of the economic potential of the Middle East will disclose that no legitimate American interest is in real danger from Arab rulers who, however fanatic their religious hatreds, nevertheless remain hard-headed businessmen whose economic advancement is wholly dependent upon American investment dollars.

Issues of precisely this character are not without precedent for the United States. The diplomatic history of any great nation is the record of its capacity to sustain, or its willingness to abandon, those ideals that embody its national creed. When confronted with a threat to the liberties of its citizens, indeed, when forced to choose between condoning exactly the kind of anti-Semitism now practiced by the Arab states and risking the possibility of economic loss, this country did not in the past waver or equivocate. For us the claim of freedom has always been of greater force and dignity than the claim of profit.

When Woodrow Wilson was advised in 1911 (as we are now advised respecting the Arab states), that there must not be American diplomatic intercession against foreign anti-Semitism because of possible danger to American investment opportunities, he stated:

> ". . . there lies a principle back of our life. America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of free men. Our greatness is built upon our freedom—is moral, not material. We have a great ardour for gain; but we have a deep passion for the rights of man. Principles lie back of our action. America would be inconceivable without them. These principles are not incompatible with great material prosperity. On the contrary, unless we are deeply mistaken, they are indispensable to it. We are not willing to have prosperity, however, if our fellow-citizens must suffer contempt for it, or lose the rights that belong to every American in order that we may enjoy it. The price is too great." *48 Congressional Record, 497-498 (62d Congress, 2d Session, December 6, 1911.)*

Before turning to a detailed examination of Arab anti-Semitism in the United States, we believe it pertinent, therefore, to consider briefly past actions taken by this country in protest of foreign anti-Semitic excesses.

I. American Diplomatic Precedents

American diplomats have never been diffident in denouncing religious discrimination against any American nationals who travel abroad. Under the Act of July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 244) the President of the United States and the Department of State are required to take immediate action whenever the rights of any American citizen are violated or threatened by a foreign state. This right of protection admits of no religious limitation. As stated by Secretary of State Lewis Cass, the object of our foreign policy is "not merely to protect a Catholic in a Protestant country, a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries." (Quoted in J. B. Moore, *American Diplomacy* (1905), at p. 135.)

This diplomatic principle derives from the recognition by those charged with determining and administering our foreign policy that the defense of religious liberty is an inseparable aspect of all American undertakings. In a diplomatic note protesting Austro-Hungarian anti-Semitism directed at the family of an American minister-designate, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared in 1885:

> Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.
>
> Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the sufferings and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever—.
>
> It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live, can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.
>
> Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments. *Foreign Relations* (1885), page 50.

A. Czarist Russia

Perhaps the most noteworthy of all of the interpositions by our government to protect the rights of Jewish communities from the