NALL-NATHAN

NANKE

January 19, 1947

Dear Mrs. Nanke:

I read the compositions of your students and I think they did very well with the use of the English language.

They are right, I think, in feeling that one of the great questions for the future is a better understanding between the races and a willingness to accept the individual at his own worth, regardless of race or creed. I regret that so many of them seem to be hopeless about the prevention of war since that would indicate that we are marching rather rapidly toward annhiliation.

Many thanks for letting me see these compositions.

Very sincerely yours,

Ranke

Letters

Box 82, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone.
January 12th, 1947.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

You are working so sincerely on "World Peace" that I am hoping you will be able to spare a few minutes to read the enclosed compositions on that subject by some of my students of the III Year, (equivalent to Sophomores in our High School in the States.)

These children are all about fifteen or sixteen years old and since they live in Panama, Spanish is their native tongue. They are taught English in our school, Pan-American Institute. Their spelling and sentence construction, I know, are incorrect but I felt sure their thoughts would interest you. Please note how they all resent the unthinking average white man's attitude towards other races.

May I ask for a few words from you to my students on their ideas for world Peace if you are not too busy? I know they will be very happy with the thought that you were sufficiently interested in their hopes for peace to comment on them.

I hope I have not taken too much of your time. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Lisbeth Ranke

(Mrs. Thomas Ranke')

Chap III A

55 nations

WORLD'S PEACE

Twenty one nations have united to solve the problem of the World's Peace and still they have not found the answer to it.

For centuries mankind has made conscious efforts to over war and maintain peace. This problem is not only of staving off war, but also of discovering and removing the causes of war.

I have thought of quite a few suggestions which I shall state for the benefit of mankind if they will only live up to them.

First of all we must not critizice other people or other nations. Wipe out discrimination of color and race. Universal Brotherhood should rein over the world. Let us look to others as our brothers not with hatred, not with envy, not with greed but with understanding, love and avoba all Cooperation.

This peace system should be embraced with almost every device for maintaining peace.

Enrique De Leon III A

WORLD PEACE

I believe that never in this world the word such as "World peace" will existe because no one can put an end to the wars and to the rivalry between the different countries of the world.

Each country have a different ideas about the other, some have fighting spirit and all this is a menace to the peace of the world.

Besides all the other causes of the war. I have all ready mention we can see for ourself that each day the way of fighting a war is better and more dangerous for the civilization.

The recent discovering of the atomic bomb is the more fearful weapon against the peace of the world even today they are fighting over the right of having the atomic bomb. In this recent war the scientist have found many ways of improving the weapons use in the war. It seem as the scientist just pass their time discovering ways of destroying mankind instead of helping them.

We win war with this kind of weapon that will never be let alone so that the world would have peace that is why I ~~believe~~ there will never be peace between the countries.

III A

HOW TO PREVENT WAR

In my opinion there are no rules and regualtions that cant prevent war. As you said a World Court governed by men of international fame an intelligence can provide ways and means to prevent features wars. But when this court dictates laws there were always be controversis because of the differencies of ideas and principles always pulling apart. For example, republican against democrats, liberals against conservatives, communisium and facism always against the others for their ideas are completly different. These are the many reasons why there will be always war.

Laws controlling trade and raw materials not always agreeable to all the countries as always one expect to be the leader. So long as there is envy and greed with anyone nations (as there always is), there were will be some disagreement.

I have found what I think to be the best result if we will learn trutfully withouth hypocrecy what is called the good neighbor police as thought by our Master to love your neighbor as yourself and to do onto other as you would have them do to you, that would prevent wars but as there are many contries who have not learned this principle and so cannot put it un practice there will never be any other method invented by man that can prevent wars.

*** In my lecture I stressed that if we could have a World Court composed of men of "International" love and vision instead of "national" etc etc

L.R.

Wing Wong III A

COULD WORLD PEACE BE ACHIEVED?

WORLD PEACE

The world is full of people who speak different languages, who have different costumes, different ways of thinking, etc. So, in my opinion, the best way to promote peace in order to prevent wars we must take into consideration their ways of thinking. We must hear all and everyone of those ideals of every country and unite them into a serie of factors which will give them complete satisfaction and will prevent wars.

There must also be fraternity between the people of the different country.

When all people are satisfied they will settle down to live comfortably and in peace. When hate is no longer between them and love settles among them they will never have wars.

But, how will they be satisfied? That's the great problem which we must face and that can be solved by teaching the younger generation not loving peace and hating war. So when they grow up they won't like to have wars for they know the devasting work that it costs and knowing that it only bring sorrow and pain to many people and great losses in money they will do what is in their power to prevent it. Those children will be such peace-lovers when they become the citizens of tomorrow that nothing will make them enter into war and if something happens between them they will settle it in a friendly manner. They will be satsified with what they have and will want nothing else. Thus we can prevent a war!

Guillermo Gonsales III A.

GOULD WORLD PEACE BE ACHIEVED?

Every human being on this earth has its own ideal; it is peace. But, could this dream be someday achieved? This is a brief outline whether there will be a longer peace.

We will be very lucky if we have a longer peace. But, it is impossible to say this is the end of all wars or the beginning of an everlasting peace.

