and educational institutions of the Jewish people of Palestine.

"Excluding all of Jerusalem from the Jewish State would be a particularly

severe blow. Jerusalem holds a unique place in Jewish life and religious traditions. It is the ancient capital of the Jewish nation and the symbol throughout the ages of Jewish nationhood. The undefeated resolve of our people to be reconstituted as a nation in the land of Isreal was epitomized in the solemn vow of the Psalmist and of the exiled people throughout the ages: 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.' We strongly urged that the Jewish section of modern Jerusalem, outside the walls, be included in the Jewish State.

"There are other modifications which we will take up at a later stage of these discussions.

"To return to the basic solution of partition^s proposed by the Special Committee: it entails, as we have said, a very heavy sacrifice on the part of the Jewish people. But if such a sacrifice is made the inexorable condition of an immediate and final sol^ution, we would be prepared to assume the responsibility for recommending acquiescence to the supreme organs of our movement, subject, of course, to further discussion of the constitution and territorial provisions which we assume will take place in the course of these sessions.

"We would be prepared to do so because the proposal makes possible the immediate re-establishment of the Jewish State, an ideal for which our people ceaselessly strove through the centuries, and because it ensures immediate and continuing Jewish immigration which, as events have demonstrated, is possible only under a Jewish State. We would do so also as our contribution to the solution of a grave^d international problem and as evidence of our willingness to join^t with the community of nations in an effort to bring peace at last to the troubled land which is precious to the heart of mankind...

"We mean to be good neighbors, not only to the Arab State of Palestine, but to the Arab States throughout the Middle East. And certainly we mean scrupulously to respect the equal rights of the Arab population in the free

FF

and democratic Jewish State. With the removal of political friction and bitterness which we hope will eventually result from the setting up of these two independent states, each people master in its own home, it should be possible to usher in an era of progress and regeneration which would be a boon to all the peoples in that important part of the world. What the Jewish people has already achieved in Palestine in a short time and in the face of enormous obstacles is indicative of what it hopes to do in the future along with, and in fullest cooperation with, all of its neighbors.

"Neighborliness, however, is a two-sided affair. Sincerely and without reservations, we bring the offer of peace and friendship. If it is met in the same spirit, rich and abundant blessings will redound to all. If not, we shall be compelled to do what any people must do under such circumstances, defend our rights to the utmost. We have builded a nation in Palestine. That nation now demands its independence. It will not be dislodged. Its national status will not be denied. We are asked to make an enormous sacrifice to attain that which, if uninterfered with, we would have attained long ago. In sadness, and most reluctantly, we are prepared to make this sacrifice. Beyond it we cannot, we will not go.

"The Jewish State when it is established, will respect the sovereignty of its neighbor states as fully as it will defend its own. The Jewish people in Palestine is prepared to defend itself. It is not impressed by idle threats. A people that has survived the accumulated fury of the centuries, faced powerful empires in a bitter battle for survival, and during the last war saw hundreds of thousands of its sons fighting for freedom in all the liberating armies of the Allied nations--while the head of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee was broadcasting Nazi propaganda from Berlin and congratulating Hitler on his African victories over the Allies--such a people will not be intimidated. Nor, we are confident, will this great international body which

omit
under-
scoring

is earnestly wrestling with this tremendously difficult problem and which is seeking a just and equitable solution, be terrorized into surrendering its high mandate...

"The Jewish people in Palestine, I repeat, will be prepared to defend itself. It will welcome, of course, whatever support can properly be given to it by the United Nations or its members, pursuant to the decisions of the United Nations.

"In this connection we must take note of the announcement made by the representative of the United Kingdom that its forces may not be available to the United Nations during the transitional period, and may be subject to early withdrawal from Palestine. In that event, in order to avoid the creation of a dangerous vacuum which might affect public security, the Jewish people of Palestine will provide without delay the necessary effectives to maintain public security within their country.

"Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee: With this United Nations report we have reached one of the important crossroads of history. The course which will be followed will be fraught with destiny for all, the Jews, the Arabs and the United Nations. We hope that it will be a course of wisdom, justice, and courage. The Jewish people hopefully awaits the decision of this body.

"Twenty-five years ago a similar international organization recognized the historic claims of the Jewish people, sanctioned our program and set us firmly on the road of realization. We were not then regarded as intruders or invaders, not even by the foremost leaders and spokesmen of the Arab world, but as a people returning home after a long sad exile. The world approved and acclaimed the return of Israel to its ancient homeland. The statesmen of the world faced the tragic problem of Jewish national homelessness and they set about to solve it.

"The Jewish people was confirmed in its right to rebuild its national life in its historic home. It eagerly seized the long-hoped-for opportunity and

proceeded to rebuild that ancient land of Israel in a manner which evoked the admiration of the whole world. It has made the wilderness blossom as the rose. Surely this great international body, surveying this faithful and fruitful work, will wish to see that work continued, that undertaking advanced, that hope of the centuries consummated. It will be a noble achievement which will redound to the everlasting glory of this world organization. It will be a supreme act of international justice."



FF

~~SECRET~~

The months between the presentation of the UNSCOP Report towards the end of August and the final vote which was taken by the United Nations Assembly on November 29, 1947, were for us intense with activity, uncertainty, and anxiety. Everything depended on the attitude of the American government--and our government was slow to show its hand. From time to time rumors swept through the corridors of Lake Success that the United States government was vacillating, was abandoning its position on partition, or that the President had become unfriendly and indifferent. This was causing confusion in the ranks of our friends among the United Nations delegations. Our Zionist Executive in Jerusalem was also in the dark.

