

17.10.1947

doc00581

Abba Hillel Silver

Moshe Shertok

Chaim Weizmann

moshe Shertok statement

on October 17 1947

Before the United Nations

october, 1947

Moshe Shertok:

17.10.1947

doc00581a

MR. CHAIRMAN and Honorable Members of the Committee:

The Jewish Agency for Palestine appears here before you as a body representing Jews throughout the world who are organized to defend the interests of the Jewish people as a whole in regard to Palestine. It speaks for the large mass of the Jews who are already in Palestine but unlike the Arab Higher Committee its constituency is not confined to that country; it is world-wide.

Yet the Jewish Agency finds itself at a serious disadvantage in relation to its Arab counterpart. We alone represent the Jewish people in the face of the fifty-seven nations here assembled. Not so the Arabs of Palestine. They have brothers in your very midst with whom they are united by the closest bonds of kinship and identity of outlook. Quite a number of delegates have upheld in the debate the justice of our claims. We are deeply grateful to them, though none of them, quite naturally, could identify himself with the Jewish cause. But when the Arab states spoke, most of them twice and three times, their utterances were charged with all the fury and passion of a party to the dispute. It was the Arabs of Palestine themselves who have spoken through their mouthpiece for an aggregate total of more hours than one would care to count. We, the Jewish representatives, sat here as silent in the face of this unceasing and seemingly inexhaustible barrage of political attack and of factual misrepresentation, unable to refute the charge, to expose the untruth, nail down the irrelevancy as they continued day after day. We appreciate the opportunity now accorded to us to speak out after the conclusion of the debate, yet we cannot but draw attention to the disproportion between the existing facilities for attack and for defense, which is due of course to no ill-will but is the direct outcome of the anomaly of our position.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, this disparity in status between the representation of the Arab and of the Jewish case at this Committee — still more obvious at the Assembly from which we are completely debarred — should serve to bring out more forcibly the real scope and significance of the issue with which the United Nations is faced. The two focal points of that issue are these: first, that Palestine is the only country in which the Jewish people can hope to attain a secure home and a national status on equal foot-

ing with other independent nations; and second, that the Arabs of Palestine are not a people in themselves but a fraction of a much larger unit, amply secure in the possession of vast areas in the enjoyment of full-fledged sovereignty and independence.

That issue is not new. The victors in World War I faced it squarely. They were given the lead by Great Britain in the Balfour Declaration and in the promises to the Arabs. They proceeded to reconcile and synthesize the two main trends of Middle Eastern settlement: the opening of a prospect for a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine and the paving of the way for Arab independence in other liberated parts of the Ottoman Empire. This dualism was clearly reflected in the international instruments of the time: the purpose of the Mandates for Syria and Iraq was to prepare the countries for independence; the primary purpose of the Palestine Mandate was to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

An attempt has been made here to invalidate the part of the settlement concerning Palestine and to extend to Palestine the validity of the other part. The learned delegate for Pakistan has treated the Committee to a formidable display of erudition on the promises made to the Arabs and the attitude of their recipients to the Balfour Declaration. According to him, the late King Hussein was uncompromisingly opposed to the Declaration. He told the Committee that in an article published in his official organ in Mecca his late Majesty called upon the Arabs to welcome Jews not only to Palestine but to all Arab countries and he asked would the Jews now claim that King Hussein had agreed to the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Syria or Iraq merely because he said they should be welcomed there?

THE question as put is pertinent on the basis of the premise set, but the premise itself is false and therefore the question does not arise.

The learned delegate for Pakistan appears to have overquoted the late King Hussein. I have that memorable article in *Al-Qibla* here in front of me in photostat copy, and I find no reference in it to the idea that Jewish settlers should be welcomed to Arab countries outside Palestine. On the contrary, Jewish immigration is represented in that

17.10.1947

article as an exclusively Palestinian phenomenon, and as a highly commendable phenomenon at that. For, wrote the late King, "the root cause (of that phenomenon) could not escape those endowed with deeper insight; they know that that country (meaning Palestine) is a sacred and beloved homeland for its original sons—*abnaibi-l-asliyyin*," and he speaks elsewhere in the article of the return of these exiles to their homeland which was conferring, according to him, great benefits on their Arab neighbors.

King Hussein's son, the illustrious Emir and later King Feisal, was even more explicit in his endorsement of Balfour Declaration policy. The famous agreement which he concluded with Dr. Weizmann dated January 3rd, 1919, speaks throughout of the Arab State and Palestine as existing side by side, the latter by no means included in the former. It provides for measures "to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale and as quickly as possible to settle Jewish immigrants upon the land." In a proviso to the Agreement Feisal stipulated that he would consider it binding only if his claims outside Palestine were fully met. The presence of six Arab delegations in this hall is evidence how amply that condition has now been fulfilled.

The representative of Pakistan further told the Committee that in appearing before the Paris Peace Conference Feisal claimed the whole of Syria, including Palestine. Those were his words—"including Palestine." But the official record available of Feisal's appearance before the Council of Five on February 6th, 1919, states: "Palestine, for its universal character, he left on one side for the mutual consideration of all parties interested. With this exception, he asked for the independence of the Arab areas enumerated in his memorandum."

It is significant that a few days later, on February 13th, the Council of Five received a Syrian Delegation which included the present Syrian Prime Minister, Jamil Mardam Bey. That delegation claimed the inclusion of Palestine in Syria as an autonomous province, but it welcomed the settlement of Jews in Palestine and freely conceded that "if they form the majority there, they will be the rulers."

