



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series I: General Correspondence, 1914-1969, undated.

Sub-series A: Alphabetical, 1914-1965, undated.

Reel
85

Box
30

Folder
1878a

Zionist Organization of America, press releases, 1946-1947.

JTA

Daily News Bulletin

PUBLISHED BY THE JEWISH TELEGRAPHIC AGENCY
106 EAST 41st STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FULL TEXT OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN INQUIRY COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, April 30 (JTA) -- The full text of the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine deals with various aspects of the Palestine problem, as well as with the problem of the Jewish refugees in Europe. It is divided into ten sections, each dealing with a particular phase and containing an explanation of the basis on which each recommendation is made. The text reads as follows:

THE EUROPEAN PROBLEM:

Recommendation No. 1: WE HAVE TO REPORT THAT SUCH INFORMATION AS WE RECEIVED ABOUT COUNTRIES OTHER THAN PALESTINE GAVE NO HOPE OF SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE IN FINDING HOMES FOR JEWS WISHING OR IMPELLED TO LEAVE EUROPE.

BUT PALESTINE ALONE CANNOT MEET THE EMIGRATION NEEDS OF THE JEWISH VICTIMS OF NAZI AND FASCIST PERSECUTION; THE WHOLE WORLD SHARES RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEM AND INDEED FOR THE RESETTLEMENT OF ALL "DISPLACED PERSONS."

WE THEREFORE RECOMMEND THAT OUR GOVERNMENTS TOGETHER, AND IN ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, SHOULD ENDEAVOR IMMEDIATELY TO FIND NEW HOMES FOR ALL SUCH "DISPLACED PERSONS", IRRESPECTIVE OF CREED OR NATIONALITY, WHOSE TIES WITH THEIR FORMER COMMUNITIES HAVE BEEN IRREPARABLY BROKEN.

THOUGH EMIGRATION WILL SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF SOME VICTIMS OF PERSECUTION, THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY, INCLUDING A CONSIDERABLE NUMBER OF JEWS, WILL CONTINUE TO LIVE IN EUROPE. WE RECOMMEND THEREFORE THAT OUR GOVERNMENTS ENDEAVOR TO SECURE THAT IMMEDIATE EFFECT IS GIVEN TO THE PROVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER CALLING FOR, "UNIVERSAL RESPECT FOR AND OBSERVANCE OF, HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS FOR ALL WITHOUT DISTINCTION AS TO RACE, SEX, LANGUAGE, OR RELIGION."

COMMENT: In recommending that our Governments, in association with other countries, should endeavor to find new homes for "displaced persons," we do not suggest that any country should be asked to make a permanent change in its immigration policy. The conditions, which we have seen in Europe, are unprecedented, and so unlikely to arise again that we are convinced that special provision could and should be made in existing immigration laws to meet this unique and peculiarly distressing situation. Furthermore, we believe that much could be accomplished - particularly in regard to those "displaced persons," including Jews, who have relatives in countries outside Europe - by a relaxation of administrative regulations.

(Continued on next page)

Our investigations have led us to believe that a considerable number of Jews will continue to live in most European countries. In our view the mass emigration of all European Jews would be of service neither to the Jews themselves nor to Europe. Every effort should be made to enable the Jews to rebuild their shattered communities, while permitting those Jews, who wish to do so, to emigrate. In order to achieve this, restitution of Jewish property should be effected as soon as possible. Our investigations showed us that the Governments chiefly concerned had for the most part already passed legislation to this end. A real obstacle, however, to individual restitution is that the attempt to give effect to this legislation is frequently a cause of active anti-Semitism. We suggest that, for the reconstruction of the Jewish communities, restitution of their corporate property, either through reparations payments or through other means, is of the first importance.

Nazi occupation has left behind it a legacy of anti-Semitism. This cannot be combated by legislation alone. The only really effective antidotes are the enforcement by each Government of guaranteed civil liberties and equal rights, a program of education in the positive principles of democracy, the senotion of a strong world public opinion - combined with economic recovery and stability.

REFUGEE IMMIGRATION INTO PALESTINE

Recommendation No. 2: WE RECOMMEND (A) THAT 100,000 CERTIFICATES BE AUTHORIZED IMMEDIATELY FOR THE ADMISSION INTO PALESTINE OF JEWS WHO HAVE BEEN THE VICTIMS OF NAZI AND FASCIST PERSECUTION; (B) THAT THESE CERTIFICATES BE AWARDED AS FAR AS POSSIBLE IN 1946 AND THAT ACTUAL IMMIGRATION BE PUSHED FORWARD AS RAPIDLY AS CONDITIONS WILL PERMIT.

COMMENT: The number of Jewish survivors of Nazi and Fascist persecution with whom we have to deal far exceeds 100,000; indeed there are more than that number in Germany, Austria and Italy alone. Although nearly a year has passed since their liberation, the majority of those living in Germany and Austria are still living in assembly centers, the so-called "camps," island communities in the midst of those at whose hands they suffered so much.

In their interests and in the interests of Europe, the centers should be closed and their camp life ended. Most of them have cogent reasons for wishing to leave Europe. Many are the sole survivors of their families and few have any ties binding them to the countries in which they used to live.

Since the end of hostilities, little has been done to provide for their resettlement elsewhere. Immigration laws and restrictions bar their entry to most countries and much time must pass before such laws and restrictions can be altered and effect given to the alterations. Some can go to countries where they have relatives; others may secure inclusion in certain quotas. Their number is comparatively small.

We know of no country to which the great majority can go in the immediate future other than Palestine. Furthermore that is where almost all of them want to go. There they are sure that they will receive a welcome denied them elsewhere. There they hope to enjoy peace and rebuild their lives.

We believe it is essential that they should be given an opportunity to do so at the earliest possible time. Furthermore we have the assurances of the leaders of the Jewish Agency that they will be supported and cared for.

We recommend the authorization and issue of 100,000 certificates for these

reasons and because we feel that their immediate issue will have a most salutary effect upon the whole situation.

In the awarding of these certificates priority should as far as possible be given to those in the centers, and to those liberated in Germany and Austria who are no longer in the centers but remain in those countries. We do not desire that other Jewish victims who wish or will be impelled by their circumstances to leave the countries where they now are, or that those who fled from persecution before the outbreak of war, should be excluded. We appreciate that there will be difficulty in deciding questions of priority, but none the less we urge that so far as possible such a system should be adhered to, and that, in applying it, primary consideration should be given to the aged and infirm, to the very young and also to skilled workmen whose services will be needed for many months on work rendered necessary by the large influx.

It should be made clear that no advantage in the obtaining of a certificate is to be gained by migrating from one country to another, or by entering Palestine illegally.

Receiving so large a number will be a heavy burden on Palestine. We feel sure that the authorities will shoulder it and that they will have the full cooperation of the Jewish Agency.

Difficult problems will confront those responsible for organizing and carrying out the movement. The many organizations - public and private - working in Europe will certainly render all the aid they can; we mention UNRRA especially. Cooperation by all throughout is necessary.

We are sure that the Government of the United States, which has shown such keen interest in this matter, will participate vigorously and generously with the Government of Great Britain in its fulfillment. There are many ways in which help can be given.

Those who have opposed the admission of these unfortunate people into Palestine should know that we have fully considered all that they have put before us. We hope, that they will look upon the situation again, that they will appreciate the considerations which have led us to our conclusion, and that above all, if they cannot see their way to help, at least they will not make the position of these sufferers more difficult.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT: NO ARAB, NO JEWISH STATE

Recommendation No. 3: IN ORDER TO DISPOSE, ONCE AND FOR ALL, OF THE EXCLUSIVE CLAIMS OF JEWS AND ARABS TO PALESTINE, WE REGARD IT AS ESSENTIAL THAT A CLEAR STATEMENT OF THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES SHOULD BE MADE:

I. THAT JEW SHALL NOT DOMINATE ARAB AND ARAB SHALL NOT DOMINATE JEW IN PALESTINE. II. THAT PALESTINE SHALL BE NEITHER A JEWISH STATE NOR AN ARAB STATE. III. THAT THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT ULTIMATELY TO BE ESTABLISHED, SHALL, UNDER INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEES, FULLY PROTECT AND PRESERVE THE INTERESTS IN THE HOLY LAND OF CHRISTENDOM AND OF THE MOSLEM AND JEWISH FAITHS.

THUS PALESTINE MUST ULTIMATELY BECOME A STATE WHICH GUARDS THE RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF MOSLEMS, JEWS AND CHRISTIANS ALIKE; AND ACCORDS TO THE INHABITANTS,

AS A WHOLE, THE FULLEST MEASURE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT, CONSISTENT WITH THE THREE PARAMOUNT PRINCIPLES SET FORTH ABOVE.

COMMENT: Throughout the long and bloody struggle of Jew and Arab for dominance in Palestine, each crying fiercely: "This land is mine" - except for the brief reference in the Report of the Royal Commission (Hereinafter referred to as the Peel Report) and the little evidence, written and oral, that we received on this point - the great interest of the Christian World in Palestine has been completely overlooked, glossed over or brushed aside.

We, therefore, emphatically declare that Palestine is a Holy Land, sacred to Christian, to Jew and to Moslem alike; and because it is a Holy Land, Palestine is not, and can never become, a land which any race or religion can justly claim as its very own.

We further, in the same emphatic way, affirm that the fact that it is the Holy Land, sets Palestine completely apart from other lands, and dedicates it to the precepts and practices of the Brotherhood of Man, not those of narrow nationalism.

For another reason, in the light of its long history, and particularly its history of the last thirty years, Palestine cannot be regarded as either a purely Arab or a purely Jewish land.

The Jews have a historic connection with the country. The Jewish National Home, though embodying a minority of the population, is today a reality established under international guarantee. It has a right to continued existence, protection and development.

Yet Palestine is not, and never can be a purely Jewish land. It lies at the crossroads of the Arab world. Its Arab population, descended from long-time inhabitants of the area, rightly look upon Palestine as their homeland.

It is therefore neither just nor practicable that Palestine should become either an Arab State, in which an Arab majority would control the destiny of a Jewish minority, or a Jewish State, in which a Jewish majority would control that of an Arab minority. In neither case would minority guarantees afford adequate protection for the subordinated group.

A Palestinian put the matter thus: "In the hearts of us Jews there has always been a fear that some day this country would be turned into an Arab State and the Arabs would rule over us. This fear has at times reached the proportions of terror ... Now this same feeling of fear has started up in the hearts of Arabs... fear lest the Jews acquire the ascendancy and rule over them."

Palestine, then, must be established as a country in which the legitimate national aspirations of both Jews and Arabs can be reconciled, without either side fearing the ascendancy of the other. In our view this cannot be done under any form of constitution in which a mere numerical majority is decisive, since it is precisely the struggle for a numerical majority which bedevils Arab-Jewish relations. To ensure genuine self-government for both the Arab and the Jewish communities, this struggle must be made purposeless by the constitution itself.

MANDATE AND UNITED NATIONS TRUSTESHIP

Recommendation No. 4: WE HAVE REACHED THE CONCLUSION THAT THE HOSTILITY BETWEEN JEWS AND ARABS AND, IN PARTICULAR, THE DETERMINATION OF EACH TO ACHIEVE

DOMINATION, IF NECESSARY BY VIOLENCE, MAKE IT ALMOST CERTAIN THAT, NOW AND FOR SOME TIME TO COME, ANY ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH EITHER AN INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN STATE OR INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN STATES WOULD RESULT IN CIVIL STRIFE SUCH AS MIGHT THREATEN THE PEACE OF THE WORLD. WE THEREFORE RECOMMEND THAT, UNTIL THIS HOSTILITY DISAPPEARS, THE GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE BE CONTINUED AS AT PRESENT UNDER MANDATE PENDING THE EXECUTION OF A TRUSTEESHIP AGREEMENT UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS.