To the meeting of the Zionist Executive which took place in Geneva, Switzerland in the middle of August, I wanted to bring some authoritative information on the American attitude which would guide it in its deliberations. I asked my friend, Herbert Bayard Swope, to sound out his friends who were close to the Administration about the situation.

Mr. Swope
He talked to Ambassador Herschel V. Johnson, who was the alternate United States Representative at the United Nations, who reported that policy would be formulated in the topmost echelon (the President and the Secretary of State) but that it had not been handed down yet. However, he added that he thought it would take enormous weight to force America into an oppositional attitude.

Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder volunteered to take up the matter which Mr. Swope brought to his attention, with the President. In a telegram to Mr. Swope, Secretary Snyder informed him that the

227

FF

over Mr. Sarge ~~he~~ was very helpful in our behalf. He had introduced me to Mr. Berwood Berwick with whom I conferred a few times at his home and persuaded him to use his good influence in Washington. He was glad to assist. ^{He says the President and Secretary Bismarck} When Winston Churchill visited the United States, Mr. Berwick introduced me to him and together we discussed the subject, Palestine. Mr. Churchill expressed his traditional interest and friendship for Zionism and the Jewish National Home - but ~~he~~ ^{he} has no longer an office Prime Minister, ...



"President confirms the statement I made to you yesterday that he has made no change in his Palestine policies" (favoring partition).

I conveyed this information to the Executive meeting in Geneva. In the midst of its sessions the UNSCOP Report was made public, and the information which I conveyed to it helped it to formulate the position of our Movement on the Report.

It was not until September 17, 1947, that Secretary of State Marshall made a statement to the United Nations in which he said:

"While the final decision of this Assembly must properly await the detailed consideration of the report, the Government of the United States gives great weight not only to the recommendations which have met with the unanimous approval of the Special Committee but also to those which have been approved by the majority of that Committee."

While this was quite general, it was nevertheless a welcome declaration, the first official public declaration of our government on partition. It remained to be seen how this would be followed up. There were many forces at work to try to shift the American position somewhere between the Majority and the Minority Reports.

It was not until October 11, 1947 that Ambassador ^{Marshall} V. Johnson addressed the Ad Hoc Committee and declared that "The United States Delegation supports the basic principles of the unanimous recommendations and the majority plan which provides for partition and immigration." He suggested that certain amendments and modifications would have to be made in the Majority plan, certain geographical modifications. Jaffa should be included in the Arab State. He probably also had in mind, without wording it, the entire Negev in the south of Palestine, which the State Department wanted transferred to the Arab state.

This declaration was publicly welcomed by the Emergency Council which, however, in view of Ambassador Johnson's reference to "certain geographical modifications" which will have to be made in the Majority plan, cautioned against this.

The American Zionist Emergency Council, speaking on behalf of the entire organized Zionist movement in the United States, welcomes the statement of the Government of the United States on Palestine before the United Nations. We are pleased to note that the United States supports the Majority report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, that it has called for a solution at this session of the General Assembly, and has expressed willingness to participate in the implementation of the solution. The United States' reaffirmation of our country's historic connection with the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home and its warning against the threat or use of force against the implementation of the UN decision are most gratifying.

"We are hopeful that the United States' declaration will hasten an early and just decision. The American people and freedom-loving nations will, we are confident, be on the alert to prevent such modifications and whittling down of the area designated as the Jewish state as to render that state utterly unviable. Acceptance of the recommendations of the Majority report represents an enormous sacrifice on the part of the Jewish people. It cannot and must not be asked to sacrifice further."

Throughout the three tense months of the United Nations debate on Palestine ^{our people} ~~we~~ kept in touch with the members of the United States delegation to the United Nations and with the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other public officials.

On October 6, 1947, twenty-three Governors joined in sending a telegram to President Truman in which they urged that the United States delegation to the General Assembly give full and vigorous support to the Majority Report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine. Other Governors wrote independently to the President urging that the United States back the UNSCOP Majority Report.

The press of the country gave its hearty endorsement to the Majority Report. The Arabs were doing their utmost to create an impression of the imminence of war. They bombed the American consulate in Jerusalem. They were playing for a panic propaganda on the United Nations. Friends of ours, mostly newspaper men, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Frank Baxton, George L. Cassidy, James G. MacDonald, Frank Gervasi, and others sent telegrams to leading newspaper editors and columnists exposing this military blackmail diplomacy.

A joint appeal was sent to the President and the Secretary of State by twenty-five of the most prominent Christian religious leaders in America, headed by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr and Dr. Henry Atkinson.

The Synagogue Council of America, representing all shades of Judaism, asked the members of all congregations to write to the President

and they responded most eagerly. The response was unprecedented. One telegraph station in Brooklyn recorded more than twenty-five thousand wires to Secretary Marshall.

The members of the American Section of the Jewish Agency and its professional staff were in constant touch with the United Nations delegations and their governments.

Especially active in advocating the Majority Report were two distinguished members of UNSCOP, Jorge Garcia-Granados of Guatemala, who was the Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States at the time of his appointment to UNSCOP, and Professor Enrique Redriguez Fabriga of Uruguay. They were enlightened, forthright, and effective.

On November 27, 1947, an impressive group of United States Senators sent a wire to the heads of all the delegations to the United Nations stating that world opinion stands behind partition, and urging them to vote for the Majority Report.