This argument about historical accuracy is no mere quibble, nor is the establishment of historical truth on the subject of mere academic value. The facts stated are directly relevant to the present controversy and to the problem of its eventual settlement. They show that in a great historic moment bold vision and the acceptance of Britain's pledge as final led Arab leaders to contemplate reconciliation between Arab and Jewish political aims. They envisaged the future in terms of mutual adjustment rather than of one-sided domination.

Another relevant aspect of the historical and legal analysis of the case concerns the international validity of

the Palestinian settlement which resulted from World War I.

AGAIN the representative of Pakistan, in his very able championship of the Arab cause, sought to overshadow the issue by a host of contentious arguments about the nature of promises made to King Hussein and the validity of various subsidiary and interpretative documents, some of which, like the Hogarth Message, were unearthed and officially published for the first time only twenty-two years after their delivery, when the British Government cast about for documentary material to justify its change of policy by way of post factum rationalization. But no amount of legalistic casuistry can avail to undermine the overriding authority of the Palestine Mandate. The McMahon promises and the Hogarth Message are at best instruments regulating the relations between Great Britain and a certain Arab dynasty. They never received any international sanction. The Palestine Mandate, on the other hand, was an open covenant, openly arrived at between the fifty-two nations which then formed the League of Nations and was publicly endorsed by the United States of America. The Mandate as is well known incorporated the Balfour Declaration which thus became an international instrument; it recognized the historic connection of the Jewish people with Palestine; it provided for the reconstitution of the Jewish National Home; it guaranteed to the Jewish people special facilities for immigration and settlement throughout Palestine, subject only to the limitation of not worsening the lot of existing inhabitants.

Under Article 80 of the Charter, the Mandate, as long as it has not been replaced by any other instrument, is part of the law of the United Nations. The delegations of the Arab States were fully aware of the implications and of the purpose of Article 80, but their strenuous efforts to resist its passage at San Francisco were unsuccessful.

Actually, as many as 47 out of the present 57 members of the United Nations were members of the League of Nations. Among the 47 are also Egypt and Iraq. The delegate for Egypt declared during the Special Session of the Assembly that when his country joined the League of Nations it made a reservation regarding the Palestine Mandate. A scrutiny of the records of the League of Nations revealed no trace of such a reservation. Iraq joined the League under a declaration that it would fulfil all the obligations which membership of the League involved; this certainly included respect of the Palestine Mandate.

Invoking the right of possession, the delegate for Pakistan and others argued that Palestine was not Great Britain's property for her to promise it to the Jews. But, for that matter, nor were Syria or Iraq Great Britain's, and

17.10.1947

Moshe Shertok

doc00581c

yet her promises in their regard were accepted as binding pledges. The Arabs, it was argued, had fought on the side of the Allies in World War I. But so did the Jews, their volunteer legions having come to Palestine from England, United States, Canada, Argentine, and from Palestine itself, to take part in the country's liberation. It is an established fact that Palestine Arabs had no share whatsoever in the fighting. In the final analysis it was the exertions, sacrifices and the final victory of Allied armies which resulted in the liberation of Palestine and the Arab provinces. It is to that victory that most independent Arab States of today owe their existence. If they accept the boon of independence which fell into their lap like a ripe plum, they must accept its price. The pledge to grant the Arabs independence in large areas and the setting aside of Palestine for the Jewish people were organic parts of the same war settlement.

JUST as the independence of Arab countries was won for them by the Allies in World War I, so it was Allied victory again in World War II which saved that independence from the danger of new submergence under Nazi-German enslavement and Fascist-Italian colonization. To that second victory of our days the Arab States contributed nothing. None of them fought and most of them joined formally in the war only in the nick of time, when all the fighting was practically over, just in order to qualify for membership of the United Nations.

The honorable head of the Iraqi delegation made here two astounding revelations: first, that in 1942, Iraq had offered to send troops to fight in North Africa, and second, that the offer was rejected owing to the intervention of the Jewish Agency. May I say that I happened to be responsible throughout the war for the Jewish Agency's contacts and cooperation with British military authorities and I have heard here of Iraq's offer for the very first time. If both parts of the Iraqi delegate's statement are to be accepted as of equal authenticity, then the fact that the second is so manifestly absurd and fantastic must raise serious doubts as to the accuracy of the first.

The only community in the Middle East which really fought in the war and which had its heart in the fighting were the Jews of Palestine. Their signal contribution to the Allied war effort was rewarded by a regime in Palestine which inflicted untold suffering on the Jewish survivors of the European tragedy. Yet the Arab States, having reaped without sowing, firmly entrenched behind the Charter, are now invoking it as a bulwark against the claim of the Jewish people for a place in the family of nations. "The principles of the Charter for which millions gave their lives," said here the delegate for Syria, little perturbed by

the fact that there was not a single Syrian, not one, among the fallen millions.

Here again the delegations of the Arab States were very ably seconded by the learned delegate for Pakistan who by dint of extensive quoting sought to set up the Charter as an insuperable barrier to the establishment of a Jewish State even in a part of Palestine. But quoting the Charter is not the monopoly of the Arab side. It all depends on who quotes and for what purpose. Take the very opening words of the Charter: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." . . . Mr. Chairman, we appeal to this Committee to agree that the "scourge of war" signified for the Jewish people wholesale extermination and that the "untold sorrow to mankind" embraces the continued agony of hundreds of thousands of the survivors. We believe that there is no effective way of saving succeeding Jewish generations from the scourge of extermination and the sorrow of homelessness except by setting up a Jewish State in Palestine. This is our determination and we invoke the Charter in our support.