COMMENT: We recognize that in view of the powerful forces both Arab and Jewish, operating from outside Palestine, the task of Great Britain, as Mandatory, has not been easy. The Peel Commission declared in 1937 that the Mandate was unworkable, and the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations thereupon pointed out that it became almost unworkable once it was publicly declared to be so by such a body. Two years later the British Government, having come to the conclusion that the alternative of Partition proposed by the Peel Commission was also unworkable, announced their intention of taking steps to terminate the Mandate by the establishment of an independent Palestine State. Our recommendations are based on what we believe at this stage to be as fair a measure of justice to all as we can find in view of what has gone before and of all that has been done. We recognize that they are not in accord with the claims of either party, and furthermore that they involve a departure from the recent policy of the Mandatory. We recognize that, if they are adopted, they will involve a long period of trusteeship, which will mean a very heavy burden for any single Government to undertake, a burden which would be lightened if the difficulties were appreciated and the Trustee had the support of other members of the United Nations.

EQUALITY OF STANDARDS

Recommendation No. 5: LOOKING TOWARDS A FORM OF ULTIMATE SELF-GOVERNMENT, CONSISTENT WITH THE THREE PRINCIPLES LAID DOWN IN RECOMMENDATION NO. 3, WE RECOMMEND THAT THE MANDATORY OR TRUSTEE SHOULD PROCLAIM THE PRINCIPLE THAT ARAB ECONOMIC, EDUCATIONAL AND POLITICAL ADVANCEMENT IN PALESTINE IS OF EQUAL IMPORTANCE WITH THAT OF THE JEWS; AND SHOULD AT ONCE PREPARE MEASURES DESIGNED TO BRIDGE THE GAP WHICH NOW EXISTS AND RAISE THE ARAB STANDARD OF LIVING TO THAT OF THE JEWS; AND SO BRING THE TWO PEOPLES TO A FULL APPRECIATION OF THEIR COMMON INTEREST AND COMMON DESTINY IN THE LAND WHERE BOTH BELONG.

COMMENT: Our examination of conditions in Palestine led us to the conclusion that one of the chief causes of friction is the great disparity between the Jewish and Arab standards of living. Even under conditions of war, which brought considerable financial benefits to the Arabs, this disparity has not been appreciably reduced. Only by a deliberate and carefully planned policy on the part of the Mandatory can the Arab standard of living be raised to that of the Jews. In stressing the need for such a policy we would particularly call attention to the discrepancies between the social services, including hospitals, available in Palestine for Jews and Arabs.

We fully recognize that the Jewish social services are financed to a very great extent by the Jewish community in Palestine, with the assistance of outside Jewish organizations; and we would stress that nothing should be done which would bring these social services down to the level of those provided for the Arabs, or halt the constant improvements now being made in them.

We suggest that consideration be given to the advisability of encouraging the formation by the Arabs of an Arab community on the lines of the Jewish community which now largely controls and finances Jewish social services. The Arabs will

have to rely, to far greater extent than the Jews, on financial aid from the Government. But the Jews of Palestine should accept the necessity that taxation, raised from both Jews and Arabs, will have to be spent very largely on the Arabs in order to bridge the gap which now exists between the standard of living of the two peoples.

FUTURE IMMIGRATION POLICY

Recommendation No. 6: WE RECOMMEND THAT PENDING THE EARLY REFERENCE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE EXECUTION OF A TRUSTESHIP AGREEMENT, THE MANDATORY SHOULD ADMINISTER PALESTINE ACCORDING TO THE MANDATE WHICH DECLARES WITH REGARD TO IMMIGRATION THAT "THE ADMINISTRATION OF PALESTINE, WHILE ENSURING THAT THE RIGHTS AND POSITION OF OTHER SECTIONS OF THE POPULATION ARE NOT PREJUDICED, SHALL FACILITATE JEWISH IMMIGRATION UNDER SUITABLE CONDITIONS."

COMMENT: We have recommended the admission of 100,000 immigrants, victims of Nazi persecution, as soon as possible. We now deal with the position after the admission of that number. We cannot look far into the future. We cannot construct a yardstick for annual immigration. Until a Trusteeship Agreement is executed it is our clear opinion that Palestine should be administered in accordance with the terms of the Mandate quoted above.

Further than that we cannot go in the form of a recommendation. In this disordered world speculation as to the economic position of any country a few years ahead would be a hazardous proceeding. It is particularly difficult to predict what, after a few years have passed, will be the economic and political condition of Palestine. We hope that the present friction and turbulence will soon die away and be replaced by an era of peace, absent so long from the Holy Land; that the Jew and Arab will soon realize that collaboration is to their mutual advantage, but no one can say how long this will take.

The possibility of the country sustaining a largely increased population at a decent standard of living depends on its economic future, which in turn depends largely on whether or not plans referred to in Recommendation No. 8 can be brought to fruition.

The Peel Commission stated that political as well as economic considerations have to be taken into account in regard to immigration, and recommended a "political high level" of 12,000 a year. We cannot recommend the fixing of a minimum or of a maximum for annual immigration in the future. There are too many uncertain factors.

We desire, however, to state certain considerations which we agree should be taken into account in determining what number of immigrants there should be in any period. It is the right of every independent nation to determine in the interests of its people the number of immigrants to be admitted to its lands. Similarly it must, we think, be conceded that it should be the right of the Government of Palestine to decide, having regard to the well-being of all the people of Palestine, the number of immigrants to be admitted within any given period.

In Palestine there is the Jewish National Home, created in consequence of the Balfour Declaration. Some may think that that Declaration was wrong and should not have been made; some that it was a conception on a grand scale and that effect can be given to one of the most daring and significant colonization plans in history.

Controversy as to which view is right is fruitless. The National Home is there. Its roots are deep in the soil of Palestine. It cannot be argued out of existence; neither can the achievements of the Jewish pioneers.

The Government of Palestine in having regard to the well-being of all the people of Palestine cannot ignore the interests of so large a section of the population. It cannot ignore the achievements of the last quarter of a century. No Government of Palestine doing its duty to the people of that land can fail to do its best not only to maintain the National Home, but also to foster its proper development and such development must in our view involve immigration.

The well-being of all the people of Palestine, be they Jews, Arabs or neither, must be the government consideration. We reject the view that there shall be no further Jewish immigration into Palestine without Arab acquiescence, a view which would result in the Arab dominating the Jew. We also reject the insistent Jewish demand that forced Jewish immigration must proceed apace in order to produce as quickly as possible a Jewish majority and a Jewish State. The well-being of the Jews must not be subordinated to that of the Arabs; nor that of the Arabs to the Jews. The well-being of both, the economic situation of Palestine as a whole, the degree of execution of plans for further development, all have to be carefully considered in deciding the number of immigrants for any particular period.

Palestine is a land sacred to three faiths and must not become the land of any one of them to the exclusion of the others, and Jewish immigration for the development of the National Home must not become a policy of discrimination against other immigrants. Any person, therefore, who desires and is qualified under applicable laws to enter Palestine must not be refused admission or subjected to discrimination on the ground that he is not a Jew. All provisions respecting immigration must be drawn, executed and applied with that principle always firmly in mind.

Further, while we recognized that any Jew who enters Palestine in accordance with its laws is there of right, we expressly disapprove of the position taken in some Jewish quarters that Palestine has in some way been ceded or granted as their State to the Jews of the world, that every Jew everywhere is, merely because he is a Jew, a citizen of Palestine and therefore can enter Palestine as of right without regard to conditions imposed by the Government upon entry, and that therefore there can be no illegal immigration of Jews into Palestine. We declare and affirm that any immigrant Jew who enters Palestine contrary to its laws is an illegal immigrant.

LAND POLICY

Recommendation No. 7: (A) WE RECOMMEND THAT THE LAND TRANSFERS REGULATION OF 1940 BE RESCINDED AND REPLACED BY REGULATIONS BASED ON A POLICY OF FREEDOM IN THE SALE, LEASE OR USE OF LAND, IRRESPECTIVE OF RACE, COMMUNITY OR CREED; AND PROVIDING ADEQUATE PROTECTION FOR THE INTERESTS OF SMALL OWNERS AND TENANT CULTIVATORS. (B) WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT STEPS BE TAKEN TO RENDER NULL AND VOID AND TO PROHIBIT PROVISIONS IN CONVEYANCES, LEASES AND AGREEMENTS RELATING TO LAND WHICH STIPULATE THAT ONLY MEMBERS OF ONE RACE, COMMUNITY OR CREED MAY BE EMPLOYED ON OR ABOUT OR IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. (C) WE RECOMMEND THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD EXERCISE SUCH CLOSE SUPERVISION OVER THE HOLY PLACES AND LOCALITIES SUCH AS THE SEA OF GALILEE AND ITS VICINITY AS WILL PROTECT THEM FROM DESECRATION AND FROM USES WHICH OFFEND THE CONSCIENCE OF RELIGIOUS PEOPLE; AND THAT SUCH LAWS AS ARE REQUIRED FOR THIS PURPOSE BE ENACTED FORTHWITH.

COMMENT: The Land Transfers Regulation of 1940 sought to protect the Arab tenant and small owner by prohibiting the sale of land save to a Palestinian

Arab in one zone, by restricting such sales in another, and allowing unrestricted sale of land only in the third zone. Their effect has been such as to amount to discrimination against the Jews; their tendency is to segregate and keep separate Arabs and Jews. In the zones where sales are prohibited or restricted, they have protected the Arab from the temptation to dispose of his land, on which his livelihood and that of his family so often depend, for a sum out of all proportion to its real value. Though made with the object of maintaining the existing standard of living of Arab cultivators, and of preventing the creation of a considerable landless Arab population, they afford no protection to the Arab living in the free zone. He may sell his land for a fantastic price and add to the congestion in the other zones by moving there. An Arab living a short distance away, just across the zone boundary, cannot obtain anything approximating the same sum for land of equal quality.

We are opposed to any legislation or restrictions discriminating against Jew or Arab. We recognize the need for protecting the Arab small owner and tenant, for providing against a large landless Arab population, for maintaining, indeed for raising, the Arab standard of living. This necessity was also recognized in the Peel Report (Chapter IX, paragraph 10) which endorsed the following principles of earlier reports, that (i) unless there is a marked change in the methods of cultivation the land in Palestine is unable to support a large increase in population, and (ii) there is already congestion on the land in the hill districts. Those principles are as true, if not truer, today.

We do not believe that the necessary protection for the Arab can be provided only by confining the Jew to particular portions of Palestine. Such a policy, suggested by the Peel Commission, is consistent with their proposed solution, partition, but scarcely with that put forward by us.

The leases granted by the Jewish National Fund contain a provision that no labor other than Jewish shall be employed by the lessee on or about or in connection with the land subject to the lease, and a further provision that a sub-lease shall contain similar terms.

As we have said we are opposed to such discrimination. We appreciate that one of the reasons for such provisions was to secure employment for Jewish immigrants on the land. We do not think that that object justifies the retention of such stipulations which are harmful to cooperation and understanding between Arab and Jews.

Land acquired by the Jewish National Fund or for a Waqf by the Supreme Moslem Council becomes inalienable. The Peel Commission expressed the view in its Report (Chapter IX, paragraph 8C) that caution on the part of the Government in disposing of State domain to these bodies was desirable. The situation required watching. It would not be to the interests of the inhabitants of Palestine if too large a proportion of the land should become inalienable whether held by one organization or another.

In the small, thickly populated country of Palestine, with its rapidly increasing population, it is in the interest of Jews and Arabs alike that all land should be developed and put to the fullest possible use. The settlement of title to land should proceed as quickly as possible and the development of State lands, not required for public purposes and capable of use, should be facilitated.