Much of this activity may perhaps appear to some to have been excessive or unnecessary, but we could not afford to take any chances. What took place a few months later when our government, under pressure from many sources, suddenly reversed itself and asked for a reconsideration of the United Nations partition resolution for which it had voted, confirmed for us the political wisdom of not leaving any stone unturned....

It was in consequence of the favorable attitude towards the Majority Report, which was so widely expressed by nearly every sector of American public opinion, that our government finally gave it the full measure of support which it required.

A purely formal declaration of its position was ostensibly not enough. Many member nations -- especially those of Latin America -- were waiting to see how earnest and determined the American Government was in its declaration.

At a meeting of the American section of the Jewish Agency held on October 13, 1947, it was agreed that Mr. Shertok should deliver the closing argument at the Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Beryl Locker of the Jerusalem Executive, who was in attendance, then suggested that Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who had not long before arrived in the United States, should also be invited to address the Ad Hoc Committee of the United Nations. It would be a personal tribute to him in the evening of his life. Shertok and Goldmann seconded the proposal. There was objection. The Zionist cause had been adequately represented at the United Nations by members of the Executive. The final hour was now in sight and a promising victory for us. The Great Powers had already declared themselves. The appearance of Dr. Weizmann at this stage would change nothing, but would only be exploited by his political followers as proof that he was called in at the last moment to save the situation. ... Everyone waited for my reaction. Everyone recalled the friction which had developed between Dr. Weizmann and myself at the Zionist Congress the year before. I said:

"This matter came up, as you will recall, in Zurich, and it was then suggested, I think by Dr. Goldmann, that Dr. Weizmann as one of the leaders of our Movement should be invited to help along during the coming critical months in whatever way he could. This was shortly after Dr. Weizmann delivered his address in Basle, in which he spoke so bitterly about the "man from Cleveland". Within twenty-four hours, the press of the world carried the news that the Executive had invited Dr. Weizmann to head the Delegation of the Executive to the U.N. Dr. Weizmann was to represent the Movement before the U.N., implying that only Dr. Weizmann would be adequate to the situation. Now, during the last few weeks, a similar propaganda had been set in motion by Dr. Weizmann's partisans that while Dr. Silver represents the Jewish Agency at the U.N., the critical situation at the U.N. calls for the appearance of Dr. Weizmann. Now it is quite clear that as far as our cause at this present Session of the U.N. is concerned, Dr. Weizmann will be coming in at the tail end of all that has transpired. The Great Powers have already declared themselves and Dr. Weizmann will not be able to make any significant contribution to the situation which is well in hand. Therefore, the question is whether this tribute should be paid to Dr. Weizmann and whether an invitation extended to him would be a gesture towards unity in our Movement. On these two grounds I say that Dr. Weizmann should be invited.

I feel that he is entitled to this recognition and that his appearance would indicate the joining of our forces and would so be interpreted. Therefore, there is no reason why this should not be done. I know that this act will be deliberately interpreted by some that we had come up against a stone wall and had to call in Dr. Weizmann to save the situation. Nevertheless, although I realize the use to which this invitation will be made by those who are opposed to us here and in Palestine, I will vote to invite Dr. Weizmann to speak with Mr. Shertok at the conclusion of the debate.

My position must have surprised Dr. Goldmann, for both he ^{along with} Mr. Locker and Shertok thanked me for the position which I took. "

When the Subcommittee which was appointed by the Ad Hoc Committee to consider in detail the partition plan recommended by UNSCOP, came to the question of boundaries, the United States proposed that the entire Negev should be transferred to the Arab State. This gave us considerable concern. Accordingly, on November 10, 1947, I wrote to Senator Warren R. Austin, Chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations, whom I had known for several years and whose friendship I valued, the following letter:

"My dear Mr. Austin: I do not know whether I will be able to reach you this afternoon by telephone. I am, therefore, sending this urgent message to you by air mail.

"Definite progress seems to have been made in the Palestine question before the U.N. I was informed this morning that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. delegations have come to a fundamental agreement on the question of implementation, an issue which threatened for a time to defeat the entire project. There remains now but one serious stumbling block, and that is the apparent insistence of the U.S. delegation to make radical revisions in the boundaries of the Jewish state _____

as recommended by the UNSCOP Report. I have been informed that the U. S. delegation is insisting that the Negev -- the southern part of Palestine which was assigned to the Jewish state -- shall be added to the Arab state on the principle that the territories of the two states should be equalized. This was a principle which was considered and rejected by the United Nations Committee. It was recognized that room must be allowed for the influx of large numbers of refugees and future immigrants. It was also recognized that if this area, largely wilderness, is to have any chance of development, even to a degree, it is the Jewish state under the necessity of caring for large immigration which would undertake experiments in development. Added to that was the realization that one Arab state was already carved out of Palestine in 1922 and set up as an Arab state -- Trans-Jordan. The Palestine which was originally contemplated as the Jewish National Home was 40,000 square miles. After Trans-Jordan was set up as an independent territory, now a state, Palestine was reduced to 10,000 square miles. The UNSCOP Report reduced the Jewish National Home further to an area of about 6,000 square miles. The U. S. delegation now insists on reducing that area still further by about one-half.

"I do not know why the U. S. delegation, of all the delegations, should take this position. There are certain rectifications in the boundaries which are indicated and which can be adjusted on the basis of a quid pro quo, but our delegation seemingly has in mind radical reductions and substituting its own conception as to just boundary lines for those of the United Nations Committee.

