

TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

A Statement by the Christian Council on Palestine

January 1946

70 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

Source & provenance

Source: Truth about Palestine — Christian Council on Palestine, January 1946 (32 pp.)

Collection: Missionary Research Library pamphlets, Columbia University Libraries

Internet Archive ID: [ldpd_11077604_000](https://archive.org/details/ldpd_11077604_000)

Archive URL: https://archive.org/details/ldpd_11077604_000

Full text (OCR): https://archive.org/stream/ldpd_11077604_000/ldpd_11077604_000_djvu.txt

Columbia CLIO: <http://clio.columbia.edu/catalog/11077604>

Status: Public domain (no visible copyright notice)

Note: Transcribed from the Internet Archive ABBYY OCR. Mechanical scan artifacts (e.g. "faa"→"fact", "conneaion"→"connection", stray marks, a few mangled names) have been corrected to the printed reading. No content, wording, names, quotations, statistics, or footnotes were abridged, reworded, or reordered.

THE Christian Council on Palestine numbers almost three thousand adherents and represents a not inconsiderable body of opinion among the Christian clergy. While our membership is predominantly Protestant, it includes a substantial number of Roman Catholics. Our aim is to formulate a broadly Christian attitude toward Palestine and Zionism. We are committed to a positive promotion of the primary objective of the Balfour Declaration and of the League of Nations' Mandate for Palestine which incorporates it — namely, the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine without prejudicing the civil and religious rights or the economic well-being of the non-Jewish communities.

OUR POSITION ON ZIONISM

Our strong support of the Zionist cause is based on our firm conviction that there should be one place on earth where the Jews, as individuals and as a people, may live the type of life that is for them spiritually and culturally most satisfying and where they would be liberated from the disabilities and suppressions attaching to the status of minorities. For historical reasons — as the Mandate for Palestine has recognized — that place can be no other than Palestine. A national home for the Jewish people would be of great significance, quite apart from the present humanitarian need. In this dark hour of Jewish history, help to the Zionist cause becomes absolutely imperative to provide for the remnant of Israel spared from extermination in Europe a haven of refuge for the soul as well as for the body.

The Christian Council on Palestine believes in the essential validity of Zionism as a political and moral idea. We are not, however, officially committed to any particular formula of the Zionist purpose. Some of our leading members believe that the "Jewish Commonwealth" conception alone offers the necessary directive; others, though agreeing in the substance of the Zionist aim, lay less emphasis on the significance of this formulation. There is basic agreement among us on the following major points:

1. That the gates of Palestine should be forever open to Jewish immigration so that all Jews who need to, or wish to, should be permitted to enter their ancestral homeland "as of right and not on sufferance."
2. That all possible aid of a legal, moral and financial character should be extended by the United Nations to encourage the Jews to develop the economic absorptive capacity of the country to its maximum.
3. That no political obstruction should be placed in the way of the Jews becoming a majority of the population of Palestine if they respond in sufficient numbers and if the developed economic possibilities of Palestine permit.

THE 1939 WHITE PAPER AN INHUMAN DOCUMENT

The convictions and purpose of the Christian Council on Palestine thus make us unalterably opposed to the 1939 White Paper, issued by the Chamberlain government and still the basis of British rule in Palestine. The White Paper limits the Jews to their present proportion of less than one-third of the population and thus reduces their status to that of a permanent minority. It limits their right to purchase land to an area comprising only about five per cent of the total land area of Palestine, and surrounds their residence in other parts of Palestine with restrictive, discriminatory regulations. It proposes in the near future to set up a Palestine State which, in view of the fact that the Arabs are by constitution to remain a majority, would in fact be an Arab State.

The 1939 White Paper repudiates the essence of the Balfour Declaration which successive British Governments declared to be the unalterable policy of the British Government in Palestine. It stands in defiance of the unanimous opinion rendered by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations which declared it to be in contravention of the Mandate as interpreted throughout all the years of its existence. It violates sacred principles of international law and democratic doctrine in that it discriminates against the Jews on grounds of descent and creed. In the light of the tragic Jewish situation in the world today, the British White Paper of 1939 is nothing less than an inhuman document.

PALESTINE CAN AID IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE

Zionism is not only of urgent import to the Jews; it offers substantial help in solving the problems that face Central European countries in their attempt to rebuild their life after the war. A realistic confrontation of the problems of reconstruction reveals a series of complex, deep-rooted social-economic problems that cannot be wished away by good-will talk. President Eduard Benes, leader of a country where liberal ideas have found noteworthy expression, and himself a genuine friend of the Jews, has been impelled recently to urge: "The establishment of a Jewish Home in Palestine is a necessity for all nations, because anti-Semitism is a regrettable but practically inevitable social phenomenon."

We do not regard Zionism as a complete solution of the Jewish problem; a complete solution involves granting the Jews complete equality of rights in all countries. We are not defeatists, for we hope that in the course of the next generation there will be a fuller implementation of the equality of rights for Jews as well as for all creeds and races all over the world. But, in the light of a realistic analysis of the facts as they are, Zionism must be regarded as an indispensable factor in any solution of the Jewish problem. No real attack can be made on the Jewish problem without full use of the opportunities afforded by present-day Palestine for the absorption of a large Jewish immigration. No permanent solution of the Jewish problem in its spiritual and cultural as well as its material phases can be achieved without the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

JEWISH DEVELOPMENT BENEFICIAL TO ARABS

We are convinced, as a result of a most careful sifting of the evidence, that the Jewish development in Palestine has not been either hostile or harmful to Arab interests and aspirations. The Arabs as a people have ample opportunities for national development in vast areas of the Levant, in Arabia, in Egypt and in North Africa. In Palestine itself all authorities agree that the Jewish achievements have led to a degree of progress unprecedented in the whole of Palestine history and that the Arabs of all classes, as well as the Jews, have been the beneficiaries. The Zionist program in its Jewish Commonwealth formulation, as well as in previous definitions of purpose, assures not only equality of rights for all regardless of faith or descent, but also guarantees a full and unhampered cultural and religious development for the Moslem and Christian communities.

RECENT MISSTATEMENTS IN CHURCH BULLETINS ON PALESTINE

We thus favor Zionism on practical, humanitarian, moral, and international grounds. Our deepest motivation in supporting Zionism is a belief that the Christian conscience is involved. It is because we are sensitive to the ethical and religious aspects of the situation that we issue this statement. Three documents recently issued by Church groups are opposed to our position. These publications are as follows:

1. "Conflict Over Palestine," issued October 7, 1944, by the Information Service of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

2. "Dilemma in Palestine," issued November 1944 by the Committee on Work Among the Moslems of the Foreign Missions Conference, and written by Dr. Glora Wysner.

3. The recent statement issued by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America (reprinted at length in the October 27, 1945 issue of Information Service of the Federal Council), the product of committees appointed by the Federal Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, and the Home Missions Council.

The Christian Council on Palestine submits that these documents are partisan presentations of the Palestine question tending to create an attitude prejudicial to Zionism. Although "Conflict Over Palestine" purported to be an unbiased analysis which would "render no verdict," important omissions and doubtful interpretations make it an instrument easily used to support anti-Zionist viewpoints. "Dilemma in Palestine" evades criticism by stating only the Arab side, on the pretext that the Jewish point of view is already well known; it thus indirectly identifies the Committee on Work Among the Moslems with the Arab position. The joint memorandum published by the Foreign Missions Conference includes vague statements and gross distortions; its main purpose seems to be to divert attention from the part that Palestine can play in giving immediate help to the displaced Jews of Europe.

EQUIVOCAL EXPRESSIONS OF CHRISTIAN GOOD-WILL NOT ENOUGH

The documents are replete with expressions of good-will, and copious tears are shed for Jewish suffering. In a certain emotional and sentimental sense these expressions are doubtless sincere. But is it surprising — in the light of the inferences drawn — that these sweet words are regarded by the Jewish people as new examples of Christian hypocrisy, since in final analysis the documents whitewash the British policy of the 1939 White Paper and support without reservation the determination of the Arab League to keep the doors of Palestine closed to the Jews? Nowhere in these three memoranda is there any suggestion that Palestine should be opened for any Jewish immigration whatsoever. We submit that this is not the time for equivocal declarations of good-will. It is the time for definite action that will translate the oft-pledged Christian sympathy for the Jews into genuine, practical justice.

In the following pages we have summarized the major anti-Zionist allegations and stated what we believe to be the true situation. Besides summarizing the documents mentioned, we have included some arguments more fully developed in Professor W. E. Hocking's pamphlet, Arab Nationalism and Political Zionism, which, though more straightforward and concrete in its presentation, nevertheless represents a similar viewpoint. We much regret that we are forced to make a public issue of our differences with the church organizations named above. But we feel it our duty to correct misstatements made by the Foreign Missions Conference and to do our part in counteracting the persistent propaganda which has already had its harmful effect in supporting the policy of further delay involved in the new Anglo-American investment.