No, we shan't ever have a never-ending peace! As long as there are two countries fighting for supremacy, there will never be peace! As long as one country invents the atomic bomb and another tries to invent a more powerful, destructive weapon or tries to invent a new defensive way against the atomic bomb, war will always come along someday. Tis is an example of the United States and Russia!. Ambition for lands, high nationalistic spirit, that was what drove Germany to fight. They didn't use their heads, they imposed their armed forces on every smaller nation they could conquer easily. They were infatuated with the thought that they were the best race in the world, the most powerful nation. A drastic end came soon to these foolish beliefs.

However, I doubt very much, there could be a World Court. There will be laws concerning world trade, raw materials, non-agression against smaller countries etc. But then trouble comes. A certain representant disagree with some inconvenient law, another is against certain representant; discussions, disagreements arise, all turns into a mess. Certainly in this way a World Court can not be kept up.

Disarming all the countries in the world, excluding none. Quite a satisfactory conclusion, leaving no arms in any country, using the atomic bomb power only for science.

Resuming up; a complete disarmament. Then, some countries will be willing to do so. But, will Russia, England, United States, voluntarily and fully accept this final conclusion? Quite doubtful, isn't it?

Mayorga III A

5

WARS

Wars are something terrible; the man realize it, but nothing can be done to prevent them.

After the World War 1, the nations, standing before the horrible scenery of death and destruction that occurred during 4 years of war, tried to form a league, a League of Nations which principal and only ocupation was to prevent another war. This league, a wonderful idea, failed.

In 1939, another war begins in Europe, a most terrible war than the World War 1. Now, there are not 4 years but 7 of destruction and extermination. Almost every nation took a part in it. As in the first science played an important part. Scientists discovered neaw and perfectioned many kinds of weapons, explosives and means of transportation, better methods of curing deseases and preventing infections.

Again the League of Nation is formed, many men and even women have congregated to prevent another war. Wars can't be prevented, there will always be wars. Maybe not this year or in a 100, but wars will come and will be most terrible than the ones we have seen. It's a biological law since nature gives us the example in the life of ants which are considerated to have the best organization. When ants cease fighting and making slaves of other ants maybe the man will find a way to prevent wars.

Excellent thought

William E. Arrieta IIIA

WORLD PEACE

There are many ways in which ever-lasting peace can be had. We need just of all cooperation from all countries. Each country should send his representative to a designated place and form a league of nations. This assembly would discuss problems that are against the keep ing of peace. The assembly would see that laws are made to control world trade, raw materials etc. The children should be taught correct education, unselfishness, thoughtfulness, kindness and above all not to think that they are superior to any other race. Sometimes a country that is powerful tries to conquer the smaller nations. The league of nations would see that this is not done by discussing the problems peacefully. Disarmament would be ordered by the league and it would be prohibited for any country to manufacture weapons. Anything that deals with destructions of homes and lives should be abandoned. Scientists would also be prohibited to invent any destructive weapon. Any idea regarding such should be immediately forgotten. Military training should cease also. The teaching of this particular training encourages and teaches boys to fight. Instead they should be taught to get along with their neighboring countries and friends, help them in any way possible, and have a good will towards them.

If the world should realize the amount of money, lives and homes that are lost in a war if would try to do anything to prevent wars. Time, beautiful arts, transportation and communication systems are all destroyed because some problem could not be solved by a country. Each country should take their problem to the league for discussion and not declare war on any country. Ever-lasting peace can be had if we all do our best to keep it so. Cooperation and understanding of all countries by means of a league of nations may help to keep peace.

Alicia Barnett III A

WORLD PEACE

There is anything in the world that can prevent war for a long time. For some years the only prevention is to build a "League of Nations" and a security pact between all the countries of the world specially the strongest ones.

The League of Nations must state prohibition to any country to use agressive weapons that can start the war. The nations must be responsible of their doings before the League of Nations.

An international law may also be made. This international law has to be obeyed very firmly, otherwise, this law has to implant his force in the League of Nations.

There is anything more effective to prevent war than a real and good education to the youth since their early days. Churches may be open in every corner of the world teaching people to love God and each other. Libraries must have good books which will make youngs and olds to understand deeply the meaning and effects of the great word "peace." People must feel themselves the same as others. Good propagandas in benefit to people can be made. The superiority and inferiority complex must be extinted by the teachers in schools, parents, friends, etc. to all the persons who feel that sichness of the soul.

Here is a great prevention of war: "The big resolution to think in God and the good will!"

WORLD PEACE

There cannot be a world peace because there will always be a fight, a rivalry between the leading countries of the world.

There will always be a race for raw materials, for controlling trade routes and this race will always end in a war. This will be the result because a lone country won't always be content with the foreign lands and trade routes she controls and will try to indispose the countries with their colonies; they will try to promote the wars by which they can get more colonies and get richer while others get killed.

If the world has to do something about this the only thing possible to do is to educate the boys, the youth to love each other, to forget war, to recognize bad propaganda from good one.

A world court cannot be so well organized as to vigilate every small movement of the countries; they cannot be so well organized to know about secret lans, treatys, so this of a world court won't give good results.

July 2, 1947

My dear Miss Nankwell:

If you are planning to take a trip to Hyde Park to visit the library and house and grave, and will let me know, I shall be glad to meet you at the library and bring you to my cottage for a short visit.

I shall be here from July first to the 13th, except for the day of the 7th.

Very sincerely yours,

Your
cousin
Lao

Mrs. G. Kingsbell
Bermingdale Ave;
N. York City. 26.
25th. June '47.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt,

My daughter and I have just recently come to N. York and would like to meet you. We are from Australia, and our desire to meet arises from our experiences during the war. We entertained over 1000 Negro soldiers over a period of 3 years in our home. It was their great respect for you and your interests in the Negro people, as conveyed to me by the soldiers, that has prompted this letter.