"If the U. S. delegation insists upon this unwarranted whittling down of the area of the Jewish state, the Jewish Agency might be compelled reluctantly to reject the whole proposal. As you well know, the UNSCOP proposals for partition were violently resisted by large sections of our people.

"Our delegation seems also to be taking a negative attitude towards the

[Handwritten signature]

FF

proposal approved by all the members of the subcommittee to limit the international zone of Jerusalem to the Old City within the walls which contains the sacred places of the three Faiths, and to add the modern City of Jerusalem which contains ninety-eight percent Jews to the Jewish State and the modern Arab section to the Arab state. Such an arrangement has worked out satisfactorily in the case of the Vatican City in relation to the City of Rome. The Old City, plus the sacred places outside of the city, such as those in Bethlehem and Nazareth, may well come under the control of an international regime.

"I do hope that you will use your fine leadership in the UN to take a position on the question of boundaries more in keeping with the letter and spirit of the UNSCOP Report, and facilitate action. It is not true that revisions of boundaries are required in order to insure a two-thirds vote in the Assembly. The justice of the boundaries has not been seriously questioned, and has not been an issue between those who favor and those who oppose partition as the solution.

"With all good wishes, I remain"

most cordally yours, Golda Meir

I wrote letters, in a similar vein, to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who had helped me time and again with his wise counsel and fine political grasp, *in 1947* and to the Minority Leader of the House, John W. McCormack, who was a loyal friend of our cause throughout. They both promised to help.

On November 18, 1947, I received the following letter from Senator Austin:
Dear Mrs. Meir:

"Thank you for your letter of November 10, concerning the boundaries of the proposed Jewish state, which has been carefully considered by the Members of our Delegation charged with this subject.

"I wish to assure you that the points you have raised have been, and will be, carefully considered by the United States Delegation.

"I am not sure that you have been kept fully informed concerning the views expressed by the United States Delegation regarding the frontier question, but in any case I can emphasize that this Delegation has no desire to insist on an unwarranted whittling down of the area of the proposed Jewish state."

Yours sincerely
(Signed) Warren R. Austin.



We worked desperately hard until the very last moment--the Emergency Council in Washington, the Jewish Agency Executive among the United Nations delegations. Our colleagues in the Agency worked feverishly, each in the sphere assigned to him, the Soviet Bloc, the Catholic countries of Latin America, the British Dominions, or Western Europe. Every avenue of support was thoroughly explored, every clue meticulously checked and pursued, the smallest or the remotest of nations was contacted and wooed.

On Saturday, November 29, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee proposing partition was finally presented to a plenary session of the Assembly for a vote. I sat tense and alert and listened with deep repressed emotion to the fateful roll call. I strained my ears to catch the "Yes" or "No" of each delegation, especially of those whose final decision was uncertain. When France, which had earlier asked for a twenty-four hour delay in the hope that a compromise policy might be submitted, cast its vote in favor of the report, a burst of applause swept through the hall. The report of the Committee, as is well known, was adopted by the necessary two-thirds majority--33 in favor, 10 against, 10 absentions, and Siam absent. When the vote was announced, there was commotion in the hall, and in the corridors there were cheers and rejoicing. In the eyes of many there were tears of joy.

The decision was regarded as a turning point in the history of the United Nations which greatly enhanced its prestige, for the hope was universally entertained that the decision would lead to the settling of the Palestine problem.

The press of the country hailed the decision. In the U. S. Senate man after man rose to express gratification over the action which was taken in the United Nations.

I sent a message of thanks to President Truman to whom on so many other occasions in the past I had been constrained to send messages of complaint, criticism or appeal:

"On this joyous occasion for the Jewish people throughout the world, when the age-old hopes of Israel have been endorsed by the United Nations, we send you, Mr. President, this heartfelt expression of our thanks for the great support which you have given our cause. On behalf of the entire organized Zionist movement of our country which is represented in the American Zionist Emergency Council, we express our profound gratitude for the leadership you have shown on the question of Palestine -- leadership which culminated in the United Nations' historic decision of Saturday, November 29. Your policy on Palestine, Mr. President, has also served to create a strong bond of friendship between the American people and the Jewish citizens of Palestine which, we are confident, will serve the best interests of both countries. You have won a place of distinction in Jewish history. May the years ahead find us all moving forward towards the better, freer world which is our common goal."

I also sent telegrams of thanks to many friends in the Congress of the United States who had given us invaluable assistance, to Senators Wagner, Taft, Vandenberg, Barkley, Brewster, Lodge and McGrath. Senator Wagner, in replying to my telegram, wrote: "Thank you for your very gracious and kind wise. The agreement by the United Nations Assembly to the partition of Palestine was truly the consummation of my dream. I am, indeed, a happy man." I sent messages to Congressmen McCormack,

Martin and others. I could not fail to include among those whom I wished to remember on this day, Sumner Welles, Thomas E. Dewey and Bartley C. Crum.

On this occasion, the American Zionist Emergency Council issued the following release:

"Today a milestone was reached in the history of the world. In endorsing the plan to set up separate Jewish and Arab states in Palestine, the United Nations has ended two thousand years of national homelessness for the Jewish people. The deep emotion experienced by Jews throughout the world today cannot be conveyed in words, for all the hopes and aspirations of Jewry, growing out of centuries of persecution and humiliation, have been concentrated on this one day of fulfillment.