Next comes the reaffirmation of "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." Here again, Mr. Chairman, we claim the application of a Charter principle to the case of the Jewish people. We believe that the dignity and worth of a Jew as a human person cannot fully assert itself, nor can Jewish men and women attain equal rights with others, unless the people to which they belong is placed on a footing of complete equality with other peoples — that is, unless its national existence is secured and unless it is enabled to enjoy, at least in one corner on the face of the globe which it can call its own, the dignity and effective protection of statehood. Furthermore, we believe that the Jews of Palestine are already a nation, deserving and entitled to equal rights with other nations, large and small. All this is before we reach Article 1 of the Charter, which has been the particular victim of quotation. What are the operative phrases in that article? We claim the relevancy to our case of the phrase "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." And we certainly invoke "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." We claim to be a people and, as such, entitled to self-determination. We are prepared to adjust our right of self-determination to the right of others but adjustment must be mutual. We are not prepared to give up our right or to concede that the right of others is superior to ours. And if any one would

17.10.1947

Moshe Shertok

doc00581d

question our title to speak as a people we would reply that this title too is a subject of self-determination, not of dictation from outside. In short, we find nothing in the Charter to invalidate our claim. We find in it a great deal to strengthen it. We regard it as inconceivable that the justice and equality which the Charter enshrines should be destined for all mankind save the Jewish people; that for the Jewish people alone there should be no room in the world edifice erected on the graves and ruins of the last war; that it should continue henceforth as before, a homeless vagabond, cast adrift over the face of the earth.

WITH a consistency worthy of a better purpose the Arab delegates proceeded to deny that the Jews are indeed a people, or that as a people they have any particular or valid connection with Palestine. Here again a brief reference to history is unavoidable. It is granted that historical associations alone cannot decide a burning political issue of today. But it is important to realize the impact of history upon present-day realities. Because historical consciousness generates a national will, the national will moves masses of men to action, action results in the creation of facts, and political facts give rise to international problems. The sequence is uninterrupted and irresistible.

It is therefore essential to realize that the connection of the Jewish people with Palestine is the central fact of the whole situation. Chronological data were cited here, mostly false, to prove the historical aspect of the Arab case. But the issue cannot be appraised by reference to mere chronology. It is the organic facts of history that matter. The Jewish people was born in Palestine and shaped by it. The country gave birth to no other people either before or after. It is untrue that all the Jews left Palestine in the first century. Their mass settlement in Palestine persisted till the seventh century despite persecutions, expulsions and the ruthless crushing of rebellions. Nor is it true that the Jews have ever turned their backs on Palestine. Their efforts to return have never ceased and the present phase of resettlement which began in the late seventies of the last century is but the last link in the chain. Zionism did not start with the Balfour Declaration. The Declaration was the product, not the origin of Zionism. The Jewish State idea is not a crazy whim of recent origin. It is the dream of centuries of Jewish martyrdom, the vision of Jews in all generations, the practical ideal which animated the first returning pioneers of seventy years ago. Both the anomalous position of the Jewish people in the diaspora and the remedy urged by Zionism for it are products of history and the whole problem cannot be understood outside its context.

It is an untruth and an irrelevancy to suggest that the Jews of Europe are no Jews at all but descendants of a Mongolian tribe. In support of this fantastic theory Arab spokesmen have repeatedly invoked the Jewish Encyclopedia. Members of this Committee were invited to consult the volume in the library. If they do that they will find that this factual assertion of Arab delegates is no better founded than many others — it is simply untrue. The article on the Khazars in Volume IV of that Encyclopedia does not contain a word from which it could be deduced that Southern Russia was the origin of European Jewry. It actually says that the great mass of the Khazars after their subjection by the Russians remained in their native country — meaning that they did not migrate to the North or to the West. All research points to the conclusion that East European Jewry originated in Western and Central Europe, not in Southeastern Europe.

The whole pseudo-scientific discussion of ethnic origins is moreover perfectly irrelevant. Politics must grapple with facts, not with theories which lead nowhere. Hitler and the Mufti were not in the least bothered about the origin of the Jews whose doom they decreed. To them they were just Jews and they let them go — and die — at that. Nor are the Jews themselves impressed by the discoveries made by others, always to suit their anti-Jewish purpose, as to what they really are so long as their consciousness and their dire need, and the attitude of the world towards them, all remain unchanged. Surely it would be absurd, for example, to inquire, for the purpose of political discussion into the racial origin of some of the Arab delegates here so long as they are conscious of being Arab and act as such. That is what they are entitled to. The Arab spokesmen would be well advised at least in this respect to accept historic and psychological facts as part of the political background—as an immutable part of the political background—and to drop once and for all this genealogical nonsense.

But then the Arabs retreat to a second line of attack and proceed to conjure up a non-existent distinction between Judaism and Zionism. Organized Zionists, they say, are but a small minority and most Jews are not Zionists. The usual double trick of false statistics is here resorted to of first quoting an absurdly low figure for the adherents of a movement and then working it out as a percentage of the total in which their own wives and children are included. One wonders how many organized and fee-paying members the so-called National Bloc in Syria had through all the years of its existence. Yet it always laid claim to the exclusive representation of the Syrian people. It is indeed singular how little understanding a group of leaders of a national movement such as that with which we have here to join issue, cares to show for the central position occupied

17.10.1947

Moshe shertok

docoo581e

by another national movement in the life of its own people. Zionism is the quintessence of Jewish national life and striving. There is no source of national will or energy, no centre of national creative activity, which operates in Jewish life outside the Zionist movement, that is, the Jewish movement centred on Palestine. That movement is nothing but the Jewish people organized in a struggle for its better future. There are large numbers of Jews who are Zionist at heart though not in name. There are very few who are militantly anti-Zionist. The publication of the majority report called forth a remarkable manifestation of Jewish unity. Jewish organizations of widely divergent political denominations in this country have all rallied to the support of the Jewish Agency in its present claim for immediate statehood. Zionism is today universally accepted as a decisive political factor in Jewish life. Nor is there any doubt in our mind what type of Jew commands the respect of true patriots in any nation, including all the Arab peoples.