By their bulletins, these church organizations play into the hands of extremist Arab political leaders. Though voicing drastic criticisms against the Zionists, they remain silent on the terrorist activities of the Mufti of Jerusalem, now revealed as a full collaborator of Hitler. These church bodies fail to see the dangers of a rising fascism in the Middle East and the threat of a resurgent Moslem fanaticism which would drive Christian influence out of the Arab world.

HENRY A. ATKINSON, Chairman
Reinhold Niebuhr, Treasurer
Carl Hermann Voss, Executive Secretary

The following members of the Christian Council on Palestine are in complete accord with the executive officers and have asked that their names be attached to this memorandum:

Prof. James Luther Adams
Prof. William Foxwell Albright
The Rev. Dr. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard
The Rev. Emory S. Bucke
The Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky
The Rev. Clark Walker Cummings
Dean Raimundo de Ovies
The Rev. C. S. Detweiler
The Rev. Richard E. Evans
Father George B. Ford
The Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
Prof. S. Ralph Harlow
The Rev. Harvey W. Hollis
The Rev. Vernon H. Holloway
The Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes
The Rev. Dr. J. Percival Huget
The Rev. David R. Hunter
The Rev. Thomas J. Jones
Prof. Henry [OCR incomplete]
The Rev. Dr. Arnold F. Keller
The Rev. George Ogden Kirk
The Rev. Donald G. Lothrop
Prof. Halford E. Luccock
The Rev. Dr. J. A. MacCallum
Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Prof. Francis E. McMahon
The Rev. Clifton Macon
The Rev. Dr. Norman V. Peale
The Rev. Leslie T. Pennington
The Rev. Wendell Phillips
The Rev. Raymond M. O'Brien
The Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling
The Rev. Paul M. Schroeder
Dr. Guy Emery Sipler
The Rev. Dr. Harold Paul Sloan
Prof. Paul Tillich
Pres. Harry Trust
Nelson Wieman

The American Palestine Committee (with which the Christian Council on Palestine cooperates in local communities as the American Christian Palestine Committee) is in complete agreement with the statements of the "Truth About Palestine." This pamphlet is specifically sponsored by the following:

Senator Robert F. Wagner, Chairman, American Palestine Committee Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas, Secretary Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, Chairman, Executive Council Dean Howard M. LeSourd, Director

CONTENTS

Page

1. Pretense that Palestine Was Promised Both to the Arabs and the Jews 8
2. Evasion of the Feisal-Weizmann Agreement 9
3. Whittling Down the Balfour Declaration 11
4. Nonsense About Arabs' Descent from the Original Inhabitants of Palestine 13
5. Soft-Pedaling Arab Political Intransigence 14

6. Attempted Denial of Arab Benefits from Jewish Settlement	15
7. The Canard About Displacement of the Arab Cultivator	17
8. Deliberate Underestimation of Palestine's Absorptive Capacity	18
9. Romanticizing Arab Life	20
10. Insinuations Against Jewish Nationalism	21
11. Misrepresentation of Jewish Opinion on Zionism and the Jewish Commonwealth	23
12. Surfeit of Christian Sentiment for the Jews but Denial of Real Help -	25
13. The Problem of United States Involvement	27

1. PRETENSE THAT PALESTINE WAS PROMISED BOTH TO THE ARABS AND THE JEWS

Much is made of pledges given by the British during the First World War, in which it is alleged, Palestine was included as one of the areas where His Majesty's Government promised to support Arab independence. The most important of these British "promises" is supposed to have been made in the Hussein-McMahon correspondence.

WITH THE EXCEPTION of the Hussein-McMahon correspondence, all the documents referred to were issued after the Balfour Declaration. None mentioned Palestine, although other countries in which the British promised to support Arab independence, in part or in full, are specifically named. Since the Balfour Declaration was a public pronouncement, the omission of Palestine from the documents was clearly intentional and supports the British contention that Palestine was never included in the declarations to the Arabs.

In the Hussein-McMahon correspondence, the British, in order to gain Arab aid against the Turks, pledged themselves to support Arab independence in certain of the Arab portions of the Ottoman Empire. This secret correspondence consisted of a series of letters exchanged in the summer and fall of 1915 and completed in January 1916, more than a year before the issuance of the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1917. If the agreement had included Palestine, then the Balfour Declaration would indeed have been a violation of a previous pledge given to the Arabs.

However, the term "Palestine" is never mentioned in the correspondence, either by McMahon or by Hussein. Certain areas were specifically excluded from the pledge on the ground that French interests were involved and that they were not wholly Arab. Sir Henry McMahon has put himself on record on two occasions (in 1922 in a letter to the Foreign Office, and in 1937 in a public communication to The Times of London). He asserted that he definitely intended that the region now called Palestine should be excluded from the area of Arab independence, and that he had every reason to believe that Hussein understood this at the time of the negotiations. Without exception, all the British officials associated with the negotiations have corroborated McMahon's testimony, and all the British Foreign Secretaries, including outstanding figures in British political life — Churchill, the Duke of Devonshire, Ormsby-Gore — have insistently held that there is no basis for the Arab claim to Palestine.

Before the 1939 White Paper was issued, the British appointed a joint committee of Arabs and Britishers to examine the correspondence. The British committee members unanimously decided that while the language of the agreement may not have been so specific as was thought at the time, "on a proper construction of the correspondence Palestine was in fact excluded." This view was underscored by the Lord Chancellor, the chairman, who held that "the correspondence as a whole not only did exclude Palestine but should have been understood to do so."

The Lord Chancellor pointed out, moreover, that not only the evidence in the correspondence itself but other circumstances precluded any undertaking by the British Government to consider Palestine part of the Arab domain. Among the points emphasized were: (a) Palestine had a very special position as the Holy Land of the three great religions; (b) it contained a great many buildings and institutions belonging to non-Arabs; (c) the country was not purely Arab as far as ethnic constituents were concerned; (d) Great Britain had practical interests in Palestine because of its proximity to the Suez Canal.

The Arab attitude during the Peace Conference at Paris further confirms the British view. The Arab delegation was headed by Hussein's son, the Emir Feisal, who had led the Arab revolt with T. E. Lawrence. Both in writing and orally, Feisal explicitly agreed to the exclusion of Palestine from the Arab domain. Testifying before the Council of Ten, he declared: "Palestine, for its universal character, should be left on one side for the consideration of all parties interested." With Lawrence acting as intermediary, Feisal signed an agreement with Dr. Chaim Weizmann, leader of the Zionists, in which the Emir gave explicit recognition to the Balfour Declaration.

Neither did Hussein, at the time of the Peace Conference, lay any claim to Palestine. According to Winston Churchill, the Arabs first made the claim to Palestine in a conversation which, as Foreign Secretary, he had with Emir Feisal in January 1921, five years after the conclusion of the correspondence. On that occasion, Churchill asserts, the Emir accepted the British point of view when it was explained that Palestine had been excluded from the pledge. Obviously, the Arab claim to Palestine, under the Hussein-McMahon agreement, was an afterthought.

It is worth noting that these "dealings" with the Arabs were completely outside the knowledge of American officials. The negotiations for the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations Mandate, on the other hand, were carried on with the full knowledge and approval of the United States Government. Furthermore, the Permanent Mandates Commission completely outlawed any consideration of these "negotiations" with the Arabs because they were in the category of "secret treaties." Thus, so far as the United States is concerned, Palestine was most certainly not a "twice-promised land."

To summarize: On the one hand is the Arab unilateral claim, unsupported by outside testimony; on the other hand is the Balfour pledge, publicly given and acknowledged and recognized by the community of nations.

2. EVASION OF THE FEISAL-WEIZMANN AGREEMENT

The Arabs have tried to evade the Feisal-Weizmann agreement, in which Emir Feisal, leader of the Arab delegation at the Peace Conference, undertook to cooperate with the Zionists in carrying out the Balfour Declaration. An attempt has been made to interpret the agreement away by representing it as providing for a small immigration into a Palestine enclosed "within a dominant Arab state." Furthermore, it is alleged that a reservation made by Feisal voided the agreement.

THE AGREEMENT was signed by the Emir Feisal, representing the Arab Kingdom of the Hejaz (over which his father, Hussein, was the recognized ruler), and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, acting for the Zionist Organization. Any reading of the agreement absolutely precludes the interpretation that it implied only a small settlement of Jews in a Palestine under Arab control. The agreement speaks definitely of "the Arab State and Palestine," provides that "Arab and Jewish duly accredited agents shall be established and maintained in the respective territories," and emphasizes that in the constitution and administration of Palestine, all measures adopted should guarantee "carrying into effect the British

Govern- ment's declaration of November 2, 1917." It explicitly provides that "all necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate the immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale."