While here - I wish to

Study the Negro in his own background, and renew the pleasant friendships formed during the war years. I have in mind a series of articles for a paper in Sydney, to try if possible to bring about a better understanding of the efforts of these very worthy people.

May I look forward to hearing from you soon?

Regards,

Yours Sincerely,

Johanna Rankwell.

June 26, 1947

My dear Mr. Nathan:

I am sorry that an unexpected meeting of the drafting committee of the Human Rights Commission made it necessary for me to leave before you arrived.

It is extremely difficult to sell hand made articles in this country in any quantity and I do not know how to suggest accomplishing what you have in mind.

In any case, the government would have to approve any shipments of lumber and since it is so scarce in this country, our building is retarded. I do not know what would be permitted.

May I also be frank about the samples you left? They are not things that would be easily saleable. We have many people here who make similar items and try to sell them with very little success. Have you approached the Netherlands Aid Society of 153 Fifth Avenue, New York City? They might be able to make suggestions.

Very sincerely yours,

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

Nathan D.

1947.

Ha

7

Mr Nathan came to apt. & left this letter & some needle-work. He wanted to know if there was anything that you could do to help them contact different women's organizations.

P.S. needlework is at office.

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

Nathan, D.

. ANDWERK-ACTIE
„Meisje help je mee?"
(GIRL LEND A HAND)
Secretariaat: Orthenstraat 41

's-Hertogenbosch, 30 April 1947.

Note - Dr. Nathan going out P
From white letter to Miss Schlos

pamphlet re t'd
7-10-47

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
U.S.A.

Madame,

Nearly two years after the end of the second world-war, which afflicted also our country so heavily, it appears that, even when our people exert themselves to the utmost, our Government is hardly able to relieve the immediate wants with sufficient speed. With a view to this the Dutch schoolgirls will try to contribute their part towards the national exertion to overcome the consequences of the war and in doing so winning and consolidating peace.

For this reason they have conceived the plan to manufacture fancy and plain needlework and to exchange this with foreign countries for timber, which our country is badly in want of for the construction of window-frames, through which the sun can come in again into our rebuilt houses.

Estimating our national stock of houses at about 2.000.000, we now have a deficit of 500.000 houses, constituting naerly 25% of the total number.

They now make an appeal to you to support them in this work bij bringing them into contact with those women-organisations in your country which among other things are willing to take over the following task:

1e. to deliver this fancy and plain needlework to the trade in your country;
2e. for the proceeds of this needlework to have timber shipped to the Netherlands, if possible 12000 standards, which is sufficient for the window-frames of 10.000 houses.

The only appeal to charity in this matter is the appeal to your readiness and that of the women-organisations to help us.

We do not want to receive more for our work than the real value of it for your country.

Not only the schoolgirls want to take this matter in hand, but also our lady-teachers, our mothers, our older lady-friends, even our sick people.

- Our youthful women are -

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

HANDWERK-ACTIE
„Meisje help je mee?"
(GIRL LEND A HAND)
Secretariaat: Orthenstraat 41

's-Hertogenbosch, 30 April 1947.

Our youthful women are convinced of it that many wise and experienced men will smile at this daring plan, partly form traditional scepticism, partly from the conviction that only men can contribute to the reconstruction of our devastated country.

More, however than the material effect of their action, this youth will manifest for the whole world, that the international solidarity, certainly in the female youth is not a mere slogan, just good enough for congresses and petitions, but that this is an incontestable reality, which offers possibilities for a better mutual appreciation and understanding of the nations in future.

Have the unchristian-like governments tried to solve the problems of our times bij letting man disappear and leave the difficulties as they were, our youth is convinced of it that it is better to give man a fair chance for a decent living by facing the difficulties in mutual sympathy and by coupling all energies.

In order to make a business-like and quick success of this action, we add some samples of finished needlework. We shall appreciate very much to hear the american opinion about the usefulness of these articles. As a matter of course, we shall gladly receive counter-proposals.

Though we know that you are more than overburdened with duties on behalf of the sacred testament of your departed husband, we think that the very knowledge about the seriousness with which this testament was made up justifies our appeal to you.

We shall thank you very much for some words.
God bless you.

In the name of the committee
"Girl lend a hand"
(Meisje help je mee?)

Deputy secretary.
(J.J.M.Keulemans).

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

Pendington
June 25

June 19, 1947

My dear Mr. Nathan:

I have received your letter and I shall be glad to see you at my apartment, 29 Washington Square West on June 25th at 10 A.M., if it is convenient for you.

Very sincerely yours,

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

Nathan

Richard Nathan
c/o.M.Schloss
1.W.Alpine Str.
Newark, N.J.

Memphis- Tenn. June 14.1947.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Hyde Park,
New York.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I received your letter of June 6th. and thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to meet you.

I would appreciate very much if you could give me an appointment on the 25th.or 26th. of June for the reason that I am booked for my return trip to Holland.on June 27th.

Please notify me if it will be possible for you to give me an appointment on one of these days ,

Thanking you for this information, I beg to remain
Very sincerely yours

Richard Nathan.