One charge thrown against us in this Committee I will not attempt to refute because it refutes itself. I refer to the charge that Zionism is identical in ideology and in method with Nazism. Addressing myself to the Iraqi and Syrian delegates who dwelt on this most unprofitable subject I would merely say this. It was not we who before the war attended as honored guests the Nuremberg rallies. Nor was it we who during the war were interned as allies of the Nazis. Our turn to be detained by the British Administration came at a later stage, after we had helped to beat down the enemy.

Another theme on which Arab spokesmen continue to harp, despite conclusive rebuttals, and which they would likewise be extremely well advised to abandon, is what I might call the Spain argument. If the Jewish claim to Palestine after such long separation is to be accepted, why not concede the right of the Arabs to return to Spain and what would the world come to if past possession, even in remote antiquity, became the guiding principle for the determination of the right of sovereignty? The analogy is not merely absurd. It defeats its own purpose and proves exactly the contrary. It merely serves to accentuate the uniqueness of the historical phenomenon of Jewish attachment to Palestine. Do Arab women anywhere tell their children about ancient Arab glories in Spain? Do they kindle in their hearts the hope of returning there? Are there any circles of Arab youth studying the geography of Spain, singing its songs and learning the crafts useful in Spain in preparation for immigrating into that country? Has the world ever witnessed boatloads of homeless Arabs desperately trying against overwhelming odds to reach the shores of Spain? The question of the Arab claim to Spain does not arise because, for want of any practical need,

Arab attachment to Spain simply does not exist. The reason is that the Arabs are all settled and perfectly at home in their countries whereas the Jew is still striving to regain his own.

WHILE I am on the point of spurious analogies, may I revert to the remarkable speech—the first of the two—made by the delegate for Pakistan. Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan was quite liberal in the use of the analogical method in relation to my country. He deprecated it only when it affected his own. He drew a parallel between the Jewish orphans in the camps of Europe and the young victims of the recent tragic events in Pakistan. He indicated many similarities but omitted from his comparison the most fundamental point of difference: the Pakistan children, for all their distress, are at home — in their own country and among their own people. Jewish children in the camps of Europe are homeless not merely in the literal sense but in the deeper historic sense. The second analogy was between the Jewish position in Palestine and the British position in India: if the claim of the Jews in Palestine is based on the benefits they have conferred on the Arab population, he argued, then the claim of the British to stay on in India would have been equally valid. The inference, though perhaps not quite intended, or not intended at all, was nevertheless self-evident: just as the British are quitting so should the Jews quit. The comparison does flagrant violence to patent facts. It would require an inordinately long stretch of imagination to make the comparison real. The British nation would have had to have been born in India, driven out of it by force, unable to regain a firm foothold in any other country and drawn to it by its persisting attachment to return to its native land. The Englishmen coming to India would have had to be coming not as viceroys, as high officials or as army officers but as tillers of the soil, as road builders, as factory workers. They would have had to be working physically in the broiling sun wresting derelict areas from the wilderness of sand, stone and swamp with their own bare hands as we have done, rearing their children to stay in India and work there planting trees to give them shade. Only then would the comparison have made sense.

In actual fact, we have never based our claim on the benefits we are conferring on others. We consider ourselves under no obligation to confer benefits. The only obligation we accept is that we should not make things worse for the existing inhabitants. We are no missionaries, or philanthropists. We come to seek our own salvation though we are most eager to help our neighbors and extremely pleased if we can do so. But the benefits we are conferring in the process of our own self-rehabilitation are an incon-

trovertible fact, acknowledged freely or grudgingly, as the case may be, by friendly and unfriendly observers, including the delegate for Pakistan himself. Moreover, those benefits are an inevitable outcome of the process. The reason is simple. You cannot bring into a country a large volume of initiative, skill, scientific knowledge and capital without the new wealth you create percolating to your environment without the example you set being followed by others. You cannot stem the tide of prosperity; it inundates the entire economic sphere. Because it is inevitable, the process is bound to continue — there is simply no other way of doing the job. The more Jews you bring in, the greater the amount of development you do, the wider are the opportunities for your neighbors. It is inherent in the nature of things and it cannot be changed.

MUCH has been made of the fact that in Jewish enterprises, as a rule, Jewish labor is employed. That is certainly the case and I would not overstress the fact that for every single Jew employed as a wage earner in the Arab economy there are at least 100 Arabs — not 10 or 20 or 50 but 100! — employed by Jews. The main criterion by which the value of Jewish development to the Arab population stands and falls is not how many Arabs are employed by Jews, but whether the total volume of employment available to the Arabs rises or drops as its result. Now one of the most conspicuous trends in Palestine's economic life is the constant increase of Arab employment in the measure as Jewish development is progressing. Apart from direct and positive evidence, our contention is proved by the enormous increase of the Arab population coupled with the steady rise in its standard of life, by the fact that the increase is greater in areas of Jewish development than elsewhere as well as by the fact that there is no Arab emigration from Palestine, but on the contrary an influx of cheap labor from the neighboring countries into Palestine. When I lived 40 years ago in a certain Arab village between Jerusalem and Nablus, many of the more enterprising villagers of that neighborhood were emigrating to America while some of the stay-at-homes used to walk on foot in the harvest season to Transjordan to eke out their incomes. Now there is no Arab emigration to America and as to Transjordan the trend has been reversed: Transjordanians come to Palestine for work, and not the other way around. If you ask the villagers even in that area which is remote from Jewish settlement, what happened to account for the change they will say that there is more work in the country and that it is better paid. And if you ask why, the answer will be: "It is the Jews." Gravitation towards higher prosperity areas is an inevitable phenomenon of economic life and the problem

for the Jewish State will be how to cope with the infiltration of lowly paid labor from outside rather than what to do with Arabs thrown out of work inside the territory.