The Holy Land of Palestine contains within its borders and throughout its territories places sacred to the followers of three great religions. The "Lido" with its dancing and swing music on the shore of the Sea of Galilee offends the

sensibilities of many Christian people. Reports came to our notice of other projects the completion of which would be equally objectionable. We therefore feel it right by our recommendation to emphasize the necessity for close supervision and to recommend the strengthening of the law should that be required.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Recommendation No. 8: VARIOUS PLANS FOR LARGE-SCALE AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN PALESTINE HAVE BEEN PRESENTED FOR OUR CONSIDERATION; THESE PROJECTS, IF SUCCESSFULLY CARRIED INTO EFFECT, COULD NOT ONLY GREATLY ENLARGE THE CAPACITY OF THE COUNTRY TO SUPPORT AN INCREASING POPULATION, BUT ALSO RAISE THE LIVING STANDARDS OF JEW AND ARAB ALIKE.

WE ARE NOT IN A POSITION TO ASSESS THE SOUNDNESS OF THESE SPECIFIC PLANS; BUT WE CANNOT STATE TOO STRONGLY THAT, HOWEVER TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE THEY MAY BE, THEY WILL FAIL UNLESS THERE IS PEACE IN PALESTINE. MOREOVER THEIR FULL SUCCESS REQUIRES THE WILLING COOPERATION OF ADJACENT ARAB STATES, SINCE THEY ARE NOT MERELY PALESTINIAN PROJECTS. WE RECOMMEND THEREFORE THAT THE EXAMINATION AND EXECUTION OF THESE PLANS BE CONDUCTED, FROM THE START AND THROUGHOUT, IN FULL CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION NOT ONLY WITH THE JEWISH AGENCY BUT ALSO WITH THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE NEIGHBORING ARAB STATES DIRECTLY AFFECTED.

COMMENT: The building of the Jewish economy has enjoyed the advantage of abundant capital, provided on such terms as to make economic return a secondary consideration. The Arabs have had no such advantage. In principle, we do not think it wise or appropriate that plans, such as the project for a Jordan Valley Authority, should, if judged technically sound, be undertaken by any private organization, even though that organization, as suggested by the Jewish Agency, should give an assurance of Arab benefits and Arab participation in the management.

Such proposals, by reason of their magnitude and far-reaching effects, should be conceived as public projects, suitable for Government enterprise and accepted only provided that they are calculated to benefit all parts of the population. But the undertaking of a worthwhile project should not be held up merely from financial considerations which could be overcome with the aid of semi-philanthropic resources. Some compromise should not be impossible which would combine Jewish finance with Government responsibility and control.

We welcome the knowledge that the Government of Palestine has itself prepared programs of post-war development; we could wish that means might be found for projects of larger range and on a more ambitious scale; but we recognize that until political peace is restored there is great difficulty in raising the necessary funds whether from revenue or borrowing.

Meanwhile it is suggested that the Government should acquire powers, at present lacking, to investigate fully the extent of the country's water resources, to control the use of underground water and to determine rights to surface water.

We doubt whether Palestine can expand its economy to the full, having regard to its limited natural resources, without a full and free interchange of goods and services with neighboring countries. In some respects, indeed, as in certain projects involving water supply, their active collaboration is indispensable to full development on an economic basis.

The removal of Article 18 of the Mandate would clear the way to those comprehensive tariff and trade agreements, not conflicting with any international obligations,

that might be accepted by the Mandatory or Trustee, which could ultimately lead to something like a customs union - an objective already in mind as between the surrounding countries of the Arab League.

EDUCATION

Recommendation No. 9: WE RECOMMEND THAT, IN THE INTERESTS OF THE CONCILIATION OF THE TWO PEOPLES AND OF GENERAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE ARAB STANDARD OF LIVING, THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF BOTH JEWS AND ARABS BE REFORMED INCLUDING THE INTRODUCTION OF COMPULSORY EDUCATION WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME.

COMMENT: In Chapter XVI of the Peel Report, the bad features of the educational system of Palestine and the great disparity between the money spent on Arab and Jewish education were pointed out. The Report also emphasized that both Jewish and Arab education in Palestine were nationalistic in character. Particular attention was called to nationalist propaganda in Arab schools.

Our investigations disclosed that today the Jewish schools also - controlled and largely financed by the Jewish community - are imbued with a fiery spirit of nationalism. They have become most effective agencies for inculcating a spirit of aggressive Hebrew nationalism. We would urge most strongly that adequate control must be exercised by the Government over the education of both Jews and Arabs, in order to do away with the present excited emphasis on racialism and the perversion of education for propaganda purposes. The Government should ensure, by a careful supervision of text books and curricula, and by inspection of schools that education contributes to the conciliation of the two peoples.

We believe further that a large share of responsibility for Arab education might well be assumed by an Arab community, similar to the Jewish community already established in Palestine. But if the Arab and Jewish communities are to set themselves the goal of compulsory education, a much higher proportion of the annual Palestinian budget must be devoted to education than heretofore, most of which will be spent on Arab education. This will only be possible if the proportion of the budget now devoted to security can be substantially reduced.

We would also stress the urgent necessity of increasing the facilities for secondary, technical and university education available to Arabs. The disparity between the standard of living of the two peoples, to which we have already drawn attention, is very largely due to the fact that the Jewish professional and middle class so largely outnumbers that of the Arabs. This difference can only be removed by a very substantial increase in the facilities for higher education available to Arabs.

THE NEED FOR PEACE IN PALESTINE

Recommendation No. 10: WE RECOMMEND THAT, IF THIS REPORT IS ADOPTED, IT SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR BEYOND ALL DOUBT TO BOTH JEWS AND ARABS THAT ANY ATTEMPT FROM EITHER SIDE, BY THREATS OF VIOLENCE, BY TERRORISM, OR BY THE ORGANIZATION OR USE OF ILLEGAL ARMIES TO PREVENT ITS EXECUTION, WILL BE RESOLUTELY SUPPRESSED.

FURTHERMORE, WE EXPRESS THE VIEW THAT THE JEWISH AGENCY SHOULD AT ONCE RESUME ACTIVE COOPERATION WITH THE MANDATORY IN THE SUPPRESSION OF TERRORISM AND OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION, AND IN THE MAINTENANCE OF THAT LAW AND ORDER THROUGHOUT PALESTINE WHICH IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE GOOD OF ALL, INCLUDING THE NEW IMMIGRANTS.

The Jewish Resistance Movement in Palestine

The following is a memorandum submitted in Palestine to the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee during its sittings in Jerusalem.

THE Jewish Resistance Movement has not set up for itself any independent aims, and does not present you with any separate claims of its own. The demand that Palestine be opened immediately to free Jewish immigration and be proclaimed as a Jewish State is also voiced by us. We are united with the whole Zionist Movement in a deep conviction and firm resolve that the Jewish State should be based on principles of full and true democracy, economic and political, and that it should assure complete equality to all its citizens whatever their race or creed. We likewise consider it self-understood that, by international arrangement, the Jewish State will guarantee the rights of the three religions to the Holy Places, and that the essential conditions of world security, such as air, naval and army bases, oil refineries, and such like will be secured by special treaties with the Jewish State.

We regard the Jewish State as essential for both the Jewish people and the democratic world: it will rescue the Jews from persecution, degradation and fear, and will free the nations of the world from that scourge of anti-Semitism which springs from the weakness of the homeless Jewish people and makes of it the leaven in the ferment of every form of reaction and Fascism. We regard the restoration of the Jewish homeland and the independence of the Jewish people, great in deeds as it is in suffering, as a categorical imperative of historical justice and human conscience. We regard the establishment of the Jewish State not only as an essential and just conception, but as a practical possibility due to the capacity for development and absorption inherent in the Land of Israel, and the capacity for work and creative effort inherent in the People of Israel.

It is not our intention to recapitulate the arguments

presented to you by the representatives of the Jewish institutions, nor do we wish to add anything new. We know that in the final analysis it is not our arguments which will decide the issue, but the political considerations of the Powers who appointed the Inquiry Committee, both of whom, Great Britain and the United States, desire security and loyal allies in the Middle East. To this political consideration we wish to contribute our humble share in the comments presented below. No other organization or institution is responsible for our formulation.

2. There exists in this country a secret Jewish armed force. This force has one fixed purpose—the defense of the Jewish settlement and Jewish work of construction. This force exists because no government—formerly Turkish and latterly British—has protected or has been able to protect us properly. The force is secret because no Government has been prepared to recognize it and leave its control in our hands. As we have said above, the fixed purpose is defense. But it is obvious that with the passage of time and the change of circumstances, changes have also taken place in the organizational forms of the force and its various duties.

From the very beginning of the Jewish settlement in Palestine, Jewish settlers were compelled to concern themselves with means of defense against Arab marauders and robbers. In the course of time, during the Turkish administration, there came into being the Watchmen's Organization (*Hatbomer*) which took upon itself the task of defending the life, property, and honor of the Jews of Palestine. Even in that period the Arab attacks on Jews were not solely of a criminal nature.

The First World War stirred up a volunteer movement among the small Jewish community which resulted in the formation of the Jewish Battalion in the framework of the British Army parallel to the Jewish Battalions which were raised in Great Britain and America. But with the completion of the British con-

quest of Palestine and the end of the war, the illusion that under the new administration, which had undertaken the policy of the Jewish National Home, there would be no need for an independent Jewish defense force, soon disappeared.

In 1920 and 1921 the Arabs attacked us in Upper Galilee, Jerusalem, Jaffa, Tel-Aviv, Petach Tikva, and other colonies. During these attacks the British forces either gave us no assistance at all, or the help was insufficient and came too late. Our losses were heavy, and almost the whole weight of defense fell on our shoulders. It was then that the National Defense Organization (*Hagana*) was established.

The bloody disturbances in 1929, and later between 1936 and 1939, proved that the existence of the *Hagana* was a vital necessity for the Jews of Palestine, and that without it we would have been wiped out. The severity of the Arab attacks grew from outbreak to outbreak—1921, 1929, 1936—but at the same time the strength of *Hagana* also grew and hardened. During the whole period of the Arab riots from 1936 to 1939 not a single Jewish settlement was crushed or abandoned—on the contrary, the protection afforded by the *Hagana* enabled the establishment of fifty new Jewish settlements in the border regions and in the heart of Arab areas. These settlements have since then enjoyed a prosperous agricultural development.

In May 1939, the *Yishuv* and the Jewish people in its entirety were attacked by His Majesty's Government when it issued the notorious White Paper and repudiated the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate. The *Hagana* was faced with a new task—to defend the *Yishuv* and its right of growth and development against a hostile government. However, at the beginning of the *Hagana's* struggle, the second World War broke out and the whole Jewish people rushed to the aid of Britain to do battle against the common enemy.

During the war the *Hagana* performed three tasks: firstly, many thousands of its best trained and most experienced members enlisted in the Jewish units of the British Army; secondly, and simultaneously with the enlistment in the army, the *Hagana* established an unofficial Home Guard in this country which prevented the Arab fifth column from operating; thirdly, a considerable number of *Hagana* members volunteered for special tasks in aid of the British forces—particularly intelligence and commando work at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, and penetration into Nazi-occupied Europe as parachutists. When the danger of a Nazi invasion of Palestine became apparent, members of the *Hagana* came forward and volunteered for special secret units

whose duties were to carry out the plans of the British command in the post-invasion period—that is, to sabotage the Nazi occupation—to provide the British Intelligence with information, to receive their orders and carry them out. In short, the *Hagana* as a whole—many thousands of well-trained and armed Jews—took an active part in the war effort, some in British uniforms, others out of uniform. The second World War ended in victory—a victory to which we also have contributed some share. But it has been decreed apparently that we should not benefit from the common victory over the common enemy.