The Arab-Jewish entente was confirmed several months later in a communication of Emir Feisal to Professor Felix Frankfurter (now Justice of the United States Supreme Court), who was then in Paris as representative of the Zionist Organization. The letter, drafted with the aid of Lawrence and signed by the Emir, expressed the most cordial sympathy with the Zionist movement. It declared that the Arab deputation in Paris was fully acquainted with the Zion- ist Organization's proposals submitted to the Peace Conference and regarded them as "mod- erate and proper." The Zionist proposals are on record; they included the Jewish claim to Palestine on the basis of historical connection, and clearly provided for free immigration into and colonization in Palestine.

When the Arabs supported the Balfour Declaration and the Zionist aspirations at this period they were at the same time supporting the British. They counted upon the British to help them secure independence outside of the Arabian Peninsula. The British claim to Palestine involved the obligation of fulfilling the Balfour Declaration as approved by the Allies. If Pal- estine had not gone to the British, it would have been claimed by the French, who were opposing Feisal and were attempting to limit both the Arab area and Arab independence in the Levant. Besides, the Arabs then needed all possible help, and any moral support they might get from the Jews at the Peace Conference, and possible financial assistance in the future to develop their countries economically, was so much additional advantage. The Arab agreement with the Zion- ists was therefore, as indicated by Lawrence's presence at the arrangements, part of their en- tente with the British.

Feisal's reservation appears as a postscript in Arabic, translated into English by Lawrence. It states that he would keep the agreement only if Arab independence were fully established in accordance with a memorandum he had submitted to the British Foreign Office; if, however, changes were made, he would not be answerable. In other words, what this reservation plainly says, in the succinct words of the Palestine Royal Commission: "If King Hussein and Emir Feisal secured their big Arab state, they would concede little Palestine to the Jews." Thus the reservation made by Feisal, instead of weakening the force of the agreement, obviously strengthens it. For if the original intention was that Palestine should be part of an Arab domain, and immigration permitted only under Arab control, clearly no reservation would have been necessary.

At the San Remo settlement, in 1920, the British came to an agreement with the French that gave to the Arabs less than what they could have expected under the Hussein-McMahon un- derstanding. Had this arrangement stood, the Arabs would have had ground for maintaining that Feisal's reservation had not been respected. But after Churchill took charge of the Foreign Office, the British fulfilled their part of the original pledge; and Lawrence, who assisted in the final settlement, declared that, in the Churchill arrangements, the British gave the Arabs more than had been promised to them in the Hussein-McMahon correspondence.

The Arabs subsequently obtained independence in British-controlled Iraq, and more re- cently, with the help of the British, liberated themselves from French domination in Syria and Lebanon. The Arabs, then, have obtained a maximum fulfillment of Feisal's demands, but, their appetite grown by feeding, they have repudiated, under pressure of an extremist nation- alist movement, their earlier consent to the Balfour Declaration.

3. WHITTILING DOWN THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

The allegation is made that the Balfour Declaration envisaged only the establishment of a spiritual and cultural center, and that it did not imply Jews would be permitted to become a majority or a Jewish State set up in Palestine. These limitations, it is further alleged, were confirmed by the 1922 White Paper.

THE IDEA THAT THE Balfour Declaration originally authorized only a small spiritual and cultural center in Palestine is flatly contradicted by the record.

On November 10, 1917, the very day that the declaration first appeared in the public press, Cyril P. Scott, the renowned editor of the Manchester Guardian, who was generally regarded as reflecting the opinion of the British Cabinet, explained:

"What it means is that, assuming our military successes to be continued and the whole of Palestine brought securely under our control, then at the conclusion of peace our deliberate policy will be to encourage in every way in our power Jewish immigration, to give full security, and no doubt a large measure of local autonomy, to the Jewish immigrants, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State."

This was the general interpretation as stated by leading British statesmen and as reflected in the press.

The most authoritative statement comes from Lloyd George, who was British Prime Minister at the time the Balfour Declaration was issued. He repudiates the idea that the Jews were to be restricted to the status of a permanent minority in Palestine, and asserts unreservedly that Mr. Balfour and the members of the Cabinet meant the ultimate establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth:

"There has been a good deal of discussion as to the meaning of the words 'Jewish National Home' and whether it involved the setting up of a Jewish National State in Palestine. I have already quoted the words actually used by Mr. Balfour when he submitted the Declaration to the Cabinet for its approval. They were not challenged at the time by any member present, and 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 without reference to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants. 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 by the idea of a National Home 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 ensure that the Jews should 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."

Winston Churchill, the author of the 1922 White Paper, himself made clear that it did not modify the original intention of the Balfour Declaration. The Palestine Royal Commission Report (1937) points out: "Though the phraseology [of the 1922 White Paper] was clearly intended to conciliate, as far as might be possible, Arab antagonism to the National Home, there is nothing in it to prohibit the ultimate establishment of the Jewish State, and Mr. Churchill himself told us in evidence that no such prohibition was intended."

Again, when the Chamberlain Government tried to use the 1922 White Paper to justify its restrictions of Jewish immigration and land sales, Churchill declared, in his parliamentary address attacking the 1939 White Paper, that it was misleading to quote extensively from the 1922 White Paper without indicating what its chief paragraphs stated unequivocally, namely, that "a Jewish National Home will

be founded in Palestine," and that His Majesty's Government's declaration of November 1917 was "not susceptible of change."

There is incontrovertible evidence that the American Government, which participated in the formulation of the Balfour Declaration, also understood it to mean the ultimate establishment of a Jewish state. This is indicated in President Wilson's well-known pronouncement, made on March 2, 1919: "I am persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our government and our people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." This statement reflected the view of the body of American experts, known as the Commission of Inquiry, at the Peace Conference, which, two months before, in January 1919, made a comprehensive recommendation for the settlement of Near East problems. Full provision was made for Arab aspirations for independence in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Arabia. As to Palestine, the recommendation read:

"That the Jews be invited to return to Palestine and settle there, being assured by the Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the protection of the personal (especially the religious) and the property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish state in fact."

The report of the King-Crane Commission,* dispatched by Wilson in the spring of 1919 to study the problem of Middle East mandates, is sometimes cited as indicating a revision in American Government policy. The status of the commission was questionable. Its investigation was hasty and admittedly conducted in an atmosphere of intrigue. Two of the three experts on the commission disagreed with its conclusions, which were, in any case, impracticable. Professor Hocking has called it a "bootless commission," and has described its work in Syria as "mischievous."

The King-Crane report was delivered to the American delegation in Paris in its closing days and was never acted upon. That it had no effect on American policy is evidenced by the fact that the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1922 unanimously passed a joint resolution of the House and Senate favoring the establishment of a National Home for the Jewish people in terms of the Balfour Declaration. Moreover, the Anglo-American Convention of 1924 consented to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty in accordance with the terms of the mandate, which was recited in full. All Presidents since Wilson have given their support to the Zionist objectives.

** Dr. Henry Churchill King was President of Oberlin College and had directed the religious work of the Y.M.C.A. in France during the war. Charles R. Crane was a member of the Chicago firm of manufacturers of plumbing valves and fixtures. He is reputed to have been the dominating figure of the Commission and was known to be anti-Semitic as well as anti-Zionist. Ambassador Dodd in his Diary said of him: "Jews are anathema to him and he hopes to see them put in their place. His advice to me was, of course: 'Let Hitler have his way'."*

4. NONSENSE ABOUT ARABS' DESCENT FROM THE ORIGINAL INHABITANTS OF PALESTINE

The claim is made that the Arabs of Palestine are the rightful owners of the country because they are descended from the ancient inhabitants and thus have been in continuous possession over a long period of time — according to Ibn Saud, for 5,500 years.

THIS IS PURE NONSENSE. Palestine has from time immemorial been subject to inroads from the desert and invasion from the seacoast, and for the major part of its history has been racially and linguistically heterogeneous. Arabia, not Palestine, is the homeland of the Arabs. Arabic became the predominant language in the major part of western Palestine only at a relatively late date, namely, the

eighth century A.D. The ancient Canaanites were, of course, not Arab, either by race or by language; they spoke a dialect akin to Hebrew, and were later absorbed by the Israelites and other invading peoples.

By the beginning of modern times, the population of Palestine was greatly depleted. In the middle of the nineteenth century there were only about 300,000 inhabitants, while not more than 200,000 were settled Moslems. The Moslems included not only Arabs but Algerians, Kurds, Turks, Circassians, and many other nationalities. Some of those called Arabs because they spoke Arabic were descendants of the Crusaders, the Greeks, and the Romans, and undoubtedly also of the ancient Hebrews. The major part of the present Arab population are, therefore, descendants of a mixed population and of persons who came in during the last hundred years. One estimate holds that "75 per cent of the Arab population of Palestine are either immigrants themselves or descendants of persons who immigrated into Palestine during the last hundred years, for the most part after 1882."¹

The Palestine Arabs never ruled Palestine. ¹ Ernst Frankenstein, *Justice for My People*, p. 130.