But, it is alleged, the Jews are driving the Arabs off their land, and in the Jewish State, according to the expressed conviction of the delegate for Pakistan, the process will gather momentum. Have the Jews not got unlimited funds at their disposal? Is not all Jewish land nationally owned? Are the Jews not prohibited from employing Arab labor at all? A horrifying prospect is thus conjured up of dispossessed and workless Arabs streaming out of a Jewish State in quest of work in distant lands. But the point is that no dispossession is taking place at all. With the progress of farming, Arab peasants are becoming more rooted in the soil, not less. Their stake in the soil of Palestine, in the shape of properly built houses, of trees, of plantations, of livestock, and of implements is increasing. An abrupt reversal of the process is unthinkable in the light of contrary experience in the past. The distorted picture is the result either of false briefing or of a complete misreading of the processes actually at work.

TO BEGIN WITH, only less than one-half of the Jewish land is nationally owned. The rest is private property. On nationally owned land the principle is not merely of Jewish labor but as a rule of self-labor—that is, all work is done by the settlers themselves, without resorting to hired labor — so that the question of employing Arabs simply does not arise. On privately owned land and particularly on orange plantations, where hired labor is the rule, thousands and thousands of Arabs are employed. But the main point is the total extent of Jewish land purchase. With all their fabulous resources, and with all the facilities they had under the mandate—not under the White Paper—the Jews have, so far, managed to acquire less than seven percent of the land area of Palestine. A large part, a very large part of the land acquired by the Jews had not been withdrawn from Arab farming at all. It had originally been given up as uncultivable and had to be reclaimed at a heavy cost. It now represents a net addition to the country's agricultural resources. On the other hand, certain marginal lands previously uncultivated here and there have been brought under cultivation by the Arabs themselves, to take advantage of the higher demand for produce created by the Jewish urban market and with capital largely derived directly and indirectly from Jewish sources. The total net loss to Arab farming in terms of area has therefore been much smaller than it looks. That loss in area has been more than made up by increased productivity due to the agricultural progress which has been largely

stimulated by the Jews. Area alone is never a decisive factor in determining agricultural prosperity. The use to which the land is put is equally, if not more, important. Transition from dry to irrigated farming for example means at least a five-fold increase of yield and of employment. in the case of land as in the case of labor the criterion is whether the total number of Arab farmers has increased or diminished and whether their average economic level has gone up or down. By both these tests the beneficial effects of Jewish settlement on Arab farming stand vindicated. The story of Arabs, rendered landless by Jewish land purchase, roaming over the countryside is a myth invented for political use. It has been disproved by official inquiries and it has not a shred of evidence in its support. A steady stream of Arab laborers from the purely Arab districts and from outside of Palestine to those partly settled by Jews on land bought from Arabs is proof to the contrary. Those who sold surplus lands invested the proceeds in the development of the remainder. Productivity has risen and so has the demand for labor. I mean for Arab labor.

It has been the invariable principle of Jewish land purchase policy not to leave landless an Arab who had worked on the land acquired. We see to it that tenants, if they must be shifted, are accommodated elsewhere in farming. Peasant proprietors look after themselves and hardly ever sell outright. Nor are we interested in buying land from very small proprietors in view of the fragmentation of holdings. We buy from those with a surplus to sell and we buy only the surplus.

The reason why Jewish agricultural settlement has not only not displaced Arab farmers but has helped to raise their standards is that a three-fold process has been at work: first, reclamation of land which was considered solely as uncultivable; second, the discovery and use of new water resources; third, the introduction on a large scale of more valuable crops. This is the reply to the question of the delegate for Pakistan — how will Jewish immigrants be settled on the land without squeezing out the Arabs. There have been a few instances where land was bought from absentee landlords and the tenants were moved; there was no case of a village of peasant proprietors having disappeared from the map of Palestine. In the coastal plain, 150 Jewish villages have been established; not one Arab village has disappeared. All of them now prosper far more than they did before. All of them are now more populous than they were before.

Today the whole position is vitiated by the operation of the racial land law which prevents Arabs from selling and us from buying land in most parts of Palestine. The law is a dead weight alike on Jewish settlement and Arab agricultural development. In the Jewish State not only will

the self-interest of the Arabs in not selling out completely operate at least as vigorously as before, but the Jewish authorities, because more directly responsible, will be even more scrupulous in the observance of their principles. In this respect as in other aspects of the treatment by the Jewish State of its Arab minority I would not lay claim to confidence in Jewish ethical superiority. We claim no such superiority. I would merely humbly suggest that the Jews may well be trusted to take a reasonably intelligent view of their own interests. We shall be living in a glass house in the Jewish State, watched with sharp suspicion by our immediate neighbors and keenly observed by many from afar. We shall have our own hostages, so to speak, in countries near and far. We shall be most vitally interested in Arab prosperity on our own account, so that they should not undermine our standards but rather be potentially good clients for our industrial products. This is not merely our declared policy. It will be a matter of direct self-interest for us to try and raise the living standard of the Arabs up to our own level.