As a result of Hitler's subjugation of Europe, during the six years of war six million Jews were annihilated, of whom the White Paper regime prevented the rescue of hundreds of thousands. The remnants are still condemned to languish in the camps. The seventy thousand Jews who are all that remain alive of the three and a half million strong Polish Jewish population still suffer from pogroms; so do the Jews of Cairo, Alexandria, and Tripoli and the gates of Palestine are locked and barred in their faces. The land, sea, and air forces of Great Britain have been mobilized to hunt out the refugees, partisans, and fighters of the ghettos, who try to break through to Palestine outside the humiliating quota of 1,500 immigration certificates a month. The Jewish armed force has now taken upon itself new tasks of defense—to safeguard the remnants of our people who come to the country, to defend the foundations of our National Home now threatened with destruction, to guard our right to build our house to the roof, to protect our people against a regime which aims at the extirpation of Zionism. It is with these objects in view that the Jewish Resistance Movement has come into being. The Jewish Resistance Movement is not identical with the *Hagana*, although members of the *Hagana* hold certain key positions in its organization. The tasks of the Resistance Movement are far wider in scope, and go very much further than purely military operations. The Resistance Movement should be taken to embrace every Jew in Palestine, and it is accountable for every action which demonstrates opposition to the policy of the liquidation of Zionism.

3. Our path is not the path of terror. In the three years of Arab riots which preceded the war we were the prey of Arab terror. We defended ourselves, and even pursued the roving Arab bands to their hiding places, but we guarded as something precious the moral purity of our arms to ensure that no innocent Arab should be harmed. The *Hagana* did not take revenge, and no Arab was attacked by the *Hagana* merely because

he was an Arab. The lofty conception of self-restraint was born. Thus did we practice restraint throughout six years of war, although six million of our brethren were slaughtered and the gates of our land locked to most of those who might have been saved. And when, in the last year of the war, the patience of two break-away groups from the general organization of the *Hagana* was tried too far, and acts of sabotage and anti-British terrorism began, it was not the authorities of this country but we, the Jewish community headed by the *Hagana*, which put an end to them because they were perpetrated when war against Hitler was still raging, and because we still had the hope that our just claims would be satisfied by the use of peaceful political means.

A radical change took place last autumn when it became clear that the present British Government had also repudiated its pledges—the pledges of the League of Nations, the pledges of Great Britain, and the particular pledges of the Labor Party. It was only then that the Jewish Resistance Movement commenced operations. But our deeds cannot be condemned as acts of terrorism. If there is terrorism in this country, it is terrorism from the authorities. That, at any rate, is how we view the situation. If, against unseaworthy craft carrying a few hundred refugees, the British Government sends out reconnaissance planes and destroyers, operates a well-equipped radar station and builds special police posts along the coast, if it uses airborne troops and mobile police to hound out the so-called illegal immigrants who land in these things, we do nothing more than defend ourselves against Government terror. When, as a means of defense, we attack Government instruments used to oppress us, we take strict precautions not to injure those manning them, even if by so doing we endanger the success of the undertaking and the safety of our own men. But British forces, on the orders of their superior officers, fired, indiscriminately, on unarmed crowds at Tel-Aviv, near Givat Hayim and near Shfayim, and killed innocent victims. British troops, on the command of their superior officers or with their permission, fired on children standing on the balconies of their houses during the curfew. The British authorities have promulgated an Emergency Regulation which lawlessly places the lives of every man, woman, and child in the country at the mercy of a hostile administration. The Government holds hundreds of young men in prison without protection of law or proper judgment, and sends into exile hundreds of Jews without any legal basis—not even the basis of the tyrannical laws which obtain here. A couple of weeks ago British forces were ordered to destroy an agricultural camp which had been built up

at Birya in Upper Galilee by the pioneering enthusiasm of peaceful workers. Thus, the paths of terror are those trod by the Government—our operations are in defense against it.

The Jewish Resistance Movement is not anti-British. We have devoted ourselves to a struggle against the hostile policy pursued against us by Great Britain; but we have no animosity towards the British people or the British Commonwealth of Nations. We do not know of a single conflicting interest between us and Great Britain; we have no interest whatsoever in the weakening of Britain's position in the world, the Middle East, or in Palestine; we have no connection with any of the undermining activity which goes on against Britain in various places. The sole conflict that exists between us has been created by the British Government, in its repudiation of the Mandate. We have no course left but to stand firmly and strongly in defense of our rights, and if there be no other way out, to stand to the last.

Our struggle has just begun. It has confined itself thus far to defense against hostile assaults and a few warning actions. We have resolved not to interfere as far as possible with the work of the Inquiry Committee, although we know in whose hands lies the actual decision and how that decision will be arrived at. Obviously, if the solution is just, we shall immediately renew our covenant of friendship with your nations; if you are true to your undertakings to the Jewish people, we shall be true to you—as we have been true in both world wars and throughout the twenty-five years between them. But if the solution is anti-Zionist, our resistance will continue, spread and increase in vigor. We shall not acquiesce in the carrying out of a solution which consigns the last hope of the Jewish people to the grave. There are precepts in Jewish ethics which oblige a man to be killed rather than trespass. The precept of defense of our national existence is at the head of these. We shall not trespass. No solution will be executed without agreement—we have strength enough to ensure that. Our resistance is liable to result in the creation of a new problem in this country—the British problem, the problem of British security in Palestine, and this problem will be resolved only by a Zionist solution. It would be better if the Zionist solution were proclaimed in recognition of the world Jewish problem and the justice of our work in Palestine. We do not threaten. We only wish you to know our intentions clearly.

4. We are in possession of clear information as to the preparations made by various departments of the British Government in this country for the suppression and eradication of the Jewish Resistance Movement.

This is nothing but the usual short-sightedness of the Palestine Administration, which does not understand the problem with which it is faced. In order to destroy the Resistance or even the *Hagana*, it will be necessary to destroy the whole Jewish community in Palestine, and to root out the eternal love of Zion from the hearts of the Jews of the world. The number of our people trained and ready for military action is not the point, as we do not intend to throw all our forces into one decisive battle with the forces of the Empire. The training and equipment of our forces are sufficient for a long and difficult struggle. But that is not our main strength. Our strength lies in the fact that every Jew in Palestine is on our side and twelve million Jews stand behind us, and that for every hundred or thousand who might be imprisoned or killed other hundreds and thousands will step forth to take their places. When Givat Hayim and Shfayim were searched for "illegal" immigrants, ten thousand Jews from the surrounding settlements rushed to the aid of the besieged villages. Practically the whole population of Tel-Aviv followed the biers of the four men who fell in the battle with the Police Mobile Force at Sarona. In place of the twenty prisoners of Birya some three thousand men, women, and children of all ages and classes streamed there a fortnight ago. Even those who do not bear arms can fight with the weapons of passive resistance and civil disobedience. We are not merely a secret society—we are the fighting Jewish nation. The choice between the British Government is clear: do justice to the Jews—or destroy them. We shall not surrender. We might be crushed by force, but we shall not give in.

5. We regard it as our duty to caution you against any attempt to decide on an anti-Zionist solution and make good for it by an increased grant of immigration certificates. The transfer of a certain number of refugees from Europe to Palestine will not solve the political question of the existence and independence of the Jewish people. We shall not accept the status of a minority in our own land, whether the minority be 33% or 49%. We know what has happened to the Assyrians in Iraq, and we are aware of the lot of the Jewish minorities in the Arab States today. We shall not accept a symbolic independence in a dwarflike token State which will not give us the chance of developing all the resources of the country and creating here a safe asylum for all Jews who are compelled or wish to come. You and your governments are requested to give a political solution, just and firm. A half-hearted compromise on the Palestinian question can only lead to disaster. It will not solve the Jewish problem, it will not gain the approval of the

Arabs, it will not halt Jewish resistance, it will not ensure the interests of the Powers as regards peace and security. You must decide.

We regard it as a duty to utter another warning. Do not postpone the political solution for ten years. No one knows how long it will take to transfer the first million Jewish immigrants or to carry out the development program. It might be necessary, until conditions of stability are reached, to leave a British, Anglo-American, or other International Control Commission here; but the Jewish State must be established speedily. Leaving the political question open for a period of years means the provocation of protests and disturbances—dangerous both to us and the interested Powers.

6. We suppose that the question that agitates you is what would happen if the Jewish claims were granted. Would that not be a signal for an uprising of all the Arabs, and possibly all the Moslems, and would not the security and stability of the Middle East be endangered still more? We know that the British Foreign Office and the American State Department are under constant pressure of the threats transmitted by their ministers and officials in the Arab capitals. We shall try to clarify briefly how the possibility of active Arab resistance looks to us.

As far as the strength of the Arabs in Palestine is concerned, we are in possession of well-founded information. There is no doubt that the Jewish force is superior in organization, training, planning, and equipment, and that we ourselves will be able to handle any attack or rebellion from the Arab side without calling for any assistance from the British or Americans. If you accept the Zionist solution but are unable or unwilling to enforce it, please do not interfere, and we ourselves will secure its implementation. We have no interest in asking for the removal of British forces from Palestine, but we do not consider their presence for any active interference on our behalf.

In the neighboring Arab countries no plans for an uprising as a reaction to the Zionist solution can be made, for these countries are independent, and their people will not rise against their own Governments and so harm their own interest. But there are two questions calling for consideration: firstly, whether these countries are able to dispatch forces to Palestine to take part in the conflict; and secondly, whether British and American installations will be attacked on account of the Palestinian question. In our view these two possibilities scarcely exist.

In all the crises of the past and until today, the Arabs have always acquiesced in the facts we have created

here and have expressed their opposition only to the creation of a new state of affairs. If they were to be faced now with the *fait accompli* of the Jewish State, they would at length acquiesce in that too. All objective circumstances will move the Jewish State to show particular concern for the welfare of the Arab minority; because we have and will have Arab States around us, and we would not wish to give them cause to rush to the defense of their brethren; and because in many countries Jews will remain a minority group and we would regard it as vital for us to serve as an example of tolerance in our treatment of national minorities; also because we would desire to prove to the Arabs of Palestine that their position in the Jewish State would not be worse than that of their fellows in the neighboring Arab States; finally, because we would be anxious to bind them with feelings of loyalty to the Jewish State.

The despatch of troops to Palestine by any Arab State while, during the transition period, it is under the control of a British or Anglo-American Commission appointed by the United Nations Organization, and will afterwards receive international guarantees for its security, will bring that Arab country into a state of war with the Great Powers, and into a serious dispute with UN. No Arab State would be willing to run this risk. They all take good care of their own interests above all things.

In the case of Egypt, for example, the interest in the "liberation" of Palestine is preceded by the interest of gaining dominion over the Sudan and Libya—and even then Egypt has not hastened to send troops to conquer those territories. Is it likely that Egypt will forego her selfish objectives in Africa for a war of intervention in Palestine, denude herself of her own troops and so leave herself in the hands of the British forces whose withdrawal she demands so vociferously?

Iraq is unable to send even one battalion to Palestine because the constant danger of a Kurdish rising has become more pressing owing to the encouragement given to the Kurdish movement by the Russians, and because the Red Army has come unpleasantly close to Iraq's borders. The Bagdad Government is dependent on British arms more than ever before, and it is idle to imagine that the Iraqi Army would be sent out of the country to wage war against the decisions of Great Britain and the U. S. A. It must also be taken into consideration that passage of military forces through Transjordan will for a long time to come be conditional on British agreement.

Syria and the Lebanon still have insufficient forces for their own internal needs.

Saudi Arabia, like Iraq, has no common frontier with

Palestine. The passage of a Saudi Army through a Hashimite country—Iraq or Transjordan—is out of the question owing to the quarrels between the two dynasties and the fear that Saudi troop movements would arouse in Bagdad and Amman.

It is of course quite possible that small Arab bands will filter into Palestine from the neighboring countries. This has happened in the previous disturbances—we have adequate force to deal with them.

President Truman was misled when, after the Potsdam Conference, he said that he was not prepared to send half a million American soldiers to protect the Jewish State. Not a single American soldier will be necessary. A few squadrons of aircraft will suffice to ensure the control and security of the borders of Palestine as they will be able to spot and halt any undesirable movements.

The only danger that remains, therefore, is that of anti-British disturbances in the Arab and Moslem countries. But disturbances of this sort occur anyway in Egypt and Syria and India without any connection whatsoever with the Palestine question. And it is obvious that if these countries are satisfied as regards their demands on Britain, the anger caused by Jewish Palestine will not be so serious. Conversely, if the Palestine problem is solved to the satisfaction of the Arabs, they will not forego their demands in any shape or form, and will not reduce their pressure on Great Britain. You will not, at any rate, be able to buy the loyalty of the Arabs at the price of our destruction.