In fact, Palestine had no independent existence under Arab rule. It was always a dependency of some larger domain. The Jews are the only people who ever made Palestine a national and political entity. After the destruction of the Jewish State by the Romans in 70 A.D., Palestine never again became sovereign. On the division of the Roman Empire, Palestine became part of the Byzantine dominions. It fell to Arab invaders about 640, but it remained in their possession for only a relatively short time. Thereafter it passed to successive foreign rulers who, though Arabic-speaking, were not Arabs. It fell under Damascus, Bagdad, Egypt, back to Bagdad, again to Egypt. Including this whole period, Palestine was under Arab rule for only about 430 years, until 1071, when it was subjected to conquerors who certainly were not Arabs, either by race or by language, e.g., Seljuk Turks, Crusaders, Mamelukes, and finally the Ottoman Turks, in 1517.

The Israelites and the Jews were the predominating element in Palestine from the thirteenth century B.C. to about the middle of the second century A.D., nearly 1,500 years. A considerable number of Jewish families have remained in continuous residence in Palestine from ancient times to this day. The term "historical connection," however, means more than occupancy; it refers also to the fact that the Jewish people never relinquished their connection with and claim to Palestine; Jerusalem and Zion have for two thousand years been cherished words, repeated in every prayer and in every event in the life of the Jews. As the Palestine Royal Commission noted: "If Christians have become familiar in the Bible with the physiognomy of the country and its place names and the events of two thousand years, the link that binds the Jews to Palestine is to them far closer and more intimate."

Palestine, under the Arabs, remained a small, backward, poverty-stricken province; it contributed nothing substantial either to the development of Arab civilization or to world culture. Palestine's significance in world history arises wholly from the fact that the Jews were once its inhabitants. The Jewish connection with Palestine, as seen by the Jews themselves, is thus only part of the story. Not less important is the fact that the Western world connects the Jews with Palestine's great contribution to Western civilization. The recognition by the League of Nations of the right of the Jews to reestablish their home in Palestine never would have come about if the eternal connection of Jewish history with Palestine were not deeply imbedded in the European conscience.

5. SOFT-PEDALING ARAB POLITICAL INTRANSIGENCE

The trouble, it is asserted, has been created by the "political Zionists" with their demand for the creation of a Jewish State. All the Arab objections stem from this primary source, since they fear

domination by the Jews. Once the Zionists yield the political objective, it is claimed, a reasonable solution based on mutual confidence might be achieved.

THE RECORD SHOWS that the Arab political leaders, not the Zionists, have obstructed a policy of conciliation and compromise. They are as much opposed to further Jewish immigration now as they are to establishment of a Jewish commonwealth ultimately. In testimony before the Palestine Royal Commission, the Mufti of Jerusalem stated there were already too many Jews in the country, and implied that when the Arabs obtained power, they would take care of the surplus through deportation. Essentially the same position was taken by Auni Bey Abdul-Hadi, leader of the Independence Party, who, in a recent statement reported in *The New York Times*, reiterated the intransigent Arab position of "not one more Jewish immigrant." Some Arab leaders have frankly declared that all the Jews who have come into Palestine since the Balfour Declaration should be deported.

The Arab leaders take the extreme position that "Palestine is an Arab country and must remain so." They declare that they are the "owners" of the country and that this alleged "ownership" gives them the absolute right of ruling. In 1923, when the British offered to set up an Arab agency analogous to the Jewish Agency, the Arab representatives curtly refused, asserting: "The Arab owners of the country cannot see their way to accept a proposal which tends to place them on an equal footing with the alien Jews." In 1936, in testimony before the Royal Commission, Auni Bey again stated that: "We do not accept the formula laid down by the Jews that there should be no domination by Jews over Arabs or by Arabs over Jews." It was his position that the Arabs had the right to dominate Palestine and could make no concessions.

Defenders of the Arab cause sedulously omit reference to Haj Amin al-Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem and former president of the Supreme Moslem Council, who dominated the political scene during the period of the mandate. He fomented riots, terrorized the Arab political opposition, and, when exiled, helped to organize the Rashid Ali al-Gailani pro-Nazi rebellion in Iraq, finally revealing himself as a collaborator of Hitler. The Palestine Royal Commission Report relates how the Mufti used the Supreme Moslem Council to promote his ambition to become dictator of Palestine; reveals the connection between the Council and the Arab Higher Committee which fomented the disturbances between 1936 and 1939; and points out that the Mufti so entrenched himself as president of the Council that no reform of its statutes could be made to diminish his power.

Some journalists, after a short visit to Palestine, have represented the Arabs and Jews as being at swords' points. But seasoned observers agree that, in day-to-day activities, Arab-Jewish relations are normal and friendly. When the Mufti was removed, the whole land breathed freely. Throughout the war there were no serious incidents in Arab-Jewish relations, and throughout the recent outbreaks in Egypt and Tripolitania, Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine remained calm. It is clear that while important political differences exist between Arabs and Jews, the intransigence, terror and violence have been initiated from above by those Arab leaders who are opposed to any compromise.

In marked contrast to the position of the Arab leaders, the attitude of the Zionist Organization has always been conciliatory. The Twelfth Zionist Congress in 1921 stressed "the determination of the Jewish people to live with the Arab people on terms of unity and mutual respect, and together with them to make the common home into a flourishing community, the upbuilding of which may assure to each of its peoples an undisturbed national development." Despite the rising tide of Arab antagonism, this conciliatory attitude has been maintained. The Jewish Agency is committed to the principle that all citizens shall have equal rights, and that full communal autonomy shall be enjoyed by the non-Jewish communities in the management of their religious, educational, and social

institutions. Moreover, the Jews have attempted to achieve rapprochement with the Arabs through the study of Arabic, organization of Arab unions, extension of medical services, etc.

The greater emphasis on the political objectives of Zionism in recent years is in part the result of Arab extremism. Arab attacks against the Jews and the uncompromising position of Arab political leaders have led to a growing conviction among rank-and-file Zionists, as well as among their leaders, that the Jews must become a majority in Palestine for self-protection and to secure the further development of the Jewish National Home. This conviction that the Jewish community must achieve the attributes of statehood was crystallized with the issuance of the 1939 White Paper. The Jewish people could not avoid the conclusion that the British Government was no longer to be trusted to carry out loyally the provisions of the mandate and that it was only too ready to subordinate its pledge to establish the Jewish National Home in Palestine to the changing contingencies of its imperialist policy.

6. ATTEMPTED DENIAL OF ARAB BENEFITS FROM JEWISH SETTLEMENT

The anti-Zionists belittle Jewish achievement in Palestine and attempt to prove that the Arab inhabitants have benefited little or nothing from the Jewish development.

DURING THE LAST twenty-five years, Palestine has been transformed from a poverty-stricken backwater of the Turkish Empire into an important economic center in the Middle East, on the way to a balanced modern economy of agriculture, industry, and commerce. Palestine's agriculture has moved from primitive cultivation to a system of intensive diversified farming. Palestine's industry, confined before the First World War to a few handicrafts, now produces a great variety of products. The waters of the Jordan have been harnessed to produce electric current for home and industrial use. The new harbor at Haifa, the third largest in the eastern Mediterranean, serves as a terminal for the oil pipe-line from Iraq. Land, sea, and air transportation are making Palestine a great entrepot between East and West.

All authorities, including Palestine Government officials and British investigating commissions not particularly favorable to Zionism, agree that Palestine's extraordinary progress has been due primarily to Jewish zeal and enterprise, and to the capital and labor brought in by Jewish immigrants. They point out unanimously that the Arab section of the population has benefited along with the Jews. The Arab-speaking population of Palestine has increased phenomenally — it has doubled in the last twenty-five years — from 600,000 to 1,200,000. In accordance with the report of the Palestine Partition Commission, the rate of natural increase of the Moslems in Palestine is one of the highest — if not the highest — recorded in the world. The extraordinary growth of the Arab population is primarily due to the reduction of the death rate, directly traceable to the better economic and health conditions introduced by the Jews.

The Palestine Royal Commission has pointed out that the progress in Palestine has benefited all classes of Arabs. The effendi landowners have sold land at high figures and, as a result, have been able to expand their cultivation and to invest in industries. Labor conditions have greatly improved. Wages have gone up. They are substantially above those paid in nearby Arab countries. Drought, low prices for agricultural products before the war, and long standing debt have prevented the fellahin or peasants from benefiting as much as other classes of Arabs, but they, too, have made considerable advances. Because of large revenues from Jewish sources, the government has been able to reduce rural taxation and to provide loans for agricultural development. The peasants, following Jewish

example, have improved their methods of cultivation; they have also been assisted by government through agricultural services provided, in the last analysis, through Jewish revenues.