Nathan

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

R. Nathan
c/o Hermann Nathan,
1757 Carruthers Avenue,
MEMPHIS, Tenn.

21st May 1937.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt,
Hyde Park,
NEW YORK.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt,

I arrived here from Holland a few days ago. The "Girl lend a Hand" organisation of Holland asked me to hand you a small gift and a letter from them. They and all the women of Holland are very anxious to help their country to the former posperity by doing fine needlework which they want to sell to other countries.

I hope that I may have the honour and pleasure to give you the present and letter personally. Perhaps you would be kind enough to let me know when it is convenient for you to spare me a few minutes. I am leaving New York today for Memphis and will stay at the above address. I will be back in New York in the first week of July and perhaps I could have an interview with you then.

Best wishes

Yours sincerely,

R. Nathan

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRESERVATION

September 5, 1947
R.R.N.

File
Robert Nathan

Major Considerations of United Nations
Committee Report on Palestine

Robert Nathan

Majority and Minority Report

The Majority Report proposes the partition of Palestine into two independent states following a transition period of two years. The Minority Report proposes an independent federal state of Palestine comprised of an Arab State and a Jewish State with a transitional period not exceeding three years. Both provide for the termination of the British Mandate of Palestine at the earliest possible date.

The prospects for success of the minority scheme are not nearly as favorable as is the majority scheme. Federalization of the two states with common authority by the Federal Government over all really significant matters, especially immigration, is hopeless at this time. The Arabs are absolutely against immigration and the Jews are equally determined to have immigration. On this score alone some kind of compromise cannot be realistically expected. The minority proposal assures Arab majority and domination on all major issues.

The Majority Report not only is the most realistic, but it is a fair proposal with respect to boundaries and with respect to procedures for reconciling major issues. Every effort should be made to encourage and assure cooperation between Arabs and Jews. Two independent states which will be autonomous can and will work together increasingly to the benefit of all inhabitants of Palestine and the Middle East.

Role of the United States

The United States should support the Majority Report actively and without qualification. This is an issue which can help the stature of the United Nations. It is an issue in which the United States can clearly support the independent report of the United Nations Committee without accusations of playing politics or using its great power to influence such a report. The Committee has worked independently in the best democratic tradition. There is no element of one world or two worlds or three worlds.

The Majority Report will have the backing of the vast majority of American Jewry, with the exception of a small number of extremists, and of non-Jews who are interested in Palestine. The United States Government was undoubtedly wise in not attempting to influence the Committee, but now that the matter is up for discussion at the open Assembly the United States support of the Majority Report, which is entirely consistent with the many proposals of President Truman, should be expressed vigorously and openly.

Implementation of the United Nations Decision

If the United Nations adopts the Majority Report, and support by the United States will go a long way toward assuring this, steps must be taken promptly to implement this decision. The task of transporting 150,000 Jews from the DP Camps of Europe, Cyprus, and from areas where present conditions for Jews are abominable, is a huge one and an expensive one. This is a task which will require the assistance and cooperation of the United States, the IRO, world financial organizations, and the United Nations. Details cannot be left to the last minute. The United States representatives on the United Nations have a responsibility in pressing for consideration and action within the United Nations and its related organizations on these matters. It must also work with the United States Government in spelling out the possible roles of the United States in these activities.

Further there is the problem of administration of Palestine during the transitional period. Perhaps the British Government will propose that the United States cooperate in this administration. This matter will undoubtedly be discussed in the United Nations. It will be most unfortunate if the matter becomes involved with conflicting interests of the major powers. The issues are clear with respect to Palestine and the refugee problem. The issues should be dealt with clearly and the decision related to these issues. The United States delegation in the United Nations can play a most important role in keeping the matter on a high plane and in helping determine the part which the United States will play in the transitional organization.

September 5, 1947
RRN

THE UN REPORT ON PALESTINE

The report of the United Nations Committee on Palestine greatly enhances the possibilities of arriving at a just and workable solution of the complex and painful problem of Palestine. One need not elaborate on all the human elements involved in the continued hardships and regimentation of life in the DP camps nor on the insecure and difficult life in Palestine to appreciate the importance of an early and lasting settlement. The procrastination and uncertainty and conflicts of recent years in Palestine, if continued, will serve as a sore spot and source of trouble which could spread and involve other areas as well.

The work of the United Nations Committee on Palestine was carried on independently and objectively. The United States made no attempt to influence or guide the Committee's work. To all intents and purposes, this is also true of Russia and perhaps of the United Kingdom. Therefore, the procedure whereby the proposed solution has been arrived at reflects most favorably on the United Nations. The successful handling of this issue in a democratic manner can serve as an example for similar approaches in the UN on other complicated problems.

Partition Compared with Other Solutions. The majority report of the UN Committee favors the partition of Palestine into two independent states. This is the most logical conclusion because it takes cognizance of a situation which has worsened over the years. Although there are many common interests between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, the vacillation and procrastination which have characterized the administration of the mandate,

have widened the breach between Arabs and Jews and have served to strengthen conflicting interests and to weaken common interests. Compromises through solutions other than partition are unrealistic because there is one major point on which compromise appears to be utterly hopeless and that is immigration.

The Jews of Palestine definitely regard themselves as the pioneers or forerunners of a sizeable and continued immigration of Jews from Europe and other parts of the world wherever conditions for normal life are untenable for Jews. The Palestinian Jews look upon such immigration as an absolute necessity. They will never resign themselves to the kind of restrictions on immigration which have been exercised for the past several years. They look back with abhorence on the growth of immigration barriers in Palestine in the late 30's at the precise time when large numbers of Jews were exterminated for lack of places to emigrate from Germany and other scenes of concentration camps.