7. You will permit us to express our suspicion that certain "experts" deliberately exaggerate the danger of Arab uprising or that of armed interference on the part of the Moslem Arab world, when they actually have an entirely different fear—that of an Arab-Soviet alliance which, they hold, the Zionist solution to the Palestine question would assist. That fear, too, is utterly groundless.

The time has come for responsible statesmen who concern themselves with these problems to ask themselves whether it is true that the question of Palestine is such a vital interest to the Arab world, and even, according to Mr. Bevin's statement on the 13th November last year, to the whole Moslem world. Have not the Arab countries and the world of Islam closer and more direct worries at home and abroad? And is the Palestine question really the decisive factor in the relations of the Middle Eastern States with Great Britain and America? In the case of Syria, for example, is not the deciding factor her striving for real independence or in other words, for the evacuation of British and French forces? And is not this the decisive issue in determining the

relations of Damascus with the Great Powers? As to Egypt, are not the crucial points her dominion over the Sudan, the withdrawal of British forces and the future status of Libya? And will not the solution of these problems determine Egypt's place in the rivalry between the U.S.S.R. and the Anglo-Saxon world? After all, the introduction of the Arab States as a factor in the Palestine question was the work of British officials and representatives in the Middle East who misled their Home Government in order to dissimulate the real differences between the Arabs and the British. In Syria, having got rid of French dominion, the Arabs did not rest content but proceeded to insist on the withdrawal of British troops as well. Similarly, the anti-Zionist agitation will not divert the Arab League from pressing its own claims on Great Britain. The Levant States and Egypt flirted with Russia at the UN session without any connection with the Palestine question, but in order to create pressure on Great Britain for the fulfilment of their own claims. If certain pro-Soviet leanings appear now in the Arab States, their cause is certainly not Palestine.

Besides, it is worth while making a close examination to see if a pro-Russian orientation of the Arab States is at all a matter of practical politics. In our view this is nothing but an empty threat. There is not a single Arab State which derives its existence from the will of the mass of its people. The feudal system still flourishes in the Arab lands, and a vast gulf stretches between the poverty-stricken subject masses and the wealthy ruling classes. The penetration of any Soviet influence to the Arab countries would be the death warrant of their dynasties and ruling classes. It must not be supposed that the rulers of Arabia do not realize this, and do not fear the spread of Soviet influence more than does Great Britain. Never has the dependence of the independent Arab States on Britain, on her favor and assistance, been greater than it is now. The pro-Soviet blackmail of the Arab States must therefore be regarded with suspicion—it is but a new and revised edition of their pro-Fascist blackmail in the Golden Age of the Rome-Berlin Axis.

We on our part do not threaten you with intrigues with Russia. We have one, and only one object—the rescue of our people from degradation and ruin. Our path is free of intrigue, ambition, and considerations of prestige. We are prepared to give our lives for the renaissance of our people and state. We shall resist all who would doom us to remain in our present state. We shall be faithful allies to all who offer us their hands. In spirit, as a people, we are free and independent. And

we say this further—the Jewish State, when established, will be the cornerstone of a stable Middle Eastern structure built on foundations of international cooperation and agreement with all interested powers. In place of the exclusive and quarrelsome Arab League there will be born in time a new progressive and peaceful league of the whole Middle East. The foundation of the Jewish State will be a powerful step in this direction. The Jewish State will likewise cause a fundamental change in the status of the Christians and other minorities of the Middle East, and will free them from the yoke of totalitarian subjection.

The Anglo-American Inquiry Committee has taken upon itself an extremely difficult and responsible task. The immediate future will prove how far and in what direction the Committee will influence the development of the vital subject of its inquiry. We are, however, convinced that the fate of every people is first and foremost in its own hands. But if you rise above the minor affairs of the hour, and search beyond the dramatic past of the Jewish people and beyond long-yearned-for future of the human race and the relations between nation and nation, you cannot but lend your hands to the reparation of the great historical wrong.

Just look at the position. You are still investigating and questioning whether the Jews are a nation. We draw your attention to the fact that millions of Jews have sworn in their hearts that the Jews are a nation like all nations, and that they must therefore attain what they lack and which all other nations have—a home, a land, a state.

You are still investigating and questioning whether to let us, the Jewish people, renew our state in this country, in Eretz Israel. We draw your attention to the fact that the six hundred thousand Jews who dwell in Zion have sworn in their hearts that they will not let anyone deny them this land of theirs, even at the cost of their lives.

You are still investigating and questioning whether to permit the Jews of the *Diaspora* to come here. We draw your attention to the fact that hundreds of thousands of Jews in Europe, and not only in Europe, have sworn in their hearts to break through the shores of their homeland, even at the price of their safety.

The Jews are a nation. The Land of Israel belongs to the People of Israel. The Jewish State will be established. It is better that it should be established with your help and for your benefit, than against you.

HEAD OF COMMAND

25th March, 1946 The Jewish Resistance Movement

Chronology

(May 18—June 30)

May 18, 1946: The Arab League announces that the leaders of the Arab states will confer on May 28, and that the Arab League Council will meet the first week in June.

May 19: The Tabriz radio announces that Iranian armed forces have attacked Azerbaijan.

May 20: The Governments of Great Britain and the United States request the Arabs and Jews of Palestine to submit their formal views on the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee report by June 20.

Hussein Ala, Iranian Ambassador, informs the Security Council that because of Soviet interference his Government still is unable to determine whether all Red Army troops have left Azerbaijan.

May 21: Hussein Ala notifies the Security Council that Soviet troops have evacuated Iran.

May 22: The State Department declares that there is no conflict between President Truman's statement of April 30, urging the transfer of 100,000 Jews from Europe to Palestine, and the State Department's statement of May 10, promising the Arabs that the United States will consult with Jews and Arabs before reaching final decisions on Palestine.

It is reported that fighting has ended along the Azerbaijan frontier and that the Azerbaijan government has absolved Premier Ahmad Ghavam of responsibility for the outbreaks.

May 23: A national emergency conference of Zionist leaders in Washington declares that while the statement on Palestine issued by the State Department made it clear that President Truman's position favoring the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine "is now the fixed policy of our Government," the State Department is "nevertheless continuing in practice a procedure of 'consultations' which may delay indefinitely" the attainment of that objective.

Jamal Husseini says an underground army is being organized throughout Syria and Lebanon to help Palestine Arabs.

May 24: Foreign Secretary Bevin tells the House of Commons he would like to see the whole Middle East working together with Great Britain and the British Dominions and eventually welded into a regional defense organization within the framework of the United Nations.

The Arab Higher Committee demands that Jewish immigration be ended immediately, that all foreign troops be withdrawn and that Palestine be established as an Arab independent state.

May 25: The Emirate of Transjordan is declared a kingdom and Emir Abdullah el Hussein enthroned as its king.

May 27: The Syrian Legation in London denies that an underground army is being organized in Syria and Lebanon to assist Palestinian Arabs.

The Palestine Arab Higher Committee sends two letters to Sir Alan Cunningham, warning that continued Jewish immigration will mean disorders beyond the control of Arab leaders and demanding the dissolution of the Jewish Agency on the charge that it fomented Jewish terrorism.

May 28: The Inner Actions Committee of the Zionist Organization announces the postponement of the meeting of the World Zionist Congress from August to December.

The rulers of seven Arab states meet in Cairo to discuss matters of foreign policy.

May 29: An Arab Higher Front is set up in Jerusalem as a rival organization to the Palestine Arab Higher Committee.

The Palestine Broadcasting System announces that an agreement for building an oil pipe-line across Transjordan has been reached between the Arabian-American Oil Company and the Transjordan Government.

George Hall, British Colonial Secretary, announces in the House of Commons that in the last six months 345 Arabs and 33 Jews have been arrested in Palestine for illegal possession of arms.

May 30: The rulers of the seven Arab League states announce decisions opposing further Jewish immigration to Palestine, favoring freedom for Libya, the completion of Egypt's independence, and the liberation of other Arab countries.

May 31: Twenty-four Jewish youths of the Biryia settlement in Palestine are sentenced by a military court to prison for illegal possession of arms.

June 2: Jamal el Husseini, chairman of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee, at a political rally, urges Arabs to be ready "to defend the country with your blood."

June 3: The ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el Husseini, in a message from Paris, appeals to the Arab world to "stand firm" in opposition to Zionism.

Hector McNeil, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, announces in the House of Commons that the British Government holds the Egyptian Government responsible for the murder of the two British soldiers in Alexandria on March 4.

June 4: In reply to the State Department's request for comment on the Anglo-American Committee report, the American Zionist Emergency Council declares that "further consultations and comments appear meaningless, except to produce delay when immediate action is called for, and to confuse where the issue has long been altogether clear."

June 7: The vessel *Haviva Reik*, carrying 470 visaless immigrants, is reported intercepted by British authorities off southern Palestine and escorted into Haifa harbor.

June 8: Thirty-two delegates from eight Arab countries meet at Bludan, Syria.

Nine persons are wounded by hand grenades, as anti-British rioting flares in Alexandria.

June 9: The ex-Mufti of Jerusalem disappears from France and is reported to have arrived at Damascus, Syria, in a British plane.

James G. McDonald, U. S. member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, demands that the United States and Great Britain take immediate action to transfer 100,000 Jews from Europe to Palestine.

June 10: The political sub-committee of the Arab League rejects a plan to set up a provisional Arab Government of Palestine in one of the neighboring Arab countries.

June 11: President Truman names a Cabinet committee to assist him on the Palestine question. Its chairman, Secretary of State Byrnes, says the committee will discuss with Britain the size and nature of any military aid the

72C
3200 7/31/41
United States may provide in connection with the admission of 100,000 Jews.

June 12: In an address to the British Labor Party, Foreign Secretary Bevin says that if 100,000 Jews were admitted to Palestine, in addition to "tremendous" costs, "I would have to put another division of British troops in there and I am not prepared to do it." He attributes the agitation in the United States for the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine to the fact that "they did not want too many of them in New York."

Delegates to the Arab League's meeting at Bludan vote unanimously to press for the earliest possible transfer of Palestine from a British mandate to a trusteeship under the United Nations. The League orders the establishment of an executive committee, with the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem as its titular head, to replace both the Palestine Arab Higher Committee and the two-weeks-old Arab Higher Front.

Twenty thousand persons, attending a rally sponsored by the American Zionist Emergency Council at Madison Square Garden, protest the delay in admitting 100,000 Jews into Palestine, and the statement made by Bevin.

June 13: The Jerusalem military court sentences to death two alleged members of the Jewish extremist organization, Irgun Zvai Leumi, for firing at British troops and for planting bombs in the Sarafand camp raid on Mar. 6.

June 14: A Foreign Office spokesman, attempting to soften the effect of Bevin's speech at the Labor Party Conference, says that the Foreign Secretary did not intend to reject the Anglo-American Committee's recommendations.

June 15: The Soviet newspaper *Trud* charges the Turks with persecuting and suppressing Kurdish nationalists.

June 16: In response to the request of the British and United States Governments for its reaction to the Inquiry Committee's report, the Jewish Agency for Palestine declares that "establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state" is the only "just, practicable and lasting solution of the Palestine problem."

Palestinian Jews blow up five bridges over the Jordan River, virtually isolating the newly proclaimed independent State of Transjordan.

June 18: Five British Army officers are kidnapped by Jewish extremists from an officers' club in Tel Aviv, and two others are wounded in Jerusalem.

Workshops in the Haifa railway yards are damaged extensively by fire and explosions during an attack by Jews on Palestine railway facilities.

The British Government receives a note from the Arab League denouncing the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee's recommendations for Palestine.

June 21: Premier Ismail Sidky Pasha of Egypt declares that his country was "honor bound" to shelter the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, but indicates that the Mufti is expected not to participate in controversial activities.