On the subject of Arab progress in Palestine, the Palestine Royal Commission concludes:²

The large import of Jewish capital into Palestine has had a general fructifying effect on the economic life of the whole country.

The expansion of Arab industry and citriculture has been largely financed by the capital thus obtained.

Jewish example has done much to improve Arab cultivation, especially of citrus.

The employment of Arab labor has increased in urban areas, particularly in the ports, as a result of Jewish development and enterprise.

The reclamation and anti-malarial work undertaken in the Jewish colonies has benefited all Arabs in the neighborhood.

Public health and welfare institutions founded with Jewish funds primarily to serve the National Home have also served the Arab population.

The general beneficent effect of Jewish immigration on Arab welfare is evidenced by the fact that the increase in the Arab population and the improvement of its standard of life has been most marked in urban areas affected by the Jewish development.

² *Abbreviated from Palestine Royal Commission Report, Cmd. 5479, pp. 128-129.*

7. THE CANARD ABOUT DISPLACEMENT OF THE ARAB CULTIVATOR

A belief has been assiduously spread that Jewish immigration and land settlement have brought about considerable displacement of Arab agricultural workers and that if land sales to Jews are continued, it would lead to the expropriation of the peasants.

THESE ACCUSATIONS are made on the basis of unverified testimony given fifteen years ago by witnesses for the Arab case at the Shaw Commission (1929) and on carelessly worded statements made by Sir John Hope Simpson in his Report on Immigration, Land Settlement and Development (1930). Subsequent investigation by the British Government over a period of five years has proved the charge of displacement basically untrue. The original charge was that many thousands of Arab families had been displaced. Approximately 3,280 claims were actually presented, and of these only 664 were admitted as valid into the Government Register of "landless."³ Of the number admitted to the Register, only about one-half, i.e., 347 heads of families, accepted the government's offer of resettlement under superior conditions, the remaining families having obtained other employment which they preferred.

As against the very small number of Arab families which have left off agricultural occupation as a result of Jewish purchases, the Jewish development in Palestine has enabled tens of thousands of additional Arab families to cultivate the soil on a higher standard. There are some 300,000 more Arabs living on the land today than there were twenty-five years ago. Moreover, the rural Arabs are not being driven into the cities — agriculture is still the predominating occupation of the Moslem Arabs of Palestine, who comprise the main agricultural class. In 1942, about 73 per cent of the Moslem Arab population were living in the rural areas and engaged in agricultural pursuits.

The reports exonerated the Jews from blame, since they complied with the land laws and in most cases gave the tenants *ex gratia* compensation. Hope Simpson was fair enough to say: "The Jewish authorities have nothing with which to reproach themselves. . . . They paid high prices for the land, and in addition they paid to certain of the inhabitants of those lands a considerable amount of money which they were not legally bound to pay." Hope Simpson's criticism was directed against the government's laxness in permitting evasions of the law.⁴ In addition to providing resettlement for the so-called displaced Arabs, the government made supervision of land transfers more stringent, so that the Arab agricultural tenant of Palestine is now the best protected in the world. He is "protected" not only against the possibility of Jewish purchases but, at times, against his own desire to leave the land and go into other occupations.

The investigations have also shown "that the Arabs' charge that the Jews have obtained too large a proportion of good land cannot be maintained."⁵ The Jews have taken swampy and sandy lands — largely uncultivated in former times, or cultivated only extensively — and have by irrigation and scientific methods made these more productive, incidentally improving the neighboring Arab lands. In sum, the Jews have added to the cultivable area of Palestine, not taken anything away. The Partition Commission Report, the most recent investigation (1938), concluded that further improvement in Arab cultivation is dependent largely on continued Jewish development. It states that "the future of the Arab population is already men-acing unless Jewish immigration and Jewish imports of capital are allowed to continue." Challenging the earlier Shaw Commission's view, the report explains that limitation of Jewish immigration is short-sighted, for the growing Arab population can be provided for only (1) through the intensification of cultivation, (2) the development of urban occupation. It adds: "And neither of these things can be brought about without the assistance of Jewish taxation and capital."

The Reports conclude unanimously that the backward condition of the Arab peasants in Palestine is due to long-standing social-economic causes. These include an outworn system of land cultivation and tenure (*mushaa*), the prevalence of sharecropping, high rates of interest on accumulated loans taken from the Arab *effendis*, widespread illiteracy, and lack of agricultural knowledge. The investigations all show that the peasants' lot can be improved only through constructive programs, that is, by reform of the system of land tenure, promotion of cooperative credit facilities, and development of general and technical education. Above all, a broad, well-defined scheme for reclamation, drainage, and irrigation is necessary. In the past, land improvement has been initiated mainly by Jews, and to a lesser extent by Government through surplus revenue derived from Jewish sources. The feudal-minded political leaders, themselves large landowners, talk much about the expropriation of the peasant, but they have done nothing to improve his condition. They are the real exploiters of the Arab peasantry and, in a manner common to reactionaries everywhere, have sought to divert attention from the underlying social and economic causes by attempting to place the blame for the peasants' backward condition on the Jews.

8. DELIBERATE UNDERESTIMATION OF PALESTINE'S ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY

The allegation is that Palestine, a small country not gifted with great natural resources, is already fully populated; that its population density could be increased only by transferring the Arab peasantry into an "urban proletariat," thus destroying the "traditional charm of the land"; that Palestine lacks the natural resources for a large industrial development; and that even if Palestine should develop industrially, it would not be in the interests of the neighboring Arab states.

TO "PROVE" THAT Palestine is already overpopulated, usually an example of an area of low population density is deliberately chosen, e.g., New Hampshire. It is argued that New Hampshire, which is about the same size as Palestine, has only a total population of less than 500,000, while Palestine already has 1,750,000. The speciousness of this analogy is quickly revealed by comparing with nearby Massachusetts which, though smaller than Palestine, has a population of 4,300,000. Massachusetts is obviously a more correct analogy with which to compare Palestine, since both regions have a coastline and harbors and are strategically well situated for industrial and commercial development. On the basis of Massachusetts' density of population, Palestine could have from four to five millions, a figure which economic experts agree does not exceed the potential absorptive capacity of the country.

The truth of the matter is that arguments about the density of population based only on area are wholly misleading. Different countries, and different regions within any single country, vary greatly in density of population, depending on the interplay of a complex series of factors, including climate, soil, type of agriculture, degree of industrial development, and capacities of the population. The Survey of International Affairs for 1930 declares that the optimum population of Palestine would be a "complex product of many factors: material assets of the country; the energy, enterprise and skill of its inhabitants including the future immigrants; economic demands of the world at large for the economic assets which Palestine could offer; the general level of world prosperity."

Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk of the United States Department of Agriculture, a renowned soil conservationist, who has studied the problem of soil and water conservation in Europe, North Africa, and the East, has concluded that if the full resources of Palestine were fully developed along TVA lines, Palestine (including Transjordan) could absorb an additional four million new settlers. Other experts have confirmed this estimate. F. Lawrence Babcock, an editor of *Fortune*, on the basis of careful calculations "heavily documented by population trends and economic analysis for the postwar decade," concludes⁶ that given a sufficient flow of capital and assuming power and irrigation development — not as ambitious as the Lowdermilk program — Palestine could absorb during the next ten years from 400,000 to 800,000 new immigrants in addition to a natural increase of 450,000 in the present population.

The argument that industrialization is impractical for Palestine because the land is "so little favored by nature" is considered fallacious by economic authorities. Palestine is excellently placed for industrial and commercial development. Standing at the junction of three continents, it is the center of land, air, and sea routes and has already begun to hold an important position in the commerce between Europe and the East. Indeed, the anxiety of the neighboring Arab countries to acquire Palestine is in no small measure due to their recognition of the significance of its economic position. The third argument, that industrial development of Palestine would compete with industrial development in neighboring countries — in Syria and Lebanon particularly — is also not confirmed by experts. On the contrary, Palestine's development has become the stimulus for a general economic development of the whole Middle East.

The notion that industrial development will deface the beauty of the Holy Land is also imaginary. Those who make this criticism seem to have in mind the growth of ugly cities in England during the nineteenth century and the planless springing up of towns in this country. Palestine's industrial development need not be followed by such results, particularly since in Palestine hydroelectric power is mainly used for energy. The industrial development already initiated has been accompanied by growth of garden cities and planned towns. Palestine is more beautiful today than it was a quarter of a century ago. A balanced economy, including rural and urban occupations, is necessary everywhere

for raising the standard of living, and the advance in the industrialization of Palestine is as important for the Arabs as it is for the Jews.