On the other hand the Arabs are adamant in their stand against mass Jewish immigration because they wish neither to become a minority nor to leave the country. They look upon Jewish immigration as the key to a Jewish majority in all Palestine and will not agree to large scale admission of Jews into all of Palestine. On other issues there may be compromise and cooperation but not on the all important matter of immigration.

In view of the apparently irreconcilable attitude of the Jews and Arabs on the matter of immigration there must be some provision whereby the decision on this issue is arrived at independently by each group or by some outside group. There can be no lasting solution in leaving the matter of immigration to be settled by outsiders. Self determination is

one of the major objectives of world peace and democracy. The answer lies in the partition of the country.

The minority report of the United Nations Committee is unrealistic in its proposal for an independent federal state comprised of an Arab State and a Jewish State. It just won't work and the conflict will merely be prolonged. If Jewish and Arab cooperation is to be fostered and stimulated then the deepest seated and most divergent interests must be somehow removed from the scene of continuous negotiation and discussion. Partition will fulfill this basic need and the way will be open for increasing cooperation between the Jews and Arabs in Palestine as well as with other countries in the Middle East.

It can be expected that there will be objections to partition by many Arabs and by small extremist Jewish groups. To be realistic, one can't conceive of a settlement to which all groups will give full consent. Therefore, the matter must be resolved with full fairness to all parties and prospects for lasting success in mind. Partition meets these objectives.

<u>The Problems Pertaining to Partition</u>. The most important single decision with respect to partition relates to boundaries. Obviously the separation of the country into two parts must bear some relationship to the objective of establishing two independent states which are viable and with the best possibility of each functioning as an independent entity. Population, existing resources, prospective development, and immigration must all be considered. Insofar as the Jews are concerned they insist, and properly so, that account must be taken of those who wish and need to go to Palestine as well as those who are there now.

The division of Northern Palestine as proposed by the majority report of the UN Committee, including the Jewish residents of Jerusalem as

citizens of the Jewish State, will provide a modest majority of Jews over Arabs in the Jewish State. If one were to take into account adults of voting age, the majority of Jews would be very substantial because the ratio of adults to population is much higher among Jews than among Arabs. Immigration will surely increase immediately after the UN decision and by the end of the transition period, the Jewish majority will be very considerable.

In Southern Palestine, which is called the Negeb, the Arab population is sparse and in substantial measure nomadic. Arab population is far greater than Jewish population in that region. This territory is primarily desert and largely undeveloped. The granting of this area to the Jews is fully justified on economic grounds. If left to the Arabs it will remain undeveloped and wasted. The Jews have plans for large-scale irrigation and development. They have already established numerous settlements there and give every indication of developing this area.

~~One could undertake to argue effectively for and against minor or substantial changes in the proposed boundaries, but by and large those which have been determined by the majority of the UN Committee are fair and sensible on every important ground.~~

With respect to economic aspects of partition, there will be many important issues to be settled in the final agreement. For instance most of the sources of water and hydroelectric power will lie within the Jewish State. Assurances of accessibility to a fair share of these resources must be given to the Arabs. Similarly, the ports lie within the Jewish State and there must be provision guaranteeing to the Arabs access to these important resources. There will be important problems relating to currency and tariffs which will require intelligent settlement. Also the disposition of British resources in the country, especially of the now existing Palestine

government, which were largely paid for by the residents of the country, should take into account the real equities in the situation. None of these problems are by any means insurmountable. Most important is to keep in mind the objective of arriving at fair deals for both groups.

The Transition Period. Both the majority and minority reports of the UN Committee propose the early termination of the British Mandate. Great Britain probably will object strongly to the majority report and even to the minority report. If it acquiesces it may not wish to carry the responsibility of administration during the transition period. In the interests of successfully resolving this thorny problem, the United States should offer to cooperate in administration during the transition period. This will have to be worked out at the UN level. Every effort must be made to keep this matter from becoming a football in any verbal controversy between the big powers. The problem of Palestine should be settled on the merits of the issues and not become involved in broader maneuvering.

An objective appraisal of the role of Great Britain in the administration of Palestine over the past 30 years clearly leads to the conclusion that the policies and practices of the Mandate government have certainly not served to help develop Palestine. Since an important aspect of the transition period is the immigration of 150,000 Jews into Palestine, there must be a development minded administration. This is of first importance. There is no basis for assuming that Great Britain will suddenly change her tactics and her policies with respect to this matter. That is why some joint administration is extremely desirable. If the same policies are adhered to as in the past, the results two years from now will be chaos and trouble instead of the kind of progress toward two healthy states which could be accomplished during the two years.

Implementation. Aside from broad policy decisions relating to partition there are many complex administrative, financial and operational issues which will call for early decision and assistance. Thus, the moving of 150,000 Jews from DP camps in Europe, from Cyprus, and from other countries to Palestine during two years is a big undertaking. It is a task that must be well planned and well organized. It calls for ships and food and personnel. It calls for financing. The Jewish Agency in Palestine can make major contributions in the carrying out of this task but it will need assistance. The roles of the United Nations, the IRO, the world financial institutions, the United States and other governments in this task must be spelled out. The allocation of responsibility will probably fall to the United Nations but the part which the United States must play will be very important. That means early decisions and actions by the United States government and the active espousal of such measures by United States delegates to the UN. The handling of detailed matters should not wait until each and every policy issue is settled. Work on these matters should be begun now and the ground work laid for speedy action later on.