Moshe Shertok, head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, demands that Irgun Zvai Leumi release the five kidnapped officers immediately, and calls their abduction an act of "lunacy." *Hagana* sets a time limit for the officers' release.

June 22: Two of the five kidnapped British officers are set free by their captors.

Hafez Afifi Pasha, Egypt's representative on the United Nations Security Council, declares in Cairo that "it is up to the Jews and Arabs to settle their differences now"

in Palestine, and if they "agree among themselves upon a government, then there is no excuse for British troops to remain in Palestine."

June 24: Nine Senators urge President Truman to "press again and without let-up" for immediate admission of 100,000 European Jews into Palestine.

June 25: The trial of 31 members of Irgun Zvai Leumi, accused of carrying firearms, begins before a military court.

June 26: A ship carrying about 1,300 refugees is intercepted by a British destroyer off Haifa and escorted by the British into the port.

In a manifesto addressed to the "Arab nation" the Palestine Arab Higher Committee declares that the sale of Arab lands to Jews is "a national crime and high treason punishable as such."

June 27: Thirty members of the Irgun Zvai Leumi are sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment for carrying firearms, and one member to life for firing at British forces.

June 29: More than 2,000 Jews, among them high officials of the Jewish Agency and leaders of Jewish Palestine, are arrested by British troops in Palestine. The London office of the Agency calls the action "a clear act of aggression against the Jewish people."

June 30: Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise, co-chairmen of the American Zionist Emergency Council, describe the British act as "treachery," and charge that it was "not merely another step in the program of terror and intimidation being pursued by the British military in Palestine, but was conceived on the highest political level in an attempt to liquidate the Jewish national home."

Irgun Zvai Leumi issues an ultimatum that if the British execute two Irgun members condemned to death, it will kill the three British hostages.

**AMERICAN ZIONIST
EMERGENCY COUNCIL**

342 Madison Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

Sec. 562, P. L. & R.
U. S. POSTAGE

PAID
NEW YORK, N. Y.
Permit No. 7381

Postmaster: If undeliverable for any reason, notify sender, stating reason, on Form 3547, postage for which is guaranteed.

New Judæa

VOL. XXII. Nos. 10-11.

JULY-AUGUST, 1946

[TAMMUZ-AB]
5706

PRICE 1s.

DEPORTATION OF JEWISH REFUGEES: Jewish Agency's Reply to Government's Statement

THE Jewish Agency Executive in Paris issued the following Statement on the night of August 13th:

(1) In its Statement on the measures to be adopted against the so-called illegal immigration into Palestine, the British Government labours to defend a régime of injustice and violation of international obligations accepted by Britain under the Mandate according to which it is her duty to "facilitate Jewish immigration."

(2) The Jewish people are not unmindful of the attitude of friendship and humanity on the part of the British people even before the issue of the Balfour Declaration, nor will that Declaration, which has given the Jewish people a chance for their great effort in the building up of Palestine, be forgotten in Jewish history.

(3) But even before the White Paper of 1939 British policy as regards immigration was not compatible with either the letter or the spirit of the Mandate. Had the principle of allowing Jewish immigration up to the limit of the economic absorptive capacity of the country been followed, additional tens of thousands of Jews could have entered Palestine before the beginning of the second World War. The 1939 White Paper was, in the words of Mr. Herbert Morrison, the present Lord President of the Council, and many others, "a cynical breach of faith." The implementation of this policy during the war prevented hundreds of thousands of Jews from entering Palestine, and thus saving themselves from Nazi extermination. This illegal White Paper policy is now virtually continued by the Government whose leaders condemned it outright at the time it was introduced.

(4) The Government statement itself admits the existence of persecution and pogroms against the Jews in Eastern and South Eastern Europe. Investigation after investigation has shown that the lot of many thousands still kept in internment camps is most deplorable. The Anglo-American Inquiry Committee stated that even after the improvement of conditions in Europe "as many as 500,000 may wish or be impelled to emigrate from Europe." Despite repeated urgent requests by the U.S. President, and the unanimous recommendations of the Inquiry Committee, the Government has till now refused to open the doors of Palestine to the remnants

of Hitler's victims. This policy can only be explained as one of appeasing the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, who was one of the chief instigators of the extermination of six million Jews, and who incited the Arabs to fight Britain and her Allies. In the face of these facts the Government Statement now tries to create the impression that the mass movement of victimised Jews is not spontaneous and natural but is an artificial movement created by "unscrupulous people" and "a minority of Zionist extremists."

(5) The Jewish people are not lacking in admiration for the heroic stand taken by Britain in the war against Nazism; but it should not be forgotten that more than one million Jews in the fighting Services of the Allied Nations and thirty thousand Jewish volunteers from Palestine fought in the British forces on all fronts.

(6) The British Government has now launched a new form of combating Jewish immigration into Palestine, the encouragement of which is the very reason for the presence of Britain in the country. It is calling upon the very Governments, who despite their good will are not able to stop pogroms and the persecution of Jews in their countries, to prevent these same Jews from leaving. It is mobilising the military, naval and air might of Britain for the hunting down of the refugees in order to prevent their entering into Palestine, and to divert them to new detention camps. It ill behoves the Government which starts by barring the way of Jewish immigrants to their homeland, to justify this act by the so-called defence of the rights of legal immigrants, or pretend anxiety about the conditions under which the refugees are reaching Palestine. It was through the merciless limitation of immigration to the arbitrary number of 1,500 monthly that "illegal" immigration, with all the hardships connected with it, has developed.

(7) The Jewish people must consider this step by the British Government against the most unfortunate of their sons and daughters an act of great cruelty. The attempt made in the Government Statement to divide the Jewish "extremists" and the "moderates" will not succeed. All the 600,000 Jews of Palestine and Jews the world over will, as they have done in the past, give all their support to any Jew seeking to return to his homeland.

ARE THEY "ILLEGALS"?

"The primary purpose of the Mandate, as expressed in its preamble and its articles, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home." (Royal Commission Report, 1937.)

THE RIGHT HON. HERBERT MORRISON.

"We regard this White Paper and the policy in it as a cynical breach of the pledges given to the Jews and the world, including America. . . . It comes at a time of tragedy and apprehension for the Jewish race throughout the world. . . . It is not only a British matter but one for the international conscience of the world. If we do this thing to-day we shall have done a thing which is dishonourable to our good name. . . . We cannot prevent this evil being done. I appeal to Hon. Members opposite. I ask them to remember that Palestine, of all the places in the world, was certainly the place where they had some right to expect not to suffer or to have restrictions imposed upon them." (House of Commons, May 23rd, 1939.)

THE RIGHT HON. HUGH DALTON (CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER).

"This Party has laid it down and repeated it so recently as last April—repeated it too recently for it to have been embodied in the Annual Report before the Conference—that this time, having regard to the unspeakable horrors that have been perpetrated upon the Jews in Germany and other occupied countries in Europe, it is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose

obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of Jews who desire to go there." (At the Annual Conference of the Labour Party, Blackpool, 1945.)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

"Does the present policy involve a violation of the Mandate? . . . I regard it as a question of common honesty, and breach of trust. . . . I have tried to look at this matter impartially, and objectively, and frankly I have found it difficult to do so. What I do care about is the fact that this country shall observe strictly and rigorously its solemn international undertakings. . . . The Mandate is our right and title to be in Palestine, and our sole right and our sole title to have anything to do with this problem at all. . . . I should be surprised if the Attorney-General can say with conviction that the policy is not a violation of the law." (House of Commons, March 6th, 1940.)

THE RIGHT HON. PHILIP NOEL-BAKER.

"Does he believe that when the war is over Jews will continue living in a country where things like that have happened? (100 Jews had been arrested in Warsaw and shot because it was alleged that a certain Jew was acting against the German occupation). Does he still pretend that we can solve the problem by our cruel facilities about British Guiana and the West Indies, where in two bitter years we have not found safety for even 100 Jews? There is one indispensable solution—the Jewish National Home in Palestine." (House of Commons, March 6th, 1940.)

THE crazy individuals who committed the horrible crime in Jerusalem will not be forgiven by Jewry. The dreadful act which resulted in the appalling loss of life of British, Jews and Arabs has shaken and distressed the Jewish people beyond words. We mourn the death of those who perished, and voice our profound sympathy with the families of the innocent victims. It is a great sorrow that the struggle for Jewish national freedom should have been marred by a dastardly and shameful deed, and those responsible for an act so un-Jewish, whatever the motive, are disowned by Jewry. The insane crime has, as might have been expected, tended to obscure many fundamental issues. It has also produced more vindictive operations by the military dictatorship in Palestine; a dictatorship steadily increasing for some time and over-reaching itself several weeks before the calamity in Jerusalem, when it made war on the Yishuv, and extending it further by condemning a population of 200,000 in Tel Aviv to a four days' confinement in their houses, cutting off the city from the rest of the world. And in Jerusalem, Jewish premises, offices and homes have been requisitioned, depriving thousands of their livelihood and dislocating normal life. On the pretence of military security Jews are punished, as General Barker said they would be, in the way they understand.

IT is a relief that, despite the humiliation, immense discomfort and heavy losses experienced by the Jews in Tel Aviv, nothing untoward has happened. We pray and hope that the cruel indignity to which an enlightened community has been subjected will not deepen the already existing bitter resentment, following the previous extensive operations and arbitrary arrests of thousands of people, including members of the Jewish Agency Executive and leaders of the Yishuv, the majority of whom are still detained without charge. The Nazi tone of the letter addressed by the G.O.C. to the commanders, the petty thefts and pilfering, added to the general hostile attitude, are not calculated to improve conditions. The troops, after beating up Jews, may succeed in forcing them to shout in chorus: "The English are good"; but that is not precisely the kind of tonic likely to soothe nerves. That the Jewish Press, which did not appear for four days, owing to the military hold-up of the city, had not been allowed to publish the disgust of British public opinion with the G.O.C.'s letter, or the fact that the British Government has dissociated itself from its contents in Parliament, does not make the position any more hopeful. The military censorship apparently does not want the Jewish community to know that there is another Britain; that British public opinion detests the heterogeneous rule of something between hostility and government, reminiscent of the Welsh marchers. The present rule is not likely to pacify the population and will certainly not subdue the Jewish spirit in Palestine. The savage attack on the Yishuv at the end of June, indefensible on many grounds, was a political blunder, unless it was deliberately calculated to widen the breach in the relations with the Jewish people. There was as little purpose in making the disastrous attack on Palestine Jewry at the end of June as the placing of Tel Aviv under war conditions in July. For the onslaught was not on terrorists and their organisations, but on the Yishuv as a whole, its accredited leaders and institutions, and on Jewish settlements.

THE raids and searches have apparently not yielded more than the discovery of quantities of arms, the possession of which had never been denied. Before the war the authorities, in view of tragic experience, had consented to Jews having arms for self-defence. During the war, after the fall of France, the attack of Italy, the pro-German revolt in Iraq, when, as Mr. Churchill told the House, Britain stood alone, it was his desire that the Jewish community in Palestine should be armed and encouraged to organise and play a part in the defence

of the country. But the defence of the Yishuv after the war is still a vital factor, and there is nothing at all remarkable that Jews should possess arms for their defence. The Arabs, it must be borne in mind, are fully armed; no action is taken to search Arab places. The neighbouring countries belonging to the Arab League are being armed by Great Britain. Moreover, Palestine itself maintains two armed Arab formations, the Trans-jordan Frontier Force and the Arab Legion; while the Jewish Brigade group, on the other hand, has been disbanded. Nor can it be overlooked that French and British troops have evacuated Syria, while the evacuation of the Lebanon is in process. There are, it is true, large British forces in Palestine, but the position is not clear; these may be reduced or even withdrawn. What then would be the fate of the Yishuv in the event of an assault without arms to defend itself? Are they not, in the light of these facts, to provide means for defence, especially now that the ex-Mufti is free and there is so much talk of a new Arab revolt or Holy War. The record of the Palestine Administration in protecting the Yishuv hardly encourages absolute confidence. It may be effective propaganda to exploit the discovery of arms in connection with terrorist activities, but the two are not related, and there is nothing startling or surprising that quantities of arms have been found in the settlements and elsewhere. Self-defence is an essential factor even in the Jewish National Home. And there is nothing derogatory in people organising self-defence, provided it is confined to it and does not go beyond it. Such people are not "extreme nationalists" or Zealots.