⁶ *"The Much Promised Land," Fortune, October 1944.*

9. ROMANTICIZING ARAB LIFE

It is alleged that Zionists are unappreciative of Arab achievements; that they have forgotten the part played by the Arabs during the Middle Ages in the preservation of classical culture; that they pay no attention to the new progressive forces in Arab life; and that Zionists continue to represent the Arabs as "nomadic," "backward," and "half-civilized," despite the asserted cultural advances.

THE OPPOSITE is the case. One of the major themes of the Zionist leaders has always been the desirability of the cooperation of the two Semitic peoples — Arabs and Jews — in a renaissance of the Near East. Classical Arabic is studied in the Hebrew secondary schools in Palestine, and the Institute of Oriental Studies was one of the first established at the Hebrew University. The Hebrew University has one of the finest collections of Arabica and Islamica in the world. Besides giving graduate courses in Arab history and culture, it conducts extension work to improve understanding of Arab life and thought among the Jewish people. On the other hand, no Arab schools in Palestine, public or private, teach Hebrew or Jewish history, or give any recognition to the Jewish contribution to Arab life or to Western civilization generally.

Unquestionably there are new forces at work in the Middle East, particularly in Egypt and in the Levant. The stimulus to change and modernization has come in major part from the introduction of Western ideas and of new economic forces. Also, during the last half century or more, Arab scholars have been working to revive and reconstruct the traditional culture.

But Arab culture taken as a whole is still in a backward condition. This is not a rumor spread by the Zionists, but the conclusion of all informed observers. In Arabia proper, the home of the romanticized "original Arab" or Bedouin, life is under tribal conditions, not free of barbarities. The Bedouin nomads on the borders of Syria are literally a curse on the land: their encampments are sources of disease, their cultivation is wasteful; they raid the villages and rob the highways. The fellahin, or peasant cultivators, who form the bulk of the settled population, are poverty-stricken, illiterate and superstitious. The effendis — as the hereditary landowning classes and their dependents are known — supply the political leadership. As a class they are notoriously selfish, concerned with their own pleasures and with the maintenance of their power. Though many are wealthy, they have left educational and philanthropic work largely to Christian missionaries and other European organizations.

Though the Arabs have an external traditional charm, and although Western democratic institutions have been introduced, they have "no depth of foundation in the minds of either the politicians or the people."⁷ A modern cultural synthesis has not yet been achieved and the old values are being lost faster than new values are being assimilated. Though much money has been spent on political propaganda, there is little interest in the development of science and culture. Modern education has too often been introduced superficially, so that it prepared neither for life nor for work. "The boy has, therefore, found his home atmosphere congenial and has sought expansion in the cafes and clubs where he learned and practiced the pattern of chauvinism."⁸ In Iraq, first of the Arab mandated territories to receive independence, "patriotism still denotes independence without obligations to the State." Members of Parliament and Government officials are likely to look on their offices as an opportunity for remission

of taxes for their friends or for obtaining government jobs for their proteges.⁹ In legislation the tendency has been to favor the landowning classes which predominate in Parliament.

The middle class — the basis of Western democracy — is still small and weak. The so-called "progressive" leaders, who are loud in their praise of democratic principles are, in the last analysis, representative of the landed classes on whom they are dependent. As Professor H. A. R. Gibb points out, the political leaders have brought no real advance to the people, and the youth feel frustrated in the face of the lack of social opportunities. Discontent is more likely to manifest itself in a hostility to "modern capitalism" and "alien rule" than in constructive social measures. In this atmosphere of dissatisfaction and tension, fascist teachings of "direct action" and dictatorship based on the army are making a strong appeal. Among the masses, still imbued with a sense of Moslem solidarity, the social protest has often been expressed in an anti-Christian, anti-Western movement of Moslem fanaticism. Today, the Jews and Zionists are being made the scapegoat of this underlying bitterness, as the recent pogroms in Egypt and Tripolitania have shown.

Romanticizing the Arab tends to support political reaction. The foundation for the revival of the Middle East must be laid in the improvement of the lot of the agricultural worker and in the development of a strong middle class capable of advancing democratic processes. The elaboration of a broad-gauged regional plan for the economic development of the Near East would accomplish far more than sentimental praise of Arab glories of the past. Furthering the Jewish National Home aids progress. Support of anti-Zionism tends to strengthen reactionary forces and to encourage extreme Arab nationalism, to the detriment of any genuine Middle Eastern cultural renaissance.

⁷ H. A. R. Gibb, *International Affairs*, October, 1944.

⁸ John Van Ess, *Meet the Arab*, p. 208.

⁹ Philip W. Ireland, *Iraq: A Study in Political Development*, p. 433.

10. INSINUATIONS AGAINST JEWISH NATIONALISM

Parroting a small group of anti-Zionists, the Foreign Missions Conference advises the Jews to regard themselves as a religious community only. The charge is made that Zionist emphasis on national elements in Judaism constitutes a step toward "racism." The Zionist position is termed "equivocal," savoring of a double political allegiance; and American Jews are warned that upholding Jewish nationalism will compromise Jews already enfranchised abroad.

THIS DISTORTED reference to the Zionist conception is dragged into the discussion to divert attention from the main issue. Obviously, no matter how we define the Jewish community in theory, the same problems confront us in the Palestine situation. Anti-Semitism never spared any Jew, however saintly, and the religious and secular have suffered and perished together. The Arabs would not consent to a large Jewish immigration even if all the immigrants were truly religious. In the assaults by Arabs in Palestine and elsewhere, the Moslem mobs frequently attacked the Jewish quarters in the old cities inhabited by the pious. Obviously a religious, as well as a national Jewish community, requires political protection.

The concept of Jewish nationalism is grossly distorted by the anti-Zionists. Every student of Jewish history knows that "To Judaism the existence of the Jewish people is essential and indispensable, not only for its realization in life, but for its very idea."¹⁰ The distinctive contributions of Judaism are associated with Israel's struggle to persist as a people, while becoming the bearer of spiritual and ethical conceptions; and Jewish nationhood and Jewish religion, in turn, are intimately connected with the hope for restoration to Zion. Zionism in its most profound sense aims to revitalize this ancient

Jewish striving for unity of the particular and universal, through bringing the Land, the People and the spiritual heritage together again. To call the Zionist movement "racist" is nothing less than a slander on one of the great political and moral ideas of our age.

The interrelationship between Jewish religion and Jewish nationalism finds concrete expression in the fact that the rank and file of Zionists are loyal to the Jewish religious tradition as well as to the national idea. The more orthodox he is, the more Zionist is the Jew likely to be. Per contra, those indifferent to Jewish nationalism generally tend to be weak in their religious affiliation. The confusion in anti-Zionist thinking is further indicated by the fact that the creator of the idea of "spiritual Zionism" (Ahad Ha'am) was a Jewish nation- alist who absorbed the religious elements in Judaism into his cultural conception. The intellectual leaders of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, whom anti-Zionists sometimes commend as holding a moderate view, do not decry the national elements in Jewish life. They would vehemently repudiate the view that a spiritual-cultural conception of Zionism implies that Palestine should be closed to further Jewish immigration. Nor would they acquiesce in the view that the Jewish community in Palestine could be reduced to the status of a permanent minority without harm to Jewish cultural and spiritual development.

¹⁰ Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*.

Since the Renaissance nationalism has been the creative force in European history and always associated with the struggle for liberalism. It was the lever of attack against political autocracy and ecclesiastical reaction; it was the weapon of small peoples against oppressors. Like every great principle, like religion itself, nationalism can be distorted for evil purposes, as in recent times when it became linked with reactionary forces. But Zionism has always been notably associated with the forces of progress and democracy. Jewish community life in Palestine today is organized on a democratic basis; the cooperative labor movement, which has done so much for the upbuilding of Palestine, is inspired by the ideal of the Jewish renaissance and yet at the same time is international in its outlook. The disingenuousness of the anti-Zionist attack on Jewish nationalism is revealed in the fact that those who bitterly oppose Zionism, despite its character as a liberal political force, warmly support the rising Arab nationalism which unfortunately has assumed an extreme chauvinistic form, and, as wartime and recent events have shown, is not free from fascist tendencies. It should be remembered that the "nationalism" of a small nation is defensive, while the "nationalism" of a large nation is apt to be offensive or imperialistic.

If there were a grain of truth in the implication of a dual political allegiance in Zionism, then the foremost statesmen of America, leading Christian clergy, and outstanding Jews would stand accused of compounding a disloyalty. Zionism, of course, expects every Jew outside of Palestine to preserve a single-minded allegiance to the country of his citizenship. Liberals have no difficulty in understanding that Americans of English, French, Danish or Irish descent, while participating in the life of America in full loyalty, may retain a love for the lands of their fathers and may do whatever they can to promote the welfare and cultural life of those countries. Such attachments enrich the culture of America and advance international ties. Why should not the same attitude apply to the Jews? Jerusalem is not less spiritual than London or Paris, than Prague or Warsaw. The charge that Zionism implies a lack of patriotism will not appeal to intelligent Americans, but it may have the insidious effect of strengthening anti-Semitism among the ignorant and the bigoted.