Above all it is important to remember that the bulk of the country's land area — 18,000,000 dunams out of a total of 26,000,000 — is today classed as uncultivable — of no use to God or man. The Arabs have no incentive to develop the largest part of that huge derelict total, and unless the Jews are given the freedom of experiment and reclamation, those large tracts scattered over the country, but particularly concentrated in certain parts, will remain for generations to come, if not forever, in the present state of stagnation. The delegate for Pakistan took strong exception to the inclusion by the majority of the Special Committee of the Negev area in the proposed Jewish State because it is purely or predominantly Arab. But the Negev comprises 45% of the area of Palestine and yet accounts for less than 5% of its population. One might have called the Negev purely Arab even if only 100 Arabs roamed over the vast expanse. The choice as regards the Negev lies between its inclusion in the Jewish State and its intensive development through irrigation for the benefit of Jews and Arabs alike, or its dereliction in its present state.

I might here recall one curious slur passed on our work by the representative of Egypt who said that all we do in Palestine is artificial. I wonder exactly what he meant by that term and how it was intended to impress us. Go and tell our children who were born in the country that they are artificial. Tell that to the trees we have planted, to the fields we have reclaimed, to the factories in which we are working. Try and dismiss as artificial the potash plant on the Dead Sea or the power house on the Jordan. In this sense the Dam of Assuan in Egypt is artificial. So is the Tennessee Valley project. So is in

fact the entire magnificent civilization of this American continent, which is all the result of migration.

IF THE Jewish people had been given a proper chance, in terms of time and administrative facilities, for conducting large-scale immigration and settlement in the true spirit of the Mandate, then the whole area of Western Palestine—after the separation of Transjordan, which was originally included in the Balfour Declaration area—would in a not-too-distant future have become what we call a Jewish State, that is an independent state with a Jewish majority, and open to receive Jewish immigrants. The Jewish Agency firmly holds that this is what the Jewish people was entitled to claim and to expect and, that given favorable political conditions, what it could have achieved. But the international acceptance and the practical implementation of this program at the present stage met with admittedly formidable difficulties. The difficulties would not have been insuperable had the Mandatory persevered in its task throughout. But the defection of the Mandatory in the White Paper of 1939, its refusal to revert to the status quo ante after the war, and the apparent absence of a practicable alternative to the former Mandatory regime, such as would render possible the continuation of large-scale Jewish immigration and settlement in an undivided Palestine over a period of years, faced the Jewish Agency with the imperative necessity of seeking a short-cut to independence.

This course was dictated by compelling Jewish needs, both in Palestine and in Europe. In Palestine, the Jewish people had outgrown its tutelage. It matured in the ordeals of the pre-war Arab disturbances and of the war itself. Around it, country after country achieved independence. The Jews of Palestine, conscious, very keenly conscious, of having become a nation, still lacked the attributes of statehood. Their political and economic system did not fit into the surrounding pattern. Their political inferiority and defenselessness were exploited against them. They felt convinced that statehood was both urgently necessary and definitely practicable.

In Europe, on the other hand, the tragedy of the surviving Jews, combined with the refusal of the Mandatory Government to increase the arbitrary, grossly inadequate, immigration quota, created an untenable situation. The highly precarious position of the Oriental Jewish communities also became a source of grave concern. The problem of providing immediate rescue for past and potential victims of persecution added further urgency to the need for statehood.

Incidentally, the story which has been repeated here so many times probably in the hope that it will stick, about

those mysterious 30,000 Jews in Palestine anxious to go back to Germany and Austria and prevented by threats, is a complete and utter falsehood. Neither 30,000, nor 10,000, nor 3,000 nor 1,000 have registered to go back. It is a pure invention. The very idea that such a large number of people can be kept in Palestine against their will by force or threats is just fantastic.

Arab delegates, in trying to make palatable to international opinion their uncompromising attitude on the immigration issue, have sought to effect a separation between the problem of Palestine and that of homeless Jews. Let the International Refugee Organization take care of the latter, they said. How genuine this suggestion is may be judged from the fact that as far as we are aware none of the Arab States has yet joined the I.R.O.—they are thus all parties to the prevention of its proper functioning. But the whole question of the I.R.O. is here beside the point. The separation which the Arabs advocate in this respect is as real and practicable as the separation which they have been urging between Judaism and Zionism. The issues are inseparable in life and in practical politics. The Jewish displaced persons press on Palestine, and that is a factor in international politics. The Jewish displaced persons and the Jewish people in Palestine believe that the entry of Jews into Palestine is a matter of right and not subject to Arab consent.

The highly distinguished delegate for India also accepted the idea of separation between the problems of Palestine and the Jewish D.P.'s—apparently by way of a dialectical escape from a moral predicament. She urged that countries should come forward with offers to take in refugees. She may be new to the subject, and not aware that such appeals have been made times out of number in the past and have fallen on deaf ears or at any rate produced very meagre response. Nor may she have heard of the intense desire of these people to go to Palestine where alone they would feel that they belong.

I should like to take this opportunity to stress the frightful urgency of a provision for an immediate substantial increase of immigration to Palestine if mass suffering is to be alleviated and if tragedies are to be avoided, such tragedies as that of the *Exodus*—an event which undoubtedly shook the conscience of the world and yet so far has not produced a remedy.