"On behalf of the entire organized Zionist movement in the United States, which it represents, the American Zionist Emergency Council wishes to share Jewry's profound joy at this moment with the millions of Americans of all races and creeds who have fought side by side with us during the past years to achieve this measure of justice. Without the wholehearted support of American public opinion, this great victory for humanity could not have been brought about. Throughout a long succession of crises and setbacks the American people have remained steadfast in their determination that Jewish national homelessness and persecution must cease.

"Our deep thanks go out to all of the Governments which voted today to set up independent Jewish and Arab states in Palestine. We are particularly

mindful of the great efforts devoted to the achievement of this decision by the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union, to whom we convey our profound gratitude. We thank also the British Dominions, the European countries, and the Latin American nations who endorsed the creation of the Jewish State.

"The American Zionist Emergency Council is happy to call special attention to the role played by the Zionists of America during the past crucial, often heart-breaking years. The ceaseless efforts and devotion of the local Zionist Emergency Committees constituted a major factor in our political struggle. We send our thanks to the tireless workers of the Zionist rank and file who have reason to be proud of their accomplishments under the leadership of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. The American Zionist Emergency Council takes particular pride in the fact that its

-2-

38

FF

leader, Dr. Silver, has, in his capacity of Chairman of the American Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, led our movement to victory in the United Nations.

4 We express our gratitude for the able and effective work accomplished by Moshe Shertok, head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, and by the leaders of the American Section, who have met the challenge of the past historic months and have achieved for the Jewish people new dignity and respect among the nations of the world.

"Difficult^{ly} days may yet be ahead of us. We do not wish to minimize the dangers that may confront the Jewish State. We are confident, however, that the citizens of that State can defend their Statehood and that American public opinion will remain constantly on the alert to safeguard it.

"We send our brotherly greetings to the stalwart citizens of the Jewish State in Palestine and to our less fortunate, but equally heroic, brethren in the displaced persons' camps of Europe and on Cyprus, who will soon become citizens of that State. Their suffering and patience has not been in vain.

"Long live the Jewish State!"

At the meeting on December 11, following the United Nations' decision, I told the members of the Executive Committee of the Zionist Emergency Council that since our last meeting, held a considerable time ago due to the pressure of work in which all of us had been engaged, many great and important things had happened. The greatest of these was the decision taken on November 29th by the Assembly of the United Nations. We are still too close to the event to appraise it adequately. The immediate actions which led to the decision were too numerous and too involved to be reviewed at this meeting. But what took place in the United Nations represented the consummation of what we had striven to achieve all through these years: a realization of the basic program of the Zionist movement.

We did not get, as a result of the decision, all that we had hoped to get. A partitioned Palestine was not the objective of the Zionist movement; it certainly was never the objective towards which the American Zionist Emergency Council had striven. Nevertheless, it represented all that the authorities of our movement believed could be achieved at this time; it represented all that a committee representing the nations of the world was prepared to give us; and it represented for us two tremendous gains: Statehood, recognition of the Jewish nation as a nation on earth, and this marked the end of galuth for our people. With this comes the great opportunity for us to ingather all the dispersed of our people, those who need a new home and have been waiting for it so desperately, and the possibility in a very short time of emptying the DP camps of Europe and giving a home at last to hundreds of thousands of our people. The UN decision is, therefore, of incalculable significance for our people and for the history of mankind. (~~DP-Silver~~^I) expressed the belief that the Jewish people could build something very great in that little country, as it did a long time ago.

Many people of our own generation share the credit that goes with this achievement, as do the faithful generations which preceded ours. There is enough praise and credit and glory to go round for everyone. Credit is due to those who built the Yishuv in Palestine throughout the years, because without their

concrete achievements in setting up a de facto nation in Palestine, formal recognition probably would not have been forthcoming. But the immediate achievement is traceable to the work of the American Zionist Emergency Council. It is now clear that the UN decision would not have been taken but for the position which the American Government took, and this U.S. stand was, in turn, a direct result of the organized activities of the Zionists of America. Our work throughout America — in building public opinion, in canalizing this mass sentiment towards Washington, in bringing it into play quickly and effectively — finally produced the historic American stand in the United Nations, which won the day for our cause.

The result was in doubt to the last. Due to the absence of a strong affirmative attitude on the part of the State Department, the impression prevailed among foreign delegations that the creation of the Jewish State was not of vital diplomatic concern to the American Government. When the Philippines, Haiti and Greece fell away on the same day, this served notice to many wavering delegations that the American Government was not really concerned about the outcome. Fortunately, we were given a ^hbreathing-spell of 36 hours. During this time, we marshalled our forces. Jewish and non-Jewish opinion, leaders and masses alike, converged on the Government and induced the President to assert the authority of his Administration to overcome the negative attitude of the State Department which persisted to the end, and persists today. The result was that our Government made its intense desire for the adoption of the partition plan known to the wavering governments.

I ^{feel} it necessary to make these observations because we ^{have} just closed an historic chapter, and the Zionists of America should have a sense of deep satisfaction in the knowledge that their labors had proved decisive in the achievement of our victory.

- 1 -

With the establishment of the State and the fulfillment of the Zionist ideal, the question soon arose as to the future of the Zionist Emergency Council. Should it disband? Should the whole Zionist Movement wind up?

My position was that the political backing of our government would be needed by the State of Israel in the future as in the past. I would be necessary again and again to rally American public opinion in defense of the political rights of Israel. Just as the Israeli were not free as yet to demobilize because their security was not yet fully established, so must the Zionists of America not think of demobilizing for some time to come.