LORD SAMUEL, who gave an admirable presentation, in the House of Lords, of the background of the situation in Palestine did not help matters when, with strange inconsistency, he proceeded to recall the period prior to the fall of Judæa, implying that the Zealots were responsible for the tragedy. It is out of place to dwell on the historic Jewish national tragedy and make prejudicial analogies; but the spirit of the Zealots—as distinct from the wild Sicarii—was not confined to a group; it permeated the whole Jewish nation, except the quislings and hirelings of Rome. The spirit of the Zealots was fostered by the brutal rule: the Roman procurators, who had held sway for several decades, drove the people to rebellion owing to their inexorable severity, cruelty and injustice. Lord Samuel, who, when High Commissioner, put into power so eminent a "Zealot" as the ex-Mufti, should have hesitated to make comparisons unless he wished to draw the moral that an administration acting on the lines of the Roman procurators must inevitably produce Zealots. Dr. Weizmann is no Zealot. He was in Palestine during the assault in June. What does he say?

"The Yishuv, for which we have toiled for three generations with so much love and devotion, to make fruitful again the land which others had despoiled, is now in a state of siege and our best sons and daughters are imprisoned. In Europe the remnants of our people, for whom Palestine is the last and only hope, are languishing behind barbed wire waiting for the slumbering conscience of the world to awaken and set them free."

Much praise is lavished on Dr. Weizmann in all official quarters, and rightly so. But having, in the words of Jeremiah, seen the affliction of the rod of his wrath, he sorrowfully laments:—

"As one who has all his life regarded co-operation with England as the indispensable corner-stone of Zionist policy, I cannot help saying, however reluctantly, that the primary cause of the dreadful happenings here to-day lies not with the Jews, but with those who have allowed the situation to drift into the present calamitous plight. . . . Britain's might is, as we have been reminded, more than

adequate to bomb Tel Aviv to rubble in an hour, to lay waste our settlements in a night . . . But if—God forbid!—that should come to pass, we shall recreate what has been destroyed, and once again build up the land of Israel to the limit of our strength and resources. And those of our people, in Europe and elsewhere, for whom the world to-day holds so little hope will continue to press at the gates of Palestine."

These words are not those of a Zealot. The President of the Jewish Agency was in Palestine when the attack was launched. It, however, did not occur to the authorities, so keen on the co-operation of the Jewish Agency, to consult him before beginning, on a Sabbath day, military operations against the Yishuv. They believed that the assertion of British might was a more effective way.

THE display of might has undoubtedly caused much misery. But might without right has not and never will impress the people of the Book. Convinced that British policy since 1939 is not based on law—the law of the Mandate—British rule has, in the eyes of Jews, lost moral weight and respect. This is regrettable, but the blame must be laid at the doors of the Mandatory. In a famous speech in the Commons on conciliation with America, Edmund Burke reminded the House that the name of authority ought ever to carry with it reverential affection and not be obeyed solely out of respect for the bayonet. The "clumsy buttresses of arbitrary power" are of no avail in Palestine. With commendable frankness the Lord Chancellor, replying for the Government in the House of Lords, said that he believes now, as he believed in 1939, that the White Paper was not consistent with the carrying out of the Mandate. But after making this admission he added that, for better or for worse, that was done. This from such an authoritative legal source surely is hardly an adequate reply to a case in which the lives of hundreds of thousands of people are involved. The "evil thing" should have been undone, as Mr. Herbert Morrison had said it would, when his party obtained power. The existing policy is still contrary to international law, and the holding up of shiploads of Jewish refugees is still inconsistent with the Mandate, as members of the Government, including the Prime Minister, had maintained at the time and reiterated till they assumed power. It had ample opportunity to discard the evil inheritance. Fully aware of its weak legal position and unable to put itself right straight away, the Government might have shown a magnanimous spirit and, pending a settlement, it could have made a gesture of humanity by the admission of a substantial number of refugees from the European camps. But it did nothing to cover up the absence of its legal authority. It turned down all appeals from the Jewish Agency and it refused the request of President Truman. Instead of allowing Jews to enter their Home, it brought a large number of troops into the country. The very forces whose obligation under the Mandate was to encourage and aid Jews entering Palestine turned against them, frequently not without violence, which was naturally resisted. Yet the Prime Minister, Mr. Herbert Morrison, and others pretend to be shocked that the Jewish Agency does not co-operate with the Mandatory in defeating the provisions of the Mandate. The Jewish Agency has invariably been snubbed on all matters vitally affecting the Jewish National Home, but when the Government wishes to enforce the unlawful exclusion of Jews from Palestine it ironically seeks the aid of the Jewish Agency.

AFTER a year of bitter disappointment and mortifying experiences, many inquiries by committees and investigations by commissions, the Government have produced a Palestine plan. It fell to Mr. Herbert Morrison—an erstwhile champion of the Jewish National Home, an enthusiastic exponent of Jewish national aspirations—to unfold the scheme. In accordance with the newly

adopted formula, the Palestine proposal was preceded by some observations on the position of refugees in general and Jewish in particular. The House was treated to the oft-repeated assertion of the need of resettling Jews and other refugees in Europe and elsewhere. As an indication of the benevolence shown towards Jewish refugees, the Lord President of the Council announced that the Government "have already given a lead in this matter by accepting a commitment to promote the settlement of 235,000 Polish troops and civilians" in the United Kingdom. In his telling speech exposing the lack of substance in the talk about the resettlement of Jews in other countries, Mr. Silverman did not wish to characterise Mr. Morrison's statement as cynicism. But it is strange that all Mr. Morrison, who was not able to be particularly generous to Jewish refugees during the war when he was Home Secretary, can offer in the way of comfort to the Jews in the camps in Europe and the Jews in Poland and Hungary, where hundreds of them have been killed in pogroms during the last twelve months, is to state that Britain has undertaken to resettle nearly a quarter of a million Polish troops and civilians outside Poland. It is almost bordering on cruelty to announce so noble a gesture to the Poles, in striking contrast to the action of mobilising British forces on land, sea and in the air, in chasing, hunting down, and blockading boats carrying poor exhausted Jewish refugees to their National Home, and as we write these forces have already cruelly and forcibly dragged away homeless, helpless men, women and children into new captivity (reminiscent of Nebuzaradan). Jews gratefully remember that 70,000 Jewish refugees have found refuge in Britain since 1933. Indeed, Jews are not allowed to forget it; the gracious act is paraded with boastful pride by some, bitter resentment by others, and with pleasure by none, not even by those who are genuinely anxious to see Jews finding a place of refuge somewhere. No wonder. For as Herzl, whose memory Jewry reverentially recalled on the occasion of the forty-second anniversary of his death, has said, the more the misery of the Jews from Eastern Europe is increased, the more the Western countries resist their entry. All the talk, therefore, of resettling Jews in other countries, apart from being no more than talk, has nothing to do with Zionism.

ZIONISM is not a refugee problem. It is, to quote Herzl again, a home-coming, a home-coming of the Jewish people to the Jewish land. A home for all Jews who wish to come. It is certainly a home for those who must come; for homeless Jews, for victims of wicked acts, for orphans and widows, whose fathers and husbands have been tortured to death, for Jews whose homes have been turned into graveyards of their dearest. These people must find a home and redress under the ancestral roof; there alone are they welcomed, and only there can they begin a new Jewish life. These cardinal principles were recognised by Britain in 1917, confirmed by the nations of the world and made part of international law through the Palestine Mandate. It cannot be considered an attack on Britain if it is said that the Mandatory had departed from the law in 1939, as the Heads of the present Government and the political party they represent have repeatedly declared that Britain had committed a breach of faith to the Jews and to the nations of the world. The proposal now advanced under the name of a Federal plan is, in fact, a crystallisation of the White Paper. The country is to be divided into three provinces, and, generally speaking, there will be a lion's share for Britain, a camel's share for the Arabs, and the Jews are to be confined to an area of 15 per cent. of the country. The Jews are to have autonomy, the autonomy of a local council; but all vital matters affecting Jews, including immigration, will remain as they are now, under British control, and at the discretion of the High Commissioner. In the circumstances it is not surprising that the plan devised by British "experts"—rejected according to many accounts by the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee

—has been found by the Executive of the Jewish Agency, at its session in Paris, unacceptable as a basis for discussion. The plan, it has been explained, offers no independence, either to the Jews or the Arabs. Self-government in the provinces is illusory, as the most important matters actually remain under the authority of the High Commissioner, who even acts for the provincial legislatures, who are dependent on his approval, and that of the executives of the provinces, to be appointed by the High Commissioner. The plan, while depriving the Jewish people of their rights under the Mandate in 85 per cent. of the country, denies them the right to decide immigration policy, even in the 15 per cent. allocated to the proposed Jewish province, an area smaller even than the Jewish State proposed by the Royal Commission of 1937. The only finality in the proposed plan is the denial of Jewish rights in 85 per cent. of the country, and the maintaining, for an unlimited period, of the arbitrary rule of the British Administration.

GOVERNMENT'S DECISION ON JEWISH "ILLEGAL" IMMIGRATION TO PALESTINE

THE following statement was issued from 10, Downing Street on August 13:—

No country in the world has been a better or more consistent friend of the Jewish people than Britain. Wherever the Jews were persecuted the voice of Britain was lifted in protest and, wherever possible, action was taken to mitigate their lot.

When they were persecuted by Hitler, the British people not only protested most vigorously, but a large body of refugees from Nazi barbarism were received in our country. Even during the war, when our people were hard pressed for shelter and supplies, more were allowed in. Altogether 200,000 refugees—a large proportion of them Jews—landed in Britain.

It was under the British mandate that nearly 400,000 Jews settled legally in Palestine, where a great Jewish community now exists. When it was threatened with Nazi invasion—a terrible threat to the Palestinian Jews—British arms prevented that dread possibility. The Jews in Palestine were given arms so that they might be equipped for their own defence against their would-be liquidators from Nazi Germany and to enable them to take part in the common struggle. In Britain there are no pogroms: Jews enjoy all the rights of civil liberty.

Such is the record of this island, now the subject of bitter and unfair attack by many—though by no means all—Jews, on account of the unhappy events in Palestine, in the course of which British soldiers, doing their duty, have been killed, wounded and kidnapped, not in open and straightforward battle, but from ambush, and even in the course of hospitality. Moreover, Civil Servants serving Palestine no less than Britain, and ordinary quiet citizens going about their peaceful business, have been the victims of outrage more worthy of Nazis than of the Jewish victims of Nazis.

Against this background, His Majesty's Government give the facts and their decision about the illegal immigration to Palestine which threatens both civil war and a breakdown of Government in that historic land.

In December, 1945, the quota of 75,000 Jewish immigrants permitted to enter Palestine under the provisions of the White Paper was exhausted.

Nevertheless, pending a final decision on future policy for Palestine, His Majesty's Government authorised the continuance of Jewish immigration at the rate of 1,500 a month. Instead of this provision being accepted pending decisions on long-term policy, there has been an increasing flow of illegal immigrants into Palestine. The numbers of these illegal immigrants have had to be set off against the monthly quota, and those already held in camps in Palestine or on ships in Haifa harbour, are more than sufficient to absorb the whole quota for many months ahead. However, illegal immigrants in considerable numbers are known to be on their way to Palestine.

Moved by sympathy for the suffering of the Jewish people in Europe, His Majesty's Government have hitherto allowed illegal immigrants to land, in spite of the grave embarrassment caused to the Palestine authorities both in the administration of the quota and by the necessity for detaining in camps those whose entry was not immediately possible under the quota.