Bearing all these considerations in mind, weighted down by their cumulative burden, in fact the Jewish Agency faced the dilemma with which the Report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine confronted it.

The conclusions we reached were indicated in our opening statement. We took note of the rejection of our own plan; we took note of the unanimous recommendation that the Mandate must be terminated, we took note of the

17.10.1947

Moshe Shertok

doc00581i

proposal of the majority of the Committee for the partition of Palestine and the establishment in it of two states. With a heavy heart but in full consciousness of the historic responsibility which the step involved, we decided to give this plan our full consideration.

The sacrifices involved in the partition plan for the Jewish people cannot be exaggerated. It entails giving up nearly one-half of a country on the regaining of the whole of which the hopes and prayers of countless generations had centered. The blow to Jewish feeling and to the Jewish future resulting from the complete exclusion of Jerusalem from the Jewish State has already been stressed. Other areas and sites hallowed by sacred associations, districts with rich potential promise, even whole clusters of Jewish settlements representing a triumph of pioneering effort over overwhelming odds have also been excluded from the Jewish State in the proposed scheme. The Jewish Agency has definite proposals to make in regard to boundary modifications as well as on other aspects of the scheme. In view of the far-reaching effect of every aspect of the scheme on the Jewish future, the Jewish Agency trusts that it will be given full opportunity to present and defend its case at such a sub-committee or sub-committees as this Ad Hoc Committee may decide to appoint.

One basic feature of the scheme on which I might comment, is the proposed Economic Union. Our attitude to this far-reaching proposal has already been stated. But during the debate sharp criticism of the Economic Union idea was voiced by some Arab spokesmen, and sinister designs on the Arab State were imputed in this connection to the Jewish Agency. Let me make it clear, therefore, that we do not in the least regard the Economic Union as essential for the well-being of the Jewish State. Rather on the contrary, it entails a heavy burden on its finances, and some curtailment of its sovereignty, in which we would be prepared to acquiesce in order to facilitate a solution, but the prospect of which we by no means relish. We naturally consider it vital that there should be the closest possible economic ties between the two States of Palestine, but were the matter left to ourselves we would not have proposed the imposition of a compulsory Union, but would have preferred a series of purely voluntary agreements.

BUT the main target of attack against the majority scheme has been the proposed territorial settlement whereby a substantial number of Arabs is to be included in the Jewish State. But that Palestine will continue to be inhabited by Jews and Arabs we regard as a decree of history. That Arab and Jewish villages are intermingled in most parts is a physical fact which cannot be changed. It is therefore impossible to carve out a substantial area for a

Jewish State, without including a considerable number of Arabs in that area. The Jewish Agency has already stated that it regards the area proposed for the Jewish State in the majority report, with certain modifications which it proposes to urge, as constituting the indispensable minimum — a compromise proposal entailing heavy sacrifice less than which the Executive would not be prepared to recommend to the movement for acceptance, but by which, if implemented, it would be prepared to abide. This being so, may I now attempt to indicate the choice of alternatives which today lies before the United Nations?

The earliest possible grant of independence to Palestine seems now to represent a consensus of world opinion. In fact it may be regarded as a foregone conclusion. The announcement by the Mandatory power of its irrevocable decision to evacuate Palestine at an early date leaves no room for doubt in that regard. That the country will soon become independent is thus certain, and the only question is what form that independence will assume. There are only two possibilities as to the form of independence — either a unitary state or two separate states. To convert Palestine into a unitary independent state on the basis of the present composition of its population would in effect mean to constitute the whole of Palestine as an Arab state and leave the Jewish minority at the mercy of the Arab majority. It is a solution which is no solution, and it has been categorically rejected by the Zionist movement with the full support of the entire Jewish people. It has rightly been dismissed in the Majority Report. The reasons are perhaps obvious, but it might nevertheless be of assistance to those anxious to form an objective and dispassionate opinion on the problem for me to offer some observations on the relative merits of the two alternatives.

In drawing the comparison I must deal with figures into a detailed analysis of which I cannot here enter. That can be done in the sub-committee. I would merely indicate that I assume that the Jews of Jerusalem will now all opt for citizenship of the Jewish State and also that as recently indicated by the official statistician of the Palestine Government the figures of Arab natural increase which until recently were accepted as valid have been found to be somewhat exaggerated.

My comparison is therefore this. First: In the event of a unitary state, nearly 700,000 Jews will be placed in an Arab state. In the event of partition on the lines of the majority report, between 400,000 and 500,000 Arabs, rather nearer the lower limit, will be included in the Jewish State. Secondly: In the former event the entire Jewish people in Palestine will be denied self-determination. In the latter event two-thirds of the Arab population will enjoy it. Thirdly: In the former event the Jews would feel that they had been put into a death trap and

would react accordingly. They would anyhow feel crushed under the weight of an overwhelming Arab majority in Palestine, reinforced by the vast and solid mass of Arab population in the surrounding countries, all united in the Arab League. In the latter event the Arab minority in the Jewish State would find a most effective guarantee for its security in the crescent of Arab states which encompass the Jewish State on three sides. Fourthly: In the former event a highly democratic and larger minority would find itself ruled by and forced to adapt itself to a majority element with a totally different economic system and totally different social conceptions. In the latter event a smaller minority would find itself bracketed with a progressive majority whose life interest it would be to help lift the minority up to its own level. Fifthly: In the former event all Jewish immigration into Palestine would stop and the problem of the homeless Jews of Europe would reach a hopeless deadlock. In the latter event the Jewish State would offer a larger and quicker solution to the problem than it might be possible to attain by all the other alternatives put together; we are convinced in fact that it would provide a complete solution to the problem. Lastly: In the former event the Jewish people, which is a minority in every country throughout the world, will be condemned to permanent minority status also in Palestine, and its one hope of ridding itself once and for all of that scourge at least in its native land will be doomed. In the latter event, all that would happen on the converse side is that the Arab people which is in an extremely fortunate position as compared with many others—in that the overwhelming majority of its members are compactly settled in countries adjacent to each other and enjoying full independence—will have a relatively small fraction placed in a minority position in an adjoining strip of territory, a minority which will forever remain united with it by innumerable economic and cultural ties.