11. MISREPRESENTATION OF JEWISH OPINION ON ZIONISM AND THE JEWISH COMMONWEALTH

A small anti-Zionist minority has assiduously attempted to create the impression that American Jews are greatly divided on the Palestine issue. They have also deliberately misrepresented the Jewish Commonwealth program, sponsored by the Zionist organizations, as aiming to create a Jewish "theocratic and racial state" in Palestine.

WHILE THERE are important differences of opinion among Jews at large and among Zionists — particularly with reference to the ultimate constitutional structure of Palestine — there is virtual unanimity on fundamentals and a preponderant majority in favor of the official Zionist proposal of a Jewish Commonwealth. This has been repeatedly demonstrated. The American Jewish Conference, held in 1943, unquestionably the most widely representative of Jewish assemblies held in recent years, by an overwhelming vote endorsed the so-called "Biltmore Program" which expressed the Zionist aim as the attainment of a Jewish majority in Palestine and the creation of a Jewish Commonwealth. Those abstaining or voting against it differed on the question of the ultimate form of government for Palestine, but were at one with the majority in demanding the immediate annulment of the 1939 White Paper and the guarantee of free Jewish immigration into Palestine and of full opportunity for land settlement and economic development, unrestricted by political considerations.

The American Jewish Conference gave expression to the views of Jewish leaders of the most important Jewish organizations in the United States. That their views reflect the opinions of the rank and file of American Jews has been amply proven by the extraordinary mass meetings and public demonstrations throughout the country. A survey recently conducted by Elmo Roper, well-known authority on public opinion and director of Fortune magazine polls, confirms this. It discloses that approximately 80 per cent of American Jews favor a Jewish State in Palestine; somewhat over 10 per cent are definitely against setting up a Jewish State in Palestine or anywhere else, believing that the Jews constitute a religious group and not a nation; and nearly 10 per cent are undecided or insufficiently informed to express opinion. Those in favor of a Jewish State represent all economic groupings, but the lower middle class and poor were more strongly in favor of the Jewish State solution than those ranked as upper middle class and prosperous.

A competent analysis pictures the situation as follows: (1) All organized Jewish public opinion, including the anti-Zionist opinion, is unalterably opposed to the 1939 White Paper which makes Jewish immigration subject to Arab consent, and limits the right on the part of Jews to purchase land. (2) The overwhelming majority of Jews — Zionists and non-Zionists alike — agree on three essentials: (a) continued immigration into Palestine to the maximum of its economic potentialities; (b) the right of the Jews to purchase land, conduct colonization, and develop the economic resources of the country, unrestricted by political considerations; (c) communal, cultural, and religious autonomy for the Jewish community in Palestine. A substantial majority of Jews, as well as all official Zionists, are united in the substance of the program included under the term "Jewish Commonwealth," which aims to create a Jewish majority in Palestine and to establish a democratic commonwealth in which all the inhabitants, without distinction of race, religion, or nationality, will enjoy equal civil, cultural, and religious rights.

Every statement on the Jewish Commonwealth made by the Zionist leaders couples the demand for free immigration, opportunity for full economic development, and a Jewish majority in the country, with the guarantee of equality for all citizens — non-Jewish and Jewish alike. A recent official statement issued by the Political Secretary of the Jewish Agency declared: "The Jewish Commonwealth was not conceived as an exclusively Jewish policy. It was realized that a considerable section of the population will not be Jewish by race or religion. The Commonwealth is to be designated Jewish because it is intended to be the national home of the Jewish people and to that end will be open to any Jews desiring to settle in Palestine, this function being indeed its principal *raison d'etre*."

The Jewish Agency for Palestine enumerates the following provisions designed to safeguard equality of rights for individuals and communities:

- (1) The status of citizens who are non-Jews would be exactly the same as that of Jews, all being subject to identical laws administered by a democratically elected government.
- (2) Wide measures for local self-government in urban, suburban, and rural areas would be introduced. In addition, Moslems and Christians would enjoy full communal autonomy as regards the management of their religious, educational, and social institutions.
- (3) Universal suffrage would be enacted without distinction of race or creed. All citizens would be entitled to representation in legislative and executive bodies, and non-Jews as well as Jews would be eligible for ministerial posts.
- (4) The religious rights of non-Jewish residents and pilgrims will be safeguarded by constitutional guarantees in all matters such as freedom of worship, maintenance of educational and charitable institutions, family law and personal status.
- (5) Moslem holy places will be administered by Moslems; Christian holy places by Christians. The existing religious courts of Moslems and of the several Christian communities would continue to exercise the same jurisdiction as at present.

The Jewish Commonwealth, as Zionists understand it, would not rest content with establishing merely formal equality, but would endeavor to bring about an increasing measure of real equality in education and standard of life by social legislation and economic development.

12. SURFEIT OF CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT FOR THE JEWS BUT DENIAL OF REAL HELP

Protesting much sympathy for the suffering remnant of Israel in Europe, the Foreign Missions Conference call on the Christian nations to open their doors to the Jews. Anti-Semitism, they proclaim, is, after all, a Christian evil and, in justice to the Moslem world, we should "share the suffering" of caring for the refugees. They charge that Zionists who link the problem of rescue with the plea to open the doors of Palestine subordinate the humanitarian need to political objectives and obstruct the finding of a suitable solution.

THE AUTHORS OF these generalities know very well that there have been numerous investigations by Government committees and other public bodies to find places of refuge for the "unfortunate Jews." The four corners of the earth have been scoured — East and West, the Tropics and the Arctics; Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Ethiopia, Tripolitania, British Guiana, Madagascar — but no place has been found. None of the Christian nations has thus far indicated readiness to open its doors for considerable Jewish immigration, let alone provide opportunities for development of Jewish communal life. Each country claims that it is faced with critical postwar problems and the very mention of plans to admit large numbers of Jews aggravates anti-Semitism. This attitude may be un-Christian, but the facts are irrefutable; to ask the Jewish refugees to wait until Christian ethics are fully practiced — as well as preached — in national affairs offers no real help in the present crisis.

Palestine can absorb a large number of Jewish immigrants immediately. Whatever may be its ultimate absorptive capacity, the most conservative estimates indicate that hundreds of thousands can surely be provided for at the present moment. The Jews in Palestine are prepared to welcome their kin to the ancestral homeland, and the Jews of the world are united in their determination to help the immigrants establish themselves on secure economic foundations. The Jews themselves, and not the

Arabs, have borne the burden of Jewish settlement in Palestine; they have increased its absorptive capacity with benefit and not "suffering" to the Arabs.

Every report from Europe has confirmed the urgent need to find a haven of refuge immediately for tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of Jews in Central European countries and the Balkans. And every report has indicated that many, if not most, of the displaced, maladjusted Jews are ready to go to Palestine for permanent settlement. Some already have relatives there who will make their adjustment easier and more secure. Others are thinking of their children, whom they wish to bring up as self-respecting persons, released from the strains, abnormalities, and persecutions which they themselves have experienced as members of a minority. Still others emphasize the religious and cultural aspects of Jewish life in Palestine. Some wish to go to Palestine because no other place is ready for them, and because they doubt whether they will live long enough to learn about the choices which may be offered to them through new investigations. It is important to remember the right of Jews to go where they want to go as long as they do it peacefully. This concept is fundamental to democratic living.

In a thoroughgoing report to President Truman on the plight of the displaced Jews in Europe, delivered toward the end of August 1945, Earl G. Harrison, American member of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, gives the strongest possible confirmation to previous statements. He declares that the Jews of Germany and Austria must be evacuated; that while every effort should be made to repatriate those who wish to return to their own countries and to admit a reasonable number to the United States and Great Britain, Palestine must be regarded as the chief haven of refuge. For a great part of European Jewry, Palestine is the only "acceptable, or even decent, solution for their future." He comes to this conclusion "on a purely humanitarian basis" without reference to the ideological or political aspects of Zionism. In closing his report he emphasizes the urgency of immediate action:

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that the main solution, in many ways the only real solution, of the problem lies in the quick evacuation of all non-repatriable Jews in Germany and Austria, who wish it, to Palestine. In order to be effective, this plan must not be long delayed. The urgency of the situation should be recognized. It is inhuman to ask people to continue to live for any length of time under their present conditions. The evacuation of the Jews of Germany and Austria to Palestine will solve the problem of the individuals involved and will also remove a problem from the military authorities who have had to deal with it.