There were those who believed that the time had come to substitute ^{the} years quiet back-door "shtadlanut" which our Movement had to abandon/before to get results. I cautioned against it. The interest of the State of Israel in Washington until peace was fully established would have to be looked after not only by the official representatives of the State of Israel in Washington who have a competence and authority all of their own and in whose sphere of action we should not meddle, but also by the continued, alerted and directed solicitude of organized American Jewry. It is as citizens of the United States that we had the right to be heard, and our representations would be helpful in the future as in the past. It is clear that all such representation should be made by a body such as the American Zionist Emergency Council which is an American body speaking for American citizens, and not by the Jewish Agency, the propriety of whose intervention might well be challenged, now that the State was established.

Certain political circles in Washington who were never too favorable to us had, under duress, accepted the fact of the existence of the State of Israel. What they wanted to see now was the quick liquidation of Zionism on the American scene so that the organized public opinion which so frequently in the past exercised a restraining influence upon their hostile maneuvers in the State Department would not have to be reckoned with in the future. They were opposed to what they call Zionist pressure on American foreign policy. Other pressures from oil interests, from missionary and educational circles, from Arab or British sources, were by them not considered pressures.

It was clear that much will yet have to be done in the purely political field to make secure what has been achieved with so much effort and sacrifice. The liquidation of organized Zionist activities at this time would simply play into the hands of those forces in Washington which ^{had} ~~have~~ never been friendly to us. This is the position which I took.

Similarly, ~~on~~ the question "should the whole Zionist Movement wind up now that the State of Israel is established?", I answered in the negative. Hardly was the ink dry upon the proclamation which set up the State of Israel, when a veritable chorus of voices from many directions in Jewry began to clamor with varying degrees of stridency for the immediate dissolution of the Zionist Movement. Some had already published an obituary and pronounced the

eulogy . I was reminded of an item which appeared some years ago in a humorous journal: "As to Prince Kropotkin's denial of his being dead, we deplore his tendency to rush into print without first fully ascertaining the facts."

All th former enemies of Zionism who had swallowed hard th bitter pills of the establishment of the State of Israel, now attempted to compensate themselves for their defeat by venting their spleen upon the Zionist Movement and by calling for its immediate disappearance. Joining in this chorus were the spokesmen of certain national Jewish organizations which had been elbowed out of the centre of Jewish life during the years of the Zionists' triumphant march to victory and who now hankered to get back into a dominant position to which neither their numbers, their achievements or their representative character entitled ^d them.

Within a few hours after the establishment of the State, when nearly every major political and economic issue was as yet unsettled, the Zionist Organization which had hardly caught its breath after the colossal political efforts in which it had been engaged, was peremptorily challenged to produce forthwith a detailed program for re-organization, re-orientation and future action, or else to put its head on the block to be decapitated. When the answer was made that considerable time must elapse before a great movement could make the necessary re-adjustments to radically changed conditions, that

it should make them only after the implications of such changes had been carefully studied, and that precipitate action was neither indicated nor judicious, Zionist leaders were broadly denounced as obtuse people who did not grasp that a great revolution has taken place in Jewish life and did not have the sense to realize that something new had really occurred. They were concerned only with hanging on to positions, power and organizational apparatus.

No nation liquidates its minimum defense forces or closes down its departments of national defense even after victory in war had been achieved, for it is realized that the idyllic conditions of permanent peace and security exist nowhere in the world.

There was a continuing need for American Jewry to remain organized and alerted in order to protect the new State of Israel, which had certainly not yet sailed ^{smoothly} ~~through~~ the broken seas of political dangers into a safe harbor. As far as its economic problems were concerned, their solution had, in a sense, just begun. If Zionism meant "kibbutz galuyot", the in-gathering, not necessarily of all the Jews of the world, but certainly ~~of~~ all who wish to go there or who had to go there, ^{in order to} ~~and~~ the program of transporting, settling and rehabilitating them, then the year 1948 witnessed not the consummation of the Zionist ideal, but only a substantial beginning. It would take years to reach ^{the} ~~the~~ ultimate goal -- many years.

This program of the in-gathering would require a constant, sustained and costly effort on the part of world Jewry. This effort would have to be made in the face of the growing demands of Jewish communities outside of Israel for their own cultural, religious, and philanthropic institutions, which ~~will claim~~^{ed} and justly so, increasing attention. World Jewry -- and that means, by and large, American Jewry -- ~~will~~^{must} have to be kept organized and educated, for this exacting and long-range program of adequate assistance to Israel. I knew of no body in American Jewry that ~~is~~^{was} better equipped and organized to give leadership to the accomplishment of this historic task, this second phase of our national redemption, than the Zionists who so magnificently helped in the performance of the first task -- the creation of the State of Israel.

Non-Zionists, to be sure, would help, even as some non-Zionists helped in the final stages of the political struggle, although some of these non-Zionists ~~now~~^{now} choose to forget ~~now~~ and would like the world to forget how much they interfered with the efforts in behalf of the establishment of the Jewish State at a time when the Zionists were struggling to unite American Jewry in its behalf, how many stumbling blocks they put in the way of our political work in Washington, and how much residual mischief has been left in our communities by their oppositional activities. But the Jewish people will not hold it against them. We welcomed their help in the final phases of our struggle although even then they had to be carefully watched. There was one moment on the very eve of May 14, 1948, when these well-intentioned non-Zionists, ~~had~~^{had} with the aid of some Zionist leaders -- who also had to be watched, so glib were they, so accommodating and so unpredictable -- ~~had~~ almost succeeded in indefinitely

postponing the proclamation of the State of Israel and in substituting the new trusteeship for Palestine which was sponsored by our State Department. . .