United States Attitude at United Nations Hearings. Perhaps the decision of the United States to make no statements and take no stand during the work of the United Nations Committee was a wise one. There can be no claim of United States pressure or prejudice upon the Committee. However, now that the Committee has reported and the issue is to be discussed openly at the United Nations assembly, the position of the United States must be expressed forthrightly. The United States should support the majority report with vigor and with no uncertainty. No doubt there will be discussion of many details and minor adjustments may be necessary but the general

attitude of the United States should be one of support of the majority report.

The majority report is fully consistent with past proposals of President Truman. Therefore the United States need make no apologies and can honestly and sincerely back up the majority report. The probability of British opposition makes it vitally necessary for the United States attitude to be made known early and clearly. It will not be satisfactory to support British opposition. The UN report in its implications is hardly complimentary to the British and their attitude is certainly going to be one which the United States cannot follow and support.

Insofar as the United Nations is concerned the solution of the Palestine problem in accordance with the majority report will be a successful solution. In that way it will bring added prestige to the United Nations. The successful handling of this problem will indicate the capacity of the United Nations to deal with important world matters.

Insofar as the United States' internal considerations are concerned, there is every reason for confidence that the vast majority of American Jews and of non-Jews in the United States will support the majority proposal. Certain extremists will take exception but they will be small in number. This is an opportunity for the United States government to carry out the wishes of most of its people and to actively determine and implement a just and lasting settlement of a problem which has threatened peace and which has posed undue hardship on millions of people.

* * *

September 2, 1947

September 2, 1947

Honorable Robert A. Lovett
Under Secretary of State
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob:

The attached memorandum and transmittal letter are self-explanatory. Sorry I didn't get them in last week.

As indicated in my letter to Henderson, I am quite favorably impressed with the justice and intelligence of the UN Committee's dicsions. It is really quite a good job and I feel that the United States should back it up strongly.

Please don't forget my continuing offer to be of assistance.

Cordially,

Robert R. Nathan

September 2, 1947

Mr. Loy Henderson, Director
Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs
U. S. Department of State
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Henderson:

The attached memorandum should have been sent to you on Friday but at the last minute there were some typographical changes to be made and our stenographers had left. I am sending it to you as completed on Friday despite the developments over the week-end. On the whole the general tenor or my memorandum still prevails.

I have only had a chance to read some of the summaries with respect to the proposal of the UN Committee. On the whole I think the proposal is quite a fair one. It varies principally from my suggestions in that the Upper Galilee is split with a substantial portion going to the Arabs. However, this does leave a rather sizeable mountainous area to the Jews both in the Upper Galilee and behind Mt. Carmel. Also it gives the Southern coastal region to the Arabs. The residual problem is primarily one of connecting the two States at two different points. The points of contact will be small and that will mitigate the problem of corridors. On the whole I think it is a most judicious and fair decision.

If I can be of further help, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

Robert R. Nathan

August 29, 1947

MEMORANDUM

TO: Loy Henderson

FROM: Robert R. Nathan

SUBJECT: General Comments on Character of Partition of Palestine

Pursuant to our recent conversation I am submitting herewith some of my personal observations with respect to the major issues, especially economic, concerning the partition of Palestine. These are my own views; they are entirely personal, represent no organization, and are presented for your personal consideration. Also they lack some degree of precision, primarily because I should want to review again some of the basic materials which were assembled in the preparation of our report on Palestine and would also wish to study more intensively some of the current information if a very precise report were to be submitted. Yet, it is my hope that these general comments will be helpful to you.

General Observations. If partition is to be the solution in Palestine, and I believe that it is the most logical one, one must approach the problem with an understanding of the fact that no one of the major parties in interest, British, Jews or Arabs, will be unanimously happy with the end result. The continued vacillation on political decisions, the deepening of vested interests, the agitation arising out of occasional or frequent conflicts and the impacts of external forces such as the Nazi extermination of millions of Jews clearly reveal an under-

standing of the impossibility of arriving at a solution which would satisfy everyone.

Though the Arab position and the Jewish position in an absolute, if not extreme sense, cannot be fully harmonized through partition, a workable compromise could be achieved through the devise of partition. But the magnitude of the giving and the taking essential to a reasonable and workable partition is so large as to make the decision one not wholly acceptable to all parties. This means that the details of partition must be worked out with care and must be related to the needs and the potentialities of the country and the people concerned.

The partition of Palestine must take cognizance of the fact that on the Jewish side the interests of the Jews in Palestine are only part of the picture. More importantly, the considerations of the displaced persons who are Jews, of other Jews in Europe who want to go to Palestine, and of Jews elsewhere, especially in the Middle East who wish to go to Palestine, should influence the decision. If the interests of only the Jews in Palestine were taken into account, the needs for expansion would be considerably limited. On the other hand, partition will only work if it makes possible substantial immigration into Palestine over the next few years and permits the immigrants to be absorbed in the economic development of the community. In short, the Jews outside of Palestine who wish and need to go there must be counted along with those in Palestine in any partition that will be constructive from an economic point of view.

Another general factor which must be taken into account relates to the use which will be made of economic resources, that is, realization

of the potentialities. Obviously this cannot be considered as an isolated and sole factor because Arabs certainly must be protected and given a reasonable share of the resources even though their rate of economic progress will be slower than that of the Jews. However, the relationship between world needs for a haven for Jews on the one hand and the undeveloped and potential resources of Palestine on the other, does offer a frame of reference in deciding the details of partition.