The conclusion I would propose to draw from this comparison is too obvious to require formulation. The delegates of the Arab states and of Pakistan have invoked the solemn rights of ownership, occupation, possession and self-determination in order to deny the validity of the Jewish claim to statehood. They refuse to accept the international dispensation which constituted Palestine as a country *sui generis*, destined not merely to continue to harbor its Arab sons but also to serve as a national home for the Jewish people. But surely they must face the physical fact that Palestine can today be so divided as to make the Jews the majority in a large part of it. Why should the high principles invoked for the whole of Palestine not be made applicable to a part of it? If the idea is, as suggested by one of the Arab delegates, that you cannot break up one mandated territory, then the whole separation of

Transjordan and its constitution as an independent state is illegal. Why should not the sauce for the goose of Pakistan be the sauce for the gander of Palestine? To this the Honorable delegate for Pakistan has two replies. First, that Indian Moslems are in India of old, whereas the Jews in Palestine are newcomers, — and second, that in India partition came by mutual consent whereas in Palestine it is a controversial issue. The first reply can hardly be expected to impress the Jews. On the second, a very apt comment was made by the distinguished delegate for Canada. He said very rightly that consent is at least as necessary for a unitary state as for partition. May I add to this the following question: What would have happened if India had not shown the statesmanship and the wisdom of conceding Pakistan's right of secession? Is the Jewish claim to secede in a suitable part of Palestine less valid merely because the Arab leaders do not share that statesmanship and that wisdom? Is unwisdom to be accepted as a dictator?

There is, of course, the question of the relationship between the Jewish State and the neighboring Arab states. The Jews are interested in concentration, not dispersal. Once a state has been established satisfactory to the Jews, its boundaries will be respected. But by a sheer process of endless repetition any absurdity can be made to sound plausible. Listening to the speeches of Arab delegates one may have come to the conclusion that the problem before the world was not how to provide a haven of refuge in a tiny territory for the wanderer of all the ages but how to protect the vast and powerful land complex of the Middle East against the danger of invasion from that tiny segment.

Mr. Chairman, the Jewish Agency was greatly heartened by the statements made here by the Honorable Delegates for the United States of America and for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as by the statements made by many other distinguished delegates. On a number of fundamental points they all spoke in unison and their statements marked an important step towards Jewish statehood. The prospects of agreement between two leading major powers on the issue of Palestine is most encouraging.

The statement of the Honorable Delegate of the United Kingdom yesterday may or may not have opened slightly a door which his former pronouncement seemed to have practically closed. The Government of the United Kingdom now have a unique chance of helping to conclude honorably a chapter of history which they initiated so nobly through the Balfour Declaration. A great deal of the bitterness of recent years will be forgotten if they take the chance. But the prospect of British cooperation in the solution advocated by two other Great Powers is

still clouded by uncertainty and evil forebodings have not been dispelled.

The implementation of the United Nations decision is admittedly a serious problem. We are most anxious to assist in its solution to the best of our ability in the sub-committee and we shall have practical proposals to make. Here I would make only one observation. The practical difficulty and the international complications which might arise from a new political settlement in Palestine will be smaller and less serious in the event of a United Nations decision than without it. For let it not be assumed that in the latter case trouble would necessarily be localized. It might implicate countries near and far in a chaotic manner. If Britain's decision to withdraw is unconditional and unrelated to United Nations procedure, then a vacuum would ensue. This prospect adds urgency to the problem and aggravates the United Nations responsibility for its effective and timely solution. For us it is a matter of elementary self-preservation to prepare for the eventuality of a vacuum as regards both administration and defense. We pray that in that event a clash may be avoided, but it is our duty to be ready for the worst. We think we shall be.

THE TONE and even the language of most of the speeches of the Arab delegates make it difficult for me to address a word of appeal to them. But let us all

think of the common people in Palestine, Arabs and Jews. Let us think of the common people throughout the Middle East. Let us think of those who meet each other in the fields, who rub shoulders on the railways, who do business together or at least would have liked to do business together. They are all, fundamentally, interested in the same things. They all want bread and work, better living conditions, decent homes, good roads, schools for their children, more efficient communications. Naturally, they all want to see their national cultures flourish, and their peoples secure and independent, sharing in the dignity and happiness which free life and enlightened citizenship can offer. There is strife today. There is fear and there is hatred. But beneath it all, there is an upsurging of common human feeling which is bound to assert itself. The returning Jew passionately believes that he belongs to that country, to that part of the world. He is a returning native. He knows there is room for him there. He has proved it. He does not take room away. He gives. He has a great deal to learn. He has something to teach. He wants equality, nothing more, nothing less—the same opportunity, the same status. His neighbors all have their states. He must have his own Jewish State. Nothing in the world will eradicate from his heart the love of Zion. Nothing will stifle in his soul the urge for freedom in his own land. If he is robbed of his due he will not submit. But he wants peace. He knows that one day he will be understood and accepted as an equal. He prays that day may be near.