But while recognizing and welcoming the services and cooperation of all Jews in the economic phase of our work, it would be a serious blunder, I maintained, to entrust the leadership and direction of this work into the hands of those who even at this late hour, when the political objectives of Zionism had been achieved, still preferred to be known as non-Zionists. This is not called for by any consideration of fund-raising. The backbone of the givers and the workers in our communities in United Jewish Appeal campaigns were not the non-Zionists. Eastern European Jews had largely taken over the leadership everywhere. By and large, they were the leaders; they were the givers; they were the workers. And they certainly did not belong to the non-Zionist constellation. In certain quarters, however, the faction was still kept alive that the success of a campaign depended upon having out in the front on the national level the glamorous name or names of some non-Zionists, men of means who themselves need not even set the example of generous giving, but the sheer magic of whose names automatically inspired others to give. Some of these non-Zionists had been converted quite recently not to Zionism, but to the inevitability of the State of Israel. They wished to have nothing to do with the Zionist Movement in the United States. They insisted upon direct connections with the State of Israel. There were those in the official circles of the State of Israel who, for reasons best known to

themselves, welcomed this direct connection, even though it meant by-passing the organized Zionist bodies in the United States which had, in the past and would alone in the future, bear the heat and the brunt of the long, sustained effort in behalf of Israel. . . ."

Again, I maintained, Zionism had always stood for a specific and positive way of Jewish life, not only for the Jewish people in a re-established Jewish State, but also for Jewish communities throughout the world. It stood for an affirmative Jewish life, of rich cultural content, of deep spiritual values, of a life linked historically with the past and geographically with the Jewish communities throughout the world. It was opposed to assimilation or to what is now euphemistically called integration, which means not the eager and active participation in the total life of the countries where Jews are citizens, which Zionists have always advocated, but submergence and self-assimilation. Zionism was always opposed to the definition of Judaism as a church and of Jews as members of a Mosaic persuasion.

I knew of no organized group in Jewish life that had so consistently throughout the years worked for this program of positive Jewish life and of Jewish survival as that of the Zionists. The need for such a body to continue to defend this Jewish way of life would be as great in the future as in the past, if not greater.

Zionism should, therefore, remain organized to meet this challenge because it is best equipped to do so. It should be the catalyst for all elements in Jewish life which are interested in purposeful Jewish survival. It need

not duplicate their activities, but it could stimulate, guide and coordinate them. It took us many hard years of struggle to establish the ascendance of these ideas in the Jewish communities of the world. We should not lose it now by default.

Not all Zionists agreed with this point of view. Foremost among those who adopted an opposite view-point was Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. He felt that now that the State was established, there was no longer any need for a strong Zionist Movement. The Zionist Movement was the necessary scaffolding for the building of the State. Now that the State was built, the scaffolding was no longer needed. A Zionist is only ^{the} one who settles in Israel. All others may be friends of Israel but should not regard themselves as Zionists. This position, he maintained consistently and vocally through the years and, in his capacity as Prime Minister of the State, did much, quite unintentionally, I am sure, to undermine the World Zionist Movement.

When Mr. Ben-Gurion visited the United States in April, 1951, to launch the campaign for Bonds for Israel, he studiously avoided reference to Zionism and the Zionist Movement and on the eve of his departure, he addressed a Zionist meeting in New York in which he told the Zionists that they cannot speak for American Jewry as a whole, that there are non-Zionists who do not want the Zionist Movement to stand "as a wall between them and Israel", and that the Zionists should confine themselves in their work to education and Aliyah (immigration to Israel).

He flatly refused to share Israel's sovereignty with the World Zionist Movement -- although no one in the Movement had asked for it! Some Zionists, he declared, have not as yet recognized the State of Israel. It is high time that they should. This was said to the very men who had been instrumental in bringing about the establishment and the recognition of the State. . . . American Zionists can advise and even criticize Israel, he declared, but have no right to issue orders to it. The New York Times on November 6, 1949, featured on the front page a news dispatch from Tel-Aviv with the sensational headlines: "Ben-Gurion Warps Foreign Zionists -- Assails Leaders Abroad Who Try to Sway Israel Policy -- Silver Held Target." These Mapai party slogans, felicitous neither in their timing nor expressions had been the stock-in-trade of the opponents of the Zionist Organization of America since 1948 and were, of course, aimed at myself.

I was in South Africa at the time, in connection with the Jubilee celebration of the Jewish National Fund. I was asked by the Jewish press to comment on Mr. Ben-Gurion's definition of a Zionist. I said:

"I do not think that that was ever the definition of a Zionist -- and I do not see why we need a new one at this time. A Zionist has always been one who is interested in helping towards the upbuilding of a Jewish State in Palestine. It was never part of Zionist propaganda or the Zionist credo that a Zionist must necessarily settle in Israel. I am not called upon to accept this new definition of Zionism from Mr. Ben-Gurion. There was a quite adequate definition before his time."

Thus, there existed, a sharp divergence in our points-of-view about the future role of the Zionist Movement. But there were also other more down-to-earth party considerations which led to conflicts between Mr. Ben-Gurion and me.

Ben-Gurion's party, the Mapai, wanted to control the government of Israel and determine its future political and economic policies, as indeed it has done ever since the establishment of the State. The Mapai's economic platform was socialistic, although not radical or inflexible. Through the years it has known how to make the necessary adjustments to conditions as they arose and it has invited and stimulated private investments and enterprises in the country.