Another general factor is that of the relationship of the Palestinian-Arab population to the Transjordan and the rest of the Arab world. Some thought should be given to possible affiliation of the Arab section of Palestine with Transjordan and freer economic relationships between the Arab segment of Palestine and other Arab countries. Also the longer run impact of a prosperous industrialized Jewish community in Palestine upon Arabic development and Arab standards of living inside and outside of Palestine should be given weight.

Anyone familiar with Palestine realizes that there can be no partition without having a sizeable number of Jews or Arabs in the international sector, a sizeable number of Arabs in the Jewish sector, and many Jews in the Arab area. Minority groups in each sector must be guaranteed full protection and full independence and equality of opportunity. There should be no resignation to any idea of second class citizenship nor of restricted minorities. This is a very important factor, because otherwise the partition of Palestine would result in a hodge podge of large and small islands and corridors and split-ups which would be <u>utterly</u> hopeless.

The Peel Proposal. About ten years ago the Peel Commission and related bodies suggested a partition of Palestine which would have given to the Jews Upper Galilee, Jordan Valley above the Beisan region, the Emek or Valley of Esdraelon, and the coastal plain to a point slightly North of Gaza. The boundary line along the coastal plain was slightly West of Tulkarm and of Ramleh. It was proposed that the Arabs should be given the entire central mountain region, the lower Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea. No serious consideration was given to the Negeb because it was primarily an arid desert occupied by Bedouins. The possible economic development of the Negeb was not taken seriously at that time.

By and large the most moderate and compromising Jews now state that they are willing to accept, if they can't do better, the partition of Palestine to take place along the lines of the Peel Commission proposal plus the Negeb.

Population Questions. Today the ratio of Jews to Arabs in Palestine is roughly one to two, with about 650,000 Jews, about 1,300,000 Arabs, and perhaps 35,000 others. A partition consistent with the needs of displaced persons and other Jews who wish to go to Palestine, which would assure a Jewish majority as of the time of the partition, is not a simple matter. In a short time the matter would be solved by immigration. Also since a larger proportion of Jews than of Arabs are adults, the relationship of voters differs from the relationship of population. The data indicates that 725,000 Arabs include only about the same number of adults as does 500,000 Jews.

If the Jews in Jerusalem, approximately 100,000, were to be regarded as full citizens of the Jewish State and the Arabs of Jerusalem as citizens of the Arab State, and if the Arabs of the all-arabic city of Jaffa, approximately 80,000 were to be given full citizenship rights of the Arabic State then the partition suggested above (Peel Commission plus Negeb) would insure majorities of the respective groups in their respective states. In the Jewish State, the Jews would constitute over 50 percent of the population and about 65 percent of the voters. This device may be desirable but more importantly I feel that there should be a realistic facing up to the fact that the wishes of those who want to go and need to go to Palestine should be included in arriving at a just settlement.

Further, it should be pointed out that with partition there will undoubtedly be a sizeable influx of Jews into Palestine almost immediately. Some international or mandate or trustee authority will be necessary for a transition period and by the end of that period the population ratio will have shifted somewhat.

I have studied the map included in the report of the Anglo-American Palestine Inquiry Committee, which indicates Jewish and Arab population in four geographic areas of Palestine. These geographic boundaries coincide with the administrative districts rather than with the proposed boundaries of the Peel Commission. Further, the figures are not up to date. For instance, in the past couple of years about twenty new Jewish settlements have been established in the region South and West of Beersheba.

There are several possibilities with respect to the problem. If the Upper Galilee were to be given to the Arabs that would require a corridor and there are many reasons for its inclusion in the Jewish territory, as will be indicated later. If the coastal region between Majdal and the Egyptian border were to be given to the Arabs and the rest of the Negeb to the Jews, this would also require a corridor. It seems to me that the population and majority requires both giving consideration to the factor I have already emphasized, namely, the prospective immigrants and giving special citizenship treatment to the Jews in Jerusalem and perhaps the Arabs in Jaffa.

Under no circumstances should there be any compulsion permitted or even anticipated for shifts in population. However, if one is to be realistic one must conclude that there probably will be some movement of population. It is my guess that some Arabs will move out of the Jewish State because of the much higher prices they can receive for their land relative to the land they will be able to purchase in the Arab State or elsewhere. Further, I think that the Jews living in rural areas in the Arab State will be inclined to migrate to the Jewish State. This is one of those probabilities that ought to be kept in mind but it should be emphasized again and again that forced shifts of population will not be tolerated.

<u>The Galilee.</u> In the various reports which have been prepared from time to time on partition there has been much argument with respect to Galilee. This is the only mountain region which could be included in the Jewish State and still avoid the complex problems arising out of

corridors. From a social and economic and health point of view I feel strongly that those who have argued in favor of including some mountain areas in the Jewish State have a very important point. It is necessary that there be some region for reforestation and for mountain resorts and for achieving some balance in agriculture through the development of orchards. The lowlands of Palestine are very hot in the summertime and there should be some mountain areas where individuals could go not only for recreation but for health. Perhaps there could be some dividing up of this area but again this leaves the matter of corridors. There is much to favor the inclusion of this region in the Jewish area.