Despite these incontrovertible facts, the Foreign Missions Conference have advised caution — to determine exactly how large the Jewish remnant is and how many really prefer to go to Palestine. They, who "claim the name of Christian," have aided and abetted the cynical British tactic of further delay through a new inquiry. They have been quite ready to keep the doors of Palestine firmly shut even before new doors were opened which would enable them "to carry some of the weight of the heavy cross that bears down upon Israel." In the many pages of their memoranda there has been no word of approval from these self-styled humanitarians for President Truman's plan to have 100,000 refugees admitted into Palestine — despite the fact that this number would not have appreciably changed the ratio of Jews to Arabs in Palestine.

The opening of the doors of Palestine would have been the only solution quick enough to meet the human need, as the Earl Harrison Report to President Truman pointed out. Whatever may have been the intentions of the anti-Zionist Christians, the effect of their activity is clear: they have helped to bring about the mockery of another committee of inquiry and to subordinate the American view to British imperial policy. And whatever the conclusions of this new investigation will be, one tragic result

is inescapable: There will be fewer Jews alive in Europe at the end of the investigation than at its inception.

The aim of Zionism has always been to achieve security and adjustment for the Jewish people, a security which would be more than temporary and an adjustment which would be psychological, cultural, and religious as well as material. Over fifty years ago the Zionist analysis of Dr. Theodor Herzl diagnosed anti-Semitism as a social and economic disease which was bound to become aggravated in Europe in the measure that the Jews were enfranchised and began to take leading parts in European life. Unfortunately, this diagnosis has proven only too true. Had the Zionist conception been understood early enough, and had genuine help been given by the Christian nations of the world in the upbuilding of the Jewish national home, hundreds of thousands — perhaps more than a million — of the Jews tortured and killed in Europe in the Nazi holocaust would have been spared. In the Zionist program, political means have ever been the instrument of the solution of a grave problem. Although more than humanitarian in the ordinary sense, Zionism has always been linked with true humanitarianism.

[By] their unqualified support of the Arab objectives, the activity of the Christian missionaries is obviously also political; but unfortunately in their case politics works against the needs of humanity and justice.

13. THE PROBLEM OF UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT

It is alleged that for the United States to become involved in the clash of complex issues surrounding the Arab-Jewish conflict would be disastrous to our interests; that a commitment to the cause of Zionism would lead to a revulsion against Anglo-American influence in the Moslem world, and possibly direct the attention of the Arabs to seek guarantors of their destiny elsewhere, perhaps in Russia; that American support of the Zionist cause would also be detrimental to our material interests, for the Arabs are the predominant element in those sections of the Middle East where we have commercial opportunities and oil concessions.

THE FACT IS that the United States can no longer avoid becoming involved in world affairs and in the problems of the Near East — indeed, we are already deeply entangled. The only question is whether we shall become involved for the purpose of promoting special interests — American business in the Levant, the oil companies in Saudi Arabia, the Christian missions to the Moslems — or whether we shall give consideration to all interests involved. Are we to come in as junior partners of Great Britain in an Anglo-American imperialistic exploitation of the Middle East, or are we, as members of the United Nations Organization, to join — with due regard to the needs of all parties involved — in an effort to solve the Middle Eastern problem in a manner respectful of international obligations and conducive to security and world peace?

In its concern for world security and peace, America cannot avoid participating in the solution of "the Jewish Problem," still acute in Europe and of growing seriousness in other parts of the world. Apart from our interest in mitigating the distress of the Jews, it is abundantly clear that if unrelieved, the Jewish problem in Europe is bound to fester, and in regions of social and economic instability, even cause new fascist disorders. It would have been wise to accept President Truman's proposal even if our only interest had been facilitating reconstruction in Central Europe and the Balkans. In a poetic sense it might be "just retribution" to compel former fascists to vacate their homes to make room for displaced Jews, but this certainly is not calculated either to increase goodwill or to solve the problem in a common sense way.

President Truman has stated that he still believes in his plan of allowing 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine the coming year. It would be in the interests of sound American policy to strengthen his hand even now. The immigration of 100,000 Jews cannot be of decisive political significance in Palestine since it would merely raise the Jews from their present ratio of 30 per cent to 35 per cent; they would still remain a minority. The entry of even 100,000 Jews would not meet the full need of the refugees; but it would certainly afford relief for the most urgent cases. Most of all, if the doors of Palestine remained open, the inquiry now conducted could be carried out with confidence that an honest attempt was being made to take into consideration all factors concerned.

United States participation is also essential to help place the Middle East on a stable foundation. The Middle East is one of the danger spots of the future and many believe that a Third World War may center there. Arab unity has hitherto expressed itself mainly in the negative form of opposition to French influence in Syria and to the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. Behind the facade of agreement there are many sources of disunity in the Arab world; the rivalries among the newly created Arab states; the conflict between the nomadic Bedouin and the settled fellahin; the strains associated with the extraordinary differences in wealth; the tensions involved in cultural transition; the divergencies of national, racial, and religious minorities. If European control — now exercised mainly through dominant British influence — is removed from the Levant, anarchy may well result.

British policy is allied with one class of the population — the feudal landed aristocracy; and this in itself does not make for stability. It would not be in line with a genuine international development, and it would not be in our character or in our interest simply to make ourselves accessories to this British-Arab reactionary partnership. Nor can the function of the United States be limited to the protection of those American educational, missionary and economic interests in the Middle East which have already secured foothold. Our task is a difficult one: to elaborate an independent policy which, with due regard to legitimate interests already established, will aim for a planned development of the Middle Eastern region in harmony with United Nations' purposes.

In such a plan there would loom large the part that America could play in the development of natural resources of the Middle East, in soil conservation and in the promotion of irrigation and water power. Here is a broad field of endeavor which would be of immense benefit to the peoples of the Middle East whose independence will not be genuine until it is established on a firm economic foundation. In such a plan, Jewish Palestine would play its proper part as one of the constructive factors in a general development of the Middle East region.

A quarter of a century ago the League of Nations through the mandatory system laid the basis for the independence of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. In a special Mandate, Palestine was set aside for the Jewish National Home. Our Government participated in this plan before the Mandate was drafted; it gave its sanction prior to its acceptance by the League of Nations, and it confirmed its approval in the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. It was a sagacious plan, for it gave consideration to the various claims involved and it implied a cooperative relationship among Palestine and the other Middle Eastern countries.

So far as the Arabs are concerned, the promises made to them have been more than fully kept. The only promise that has not been kept is the pledge to Jewish people in the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine. Who is to know how many men and women would be living today, and what human anguish would never have been suffered, had this great promise been carried out before?

This failure to keep our publicly made pledges is the very essence of the trouble. All the reasons that justified the issuance of the Balfour Declaration twenty-eight years ago are today more valid than ever.

Our future course should be continuous with our past decisions. We should now carry out in action what we have formerly supported only with words. We should cooperate in strengthening the international sanctions that will secure the fulfillment of the Jewish National Home purpose in harmony with the civil, cultural and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine. We should support the international decisions on Palestine by the same measures that we support other international decisions. Such a solution would be in accord with international conscience and certainly with the Christian conception of justice.

On the 1939 White Paper

I venture to think that it was precisely from this permanent minority status that they had hoped to escape. They had hoped that in one place upon this earth this people of something like sixteen and a half millions might have a sphere of their own, where they could show what was in them, where they could be masters of their own destiny and affairs, and where there could be a center of Jewish life, culture, and influence throughout the world. If they have, for obvious reasons, thrown very special emphasis upon numbers, I believe that in their hearts what Zionists have desired more than anything is that they should get their freedom from this minority status. Now, I have to repeat, they are given the prospect that the minority status will be permanent, and whatever a National Home may have meant — we all know how many interpretations are put upon it — it surely cannot have meant that. It surely must have meant that somewhere in Palestine there would be a place where the Jews would be able to fulfill their aspirations, in some territory in which they had some autonomous control.

I have always had the greatest possible sympathy with the Arabs. I am bound to say that those who have been in Palestine cannot but have that sympathy. It is very widely felt in this country. I recognize the force of their claims and of their fears, but I feel bound to quote to your Lordships some words spoken in this House in 1923 by Lord Milner, at the very time when he professed himself in favor of a pro-Arab policy. I quote them as showing that it is not possible to regard the Arabs as those to whom a predominating influence in the future of Palestine should be entrusted. Lord Milner said: "Palestine can never be regarded as a country on the same footing as the other Arab countries. You cannot ignore the fact that this is the cradle of two of the greatest religions of the world. It is a sacred land to the Arabs, but it is also a sacred land to the Jew and the Christian, and the future of Palestine cannot possibly be left to be determined by the temporary impressions and feelings of the Arab majority in the country of the present day." Then, I submit, it is still less reasonable that it should be determined by a permanent Arab majority in a single future Palestinian State.

— *The Most Rev. Cosmo Gordon Lang, late Archbishop of Canterbury, May 23, 1939, in the House of Lords*