But from the beginning it looked upon the party of the General Zionists in Israel as a most serious rival and competitor. The General Zionists' party was ^{now} ~~mapai~~- socialistic and represented largely the business and professional elements in the country. The members of the Zionist Organization in America, composed, in the main, of middle-class business and professional people, were in sympathy with the General Zionists Party of Israel and were loosely identified with it, not in as direct a way as the Poale Zion in America were identified with the Mapai, or the Mizrachi in America with the Mizrachi party in Israel.

The General Zionists favored the encouragement of private initiative in industry, trade and agriculture, and called for a unified national school

system in the country. Generally speaking, they represented ideas which were common to the American economic system and the American educational pattern.

I was a General Zionist and because of the prominence of the position which I occupied, I came to be regarded as an asset to the General Zionist Party in Israel, and correspondingly a threat to the political position of the Mapai. Had the Z. O. A. membership been largely laborite instead of "liberal centrist", all the difficulties and disputes which were to follow would not have arisen.

No long after the State was established, elections were held for a national Constituent assembly (The Knesset) and as the date set for the election, January 25, 1949, approached, electioneering began in earnest and rapidly gained in intensity. The General Zionists in Israel quite naturally pointed to the political achievements of their friends in the United States. The Mapai, quite as naturally, found it necessary to disparage them. . . . And so politics bedeviled our relationship. Ben-Gurion, as the official leader of the Mapai, and I, as the unofficial leader of General Zionism in America, thus drifted into discord and misunderstandings. Politically, both in theory and method, we were not far apart. We were both known as maximalists, activists, and -- ; stubborn. I admired the very dynamic and courageous leadership which Ben-Gurion exhibited during the critical years of the founding of the state. In the hour of decision he remained firm. He did not waver in his convictions and he did not under-rate the determination of the Yishuv to fight for its national redemption. But he was more of a Party man than I was, and all too often, he judged situations and evaluated personalities narrowly in relation to his Party's interests -- to what was good for the Party.

Rumors were soon circulated by friends and foes alike that I intended to go to Israel and place myself at the head of the General Zionist Party to challenge the position of the Mapai and of Mr. Ben-Gurion. Other rumors had it that I wanted to become the President of the World Zionist Organization, and to inject myself in the affairs of the State of Israel. There was never a scintilla of truth in all these rumors. I never entertained any political ambitions. This was not my cup of tea. I was a Rabbi and intended to remain to the end in a profession which was dear to me. In a critical hour I had been summoned by the Movement and given a political assignment. I thank God that the mission on which I was sent, was successfully accomplished. If there was any additional work that the Movement wished me to undertake, I was prepared to do so provided the circumstances were such as would give me a congenial atmosphere in which to work. I was not prepared to fight Zionists in order to serve Zionism, and I never expressed nor entertained any desire to hold any office in the government of Israel.

It took some years before my position was finally understood by Mr. Ben-Gurion and his friends in the Mapai, and then they visibly relaxed towards me. Some even came to like me. . . . The partisan antagonisms and mutual recriminations began to abate in 1952, when the General Zionists joined the government coalition in Israel, and especially after the election of President Eisenhower in the fall of 1952. This removed from the arsenal of criticism the argument which had frequently been employed against me that I was persona non grata at the White House. . . .

In the eyes of certain politically oriented American Zionists, a leader's position depended on whether he was persona grata at the White House. When President Truman was elected in 1948, my stock slumped. When Dwight Eisenhower was elected President in 1952, my stock rose sharply. Actually, my Zionist achievements under the Eisenhower administration, such as they were, were far less substantial than under the Truman administration, though my personal contacts with the Eisenhower administration were far more frequent and pleasant. Important national policies and decisions are simply not arrived at the "personality" level... Furthermore, the attitude of the State Department under John Foster Dulles was quite as vacillating toward Israel as it had been under Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, or Marshall. At times it seemed to be definitely following a policy of Arab appeasement, reminiscent of earlier days.

I sensed the cooling off towards me on the part of the friends of the Mapai in the United States -- the Poale Zion -- as early as 1946, when elections for the World Zionist Congress of that year were held. The Poale Zion had backed me up solidly right along and its spokesmen had praised and defended me. But now Party interests asserted themselves. The Poale Zion naturally wanted to capture as many delegates to the Congress as possible, and it suddenly appeared advantageous to them to attack Dr. Silver who headed the Z. O. A. list and, in contrast, to extol David Ben-Gurion, who headed their list.

At the 1946 Congress, the Mapai delegates had voted by and large for Dr. Weizmann's policies. I led the fight against them. This again did not generate any great affection for me. Likewise, my failure to denounce the Irgun, Mapai's ^Abete noire in the resistance movement in categorical terms, also rankled.

And so a campaign was launched by friends of the Mapai in Israel and by the Poale Zion (Labor Party) in America to "reduce my stature", as it were, to take power and control out of my hands and to transfer them to others who posed no threat to the Party.

What finally led to a major set-to and to my resignation as Chairman of the American Section of the Jewish Agency was, on the surface, a disagreement over fund-raising activities in the United States. But this was not the real issue. It ran much deeper. It concerned the basic attitude of the leaders in the government of Israel toward the Zionist Movement in the United States and towards the authority and prestige of its spokesmen. It also involved the effectiveness of my own future leadership. I was made to feel that I did not have the full confidence and backing of the men in Israel who now constituted the government of Israel, without which I could not carry on with my work.