The Southwest and the Negeb. Insofar as the reasonably heavily settled area along the coast between the Majdal and the Egyptain border, there is considerable logic in keeping that region in an Arab State. It is predominantly Arab and has been rather well developed agriculturally by the Arabs. On the other hand it seems to me that there is little logic in denying the Negeb to the Jews. As one travels through Southern Palestine it becomes very clear that the land south of a line running roughly between Hebron and Gaza, except for the Southern coast, is little developed. It is land used sporadically by Bedouins. I feel very strongly that if this territory is left in the hands of the Arabs it just won't be developed. On the other hand, if given to the Jews there is a good possibility that it will be irrigated and will become a significant factor in the development of Palestine and the Middle East.

The achievements of the Jews in the coastal plain has had a favorable influence upon Arabic use of agricultural land and will continue to show the

way to the Arabs toward intensive and prosperous agriculture. Development of the Negeb will likewise have a favorable impact not only on Palestinian Arabs but in the other Middle Eastern countries as well.

In view of the overwhelming economic arguments in favor of giving the Negeb to the Jews, I believe that the whole Southern coastal plain should be included in the Jewish State so as to avoid corridors. The Arabs now located in that region could stay there and probably prosper in the Jewish State because they do have some industrial activity there and they are engaged in some intensive agriculture, for which good markets would exist in the Jewish State. If the decision were made to keep the coastal plain in the Arab region and to connect that area with the Arab State physically then either there would have to be a corridor or the Negeb would have to be denied the Jews. The latter decision is totally undesirable in appraising the entire region and every constructive economic factor.

There are two other questions with respect to the Negeb. One relates to the establishment of British military bases. This problem or decision is largely political rather than economic and I have no judgment on the matter except to say that the setting aside of any territory in the far South of the Negeb for such purposes would not seriously interfere with the economic possibilities of the region. The bringing of water from the North by the Jews would make this area more valuable to any outsider for defense or other purposes. However, consideration of this element will complicate a settlement by or in the United Nations.

There is also the question of Akaba which serves as a water outlet to the Indian Ocean and the Far East. It is important for trans-

portation purposes and as a fishing center. My only suggestion is that its economic development would undoubtedly be enhanced if it were part of the Jewish State. However there are political considerations involving the relationship of this port and the South Negeb with adjacent Arab countries. Probably political factors out-weigh the economic element.

There is also the matter of the Dead Sea. There is logic to a proposal which some people have made of internationalizing the Dead Sea along with Jerusalem and Nazareth and Bethlehem. This would impose considerable economic responsibilities upon the governing authority because the Potash works are rather important to Palestine and there are other chemical potentials in the Dead Sea region. These assets have big possibilities and international control would open the potentials to both Arab and Jewish investment and effort. However, the inclusion of this asset in the Arab State might be considered as an offset to some other concessions to the Jews, especially in Galilee or the Southern coastal region.

General Economic Matters. It is my strong conviction that in implementary partition there are very important questions other than those relating to geographic boundaries. All efforts should be made to expediate development. The old colonial concepts of exploitation should be tossed out post haste. Prosperity for both Jews and Arabs will be better assured if the relationships favor development for both rather than exploitation of either by the other.

For instance there is the matter of water. If the Jews are given the Upper Jordan Valley they will have control over important water resources. Accessibility to this water for irrigation and power purposes must not be

denied to the Arabs. Likewise, the water coming down from the wadis in the inland coastal plain should also be shared. Provision must be made in the settlement for the protection in the interests of both the Arabs and the Jews. This applies also to hydro-electric power. Both groups will get maximum benefit only if both can share in these vital resources. Likewise the maximum benefit from these vital resources can be achieved only if there is full cooperation on rights of way and on conservation measures.

Arrangements must be made with respect to customs and currency so as to facilitate economic development in each state and also to encourage trade between the states. A common customs union and a common currency has much merit. However, it should be noted that the Jewish State will need some protection for infant industries which are particularly adaptable in the Jewish State. The Arab State may be against such customs. Certain leeway must be allowed but by and large there should be maximum free trade between the two States. Goods in transit requires absolute freedom.

Accessibility to port facilities must be assured to the Arabs. Free port arrangements should be allowed whether in Jaffa or in Haifa for Arabs. Both groups must participate cooperatively in free port administration and in tariff or customs activities.

The partition agreement should always keep in mind the goal of maximum economic development on both states. They should look forward to modernization, industrialization and progressive development in the Arab State as well as the Jewish State. I believe that the United States, the United Nations, the World Bank and any other organizations or institutions should be dedicated toward the development of both states as well as the rest of the Middle East. Considerable external investment will be

needed, especially in the settlement of Jewish immigrants. Loans for this purpose must be substantial. Loans for Arab development should also be substantial. Aid and advice will be necessary in setting up internal monetary and fiscal systems designed to facilitate expansion.

During the transition period the governing authority must be development minded and the policies should be geared toward initiating economic progress promptly. As you know it is my conviction that the British policies have not tended to facilitate the development of Palestine. The authority during the transition must follow substantially different lines than those which have been pursuded by the British. Immigration during the transition should be related somehow to economic development and economic absorption with perhaps limitations on immigration geared to existing unemployment or some other measure.

Conclusion. The above comments may be more useful in suggesting general principles and criteria rather than specific decisions, but I think the details will have to be worked out with very great care and with much thought. These can be solved to the benefit of all parties concerned if the basic concepts are clear. The role of the United States in final settlement will be of first importance and that is why I believe we must be clear in our own minds as to what should be done.