The patience, forbearance and humanity thus shown by His Majesty's Government has, however, been interpreted by those responsible for the traffic as a sign of weakness and as an encouragement to redouble their efforts to increase the flow of illegal immigrants still further.

The point has now been reached when it is clear that the present illegal traffic is not, as has been maintained, a movement arising spontaneously among the European Jews who see in Palestine their only hope for the future. Nor are those who encourage and direct it inspired solely by the sympathy which is so widely felt for suffering. Recent developments have revealed the illegal immigrant traffic as a widely ramified and highly organised movement supported by very large financial contributions from Zionist sources, which has been built up and put into operation by unscrupulous persons in an attempt to force the hand of His Majesty's Government and anticipate their decision on future policy in Palestine.

The organisers maintain a closely knit network of agents in the countries of Eastern and Southern Europe, by whom considerable numbers of displaced Jews are moved from points of departure as far distant as Poland down to the Mediterranean seaboard. Thence, herded into over-crowded and unseaworthy ships with insufficient food, and in conditions of the utmost privation and squalor they are brought across the Mediterranean, inspired by a conviction carefully instilled into them that this is their only road to safety. In all this process the laws and regulations of the countries concerned are ignored; identity and ration cards, travel documents, etc., are forged on a large scale; food, clothing, medical supplies and transport, provided by U.N.R.R.A. and other agencies for the relief of suffering in Europe are diverted to the maintenance of what is openly described as "the underground railway to Palestine."

His Majesty's Government have been distressed to receive reports of persecution and pogroms against Jews in Eastern and South Eastern Europe. It is a tragic situation that in countries which have been liberated by Allied—including British—arms and sacrifice, the very anti-Semitism against which we fought should raise its ugly head. It is to be hoped that the Governments of the countries concerned will bring this shame to a sharp and decisive end.

Apart from its illegality, the immigration and traffic to Palestine is a source of grave danger to law and order in Palestine. The reception and guarding of large numbers of illegal immigrants places a severe strain on the administration. Their arrival has greatly increased tension between the Arabs and Jewish communities in Palestine. And since there is evidence that the terrorist element among the Jews has been reinforced from the ranks of the illegal immigrants, their promiscuous introduction clearly cannot be tolerated any longer. As the Mandatory Power for Palestine, His Majesty's Government have responsibilities towards the population of that country. It is obviously not in the interests of Palestine generally that such illegal activities should be allowed to continue.

The recent increase in illegal immigration—which sets aside consideration of priority and equity—is also operating with great unfairness towards those Jews who would otherwise have been able to enter Palestine legally under the quota, and much suffering has arisen from this cause. Even Jews long resident in Palestine who have succeeded in tracing near relatives living in distressing conditions in Europe and who wish to bring them to Palestine, are unable to do so because all potential legal immigration has been pushed aside by this illegal traffic. It is also a matter of concern to His Majesty's Government that a large proportion of the illegal immigrants come from the countries of Eastern Europe, and not from the Displaced Persons Centres in Germany, Austria and Italy, to the emptying of which the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry attached great importance.

The continuance of this traffic at the present time is likely to have an adverse effect on the hope of a general settlement in Palestine. It is well known that His Majesty's Government has accepted as a basis for negotiation a plan drawn up by British and American experts which is designed to provide for increased immigration into Palestine under conditions which would not disturb the peace and economy of the country.

For all these reasons His Majesty's Government can no longer tolerate this attempt to force their hand in framing a new policy for Palestine. They have made urgent representations to the Governments of the countries from which the immigrants are despatched in order to stop the traffic at its source. In addition instructions have been given to the Palestine authorities that the reception into Palestine of illegal immigrants must cease.

Accordingly, immigrants arriving illegally will hencefor-

ward be conveyed to Cyprus or elsewhere and housed in camps there until a decision can be taken as to their future. Meanwhile, it is fully understood that many of the illegal immigrants concerned have come through conditions of great hardship in circumstances not under their control, and all reasonable measures will be taken for their health and well-being.

In announcing this decision, His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that, while they cannot tolerate this attempt by a minority of Zionist extremists to exploit the sufferings of unfortunate people in order to create a situation prejudicial to a just settlement, they are deeply sensible of the sufferings undergone by the Jewish community and are anxious to bring them to an end as soon as possible.

It is clear that a permanent solution of this complicated question can only be brought about if Jews and Arabs are prepared to enter upon discussions in a realistic and constructive spirit in order to evolve a practical scheme for harmonising the claims of these two historic peoples.

FROM A NOTEBOOK

THE blowing up of the King David Hotel, resulting in an appalling loss of life, is an act too horrifying for words.

Anything one says is likely to be misunderstood by some and misconstrued by others. It would be easier to bear the pain and grief in silence which often "persuades when speaking fails."

Words fail to express the horror evoked in Jewry by the outrage in Jerusalem. It is terrifying too that any Jew should have thought that such an act was likely to promote the Jewish cause. It clearly shows that the individuals responsible for the disaster are bordering on lunacy, people with diseased minds. Such desperate zealots obviously constitute a danger to the House of Israel.

Heaven and earth can testify that Zionism, closely bound up with Judaism, is based on peace, purity and humanity. The Prophetic warning: "Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood and establisheth a city by iniquity," rings in the ears of the Jewish nation. The clean record of Jewish work and achievements in the revived Palestine proclaims that Jews have firmly clung to the ethical principles embodied in Judaism and Zionism. They have benefited many and harmed none. They have been provoked, yet their faith in the sanctity of human life remained unshaken—a faith sealed with their own blood and tears. Ready to die in the defence of their people and their land, they have valued and respected human life as no other nation has done.

It is the more painful and revolting that some Jews, however small the number, should have become adepts in a realism of the most repulsive and brutal kind, so alien to the Jewish spirit. It is a new and tragic phenomenon, produced by rivers of Jewish blood. It demonstrates the truth that "bloody instructions, which being taught, return to plague the inventor."

It is a distressing manifestation that even a small number of Jews should have lost the sense of sacredness for human life and resorted to the mad, desperate methods so common in a cruel and cynical world; in a world that looked on indifferently, or looked away, while millions of Jews were sent to gas chambers, and locked all doors of escape.

That the very Power charged by the nations of the world with establishing the Jewish National Home had barred its doors before the massacre of Jewry began, and had slammed it against those running away from slaughter-houses, is sufficiently terrifying to shatter the minds of many. Even so, the killing of innocent people is a crime which cannot be forgiven. One of the oaths imposed upon Israel by the Almighty, it was said by our sages, was that the restoration of its land should not be brought about through violence. Jews must defend their fundamental rights; their natural and historical rights; the rights acquired by the law of nations and by their own creative, constructive achievements. But the Jewish name must not be defamed by immoral acts. Not because of the evil effects on the outside world, or on account of the bad reputation it may give them here, there or anywhere. That is of secondary consideration. The world is no more impressed by Jewish virtues than by Jewish sufferings, even though lip-service is paid to both on convenient occasions. It is the character and integrity of the Jewish people which is of primary consideration. Jewish tradition, Jewish ethics, must be preserved and must remain the guiding principles in Jewish life. The Jew has been slandered for twenty centuries and more; he has been abused when his life was a model of purity and sanctity, when his conduct was angelic compared with those who defamed and

slandered him. The pages of his history have never been blackened by such dark deeds as were committed against him, culminating in the most dreadful happenings in the last decade. But Jews must resist the corrupted currents of killing.

* * *

"Zion, hast thou no greeting for thy prisoned sons,
That seek thy peace, the remnant of thy flock?
I would pour forth my soul upon each spot
Where once upon thy youth God's spirit breathed."

These words of Yehuda Halevi, read annually on the Ninth of Ab, the anniversary of the destruction of Jewish statehood, have a unique significance to-day. The imprisoned sons still in the concentration camps of Europe, the imprisoned sons in Palestine itself. The rule in Palestine has been handed over to General Barker, who so impressively demonstrated his executive power on Saturday, June 29th. The "contempt and loathing" for the Jews in Palestine, which he has since openly avowed, were strikingly demonstrated on that day when, under his orders, the Yishuv and its institutions were raided by the troops. A fine exhibition of an orderly smash-and-grab of human beings. General Barker will no doubt receive all the military honour he deserves for the distinguished and heroic service he has rendered on that and on subsequent occasions. The smashing of buildings and grabbing of people, of thousands of men, women and youths—and other things—will enhance his own military glory and that of those who worked with him.

Note must be taken of the fact that the Sabbath day was chosen for the heroic display. Particularly the arrest of the aged Rabbi Fishman, one of the most worthy Jewish scholars of the day, compelling him to desecrate the Sabbath, probably for the first time in his life. Such bravery on the part of General Barker deserves particular mention. It shows manly and soldierly contempt not only for the Jews, but also for the Jewish religion. Since the General Officer Commanding believes that Jews can best be punished by striking at their pockets—as he so delicately put it in his order to the troops not to have any intercourse with them—it is not surprising that he is as completely insensitive to religion as he is to ordinary decency.

"One sin, I know, another doeth provoke." The raid, the brutal manner in which it was done, the beating of people, the smashing of furniture, the damaging and removing of things, the detention of thousands for over a month without charge, were, in effect, a declaration of war on the Jews in Palestine. General Barker has said as much in his order. All Jews in Palestine, he says, are responsible for the outrages, and they must all be punished.

If that be true, Jews might charge all Englishmen with responsibility for the death of 760 Jewish refugees—men, women and children, who were drowned in the "Struma", for some 200 Jewish lives lost in the "Patria," and for the 793 Jews who perished in the "Salvador." They were all victims of the British Administration, which slammed the door in their faces when they were escaping from the death-traps of Hitler.

But no responsible Jew would blame the British people for the inhumanity manifested by a few people in Downing Street or in Jerusalem. Can Jews blame the people of Britain for the immoral and illegal White Paper of 1939, which cost the lives of tens of thousands of Jews—though that would be more logical because that illegal act was carried out by the Government of the country. But Jews blame men like Mr. Malcolm MacDonald and company for the cruel outrage inflicted upon them, knowing they had not the support of the British people, nor even of Parliament, which had been tricked, or dodged, as the present Prime Minister said at the time. Yet the gallant General Barker blames all the Jews of the Yishuv for an outrage committed by a few over whom the Jews have no authority and could not have had authority.

Mr. Herbert Morrison and others pretend to be shocked by a statement by members of the Executive that it was difficult to appeal to Jews in Palestine to observe the law when the Mandatory itself was violating it. But it is the truth.

Did the cruel betrayal of 1939 have the law behind it? Whose law? What law? Of course, "there is no vice so simple but assumes some mark of virtue on the outward parts." Hence the approval in some quarters of everything that is done in the name of the law, without asking the nature, the origin, the very legality of that law. For,

"In law what plea so tainted and corrupt
But being seasoned with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil. . . ."

The Prime Minister is right in insisting that law and order must be maintained. But he must first establish whether the present rule is based on law.

The law is indeed vital. Israel and the Torah (The Law) is one, as our ancients have said. But the law must be armed with justice and not merely with big armies and weapons.

It is the contention of the Jewish people that the British rule in Palestine since 1939 has no legal validity. British rule derived its authority from, and was governed by, the Palestine Mandate. When the provisions of the Mandate are defied, the legality of British rule ceases.

This fundamental fact is evaded by many discussing the Palestine issue. Deliberately so, because it touches the core of the problem. Some members of the present Government should certainly be conscious of the illegality of its rule. They staunchly fought against the policy, not only because it was an act of treachery or, in Mr. Churchill's words, a breach of faith, but because it was contrary to the law of nations, an infringement of the Mandate.

The British position in Palestine is that of an army of occupation, if the development of the Jewish National Home is frustrated. Entrusted by the nations of the world with one of the greatest and most sacred missions in history—regarded by the British people at the time as a Providential privilege—the Chamberlain Government converted the mission into an historic betrayal; the betrayal of a loyal and devoted ally and the betrayal of an international trust.

That mortal blow was inflicted upon Jewry when Hitler let loose his bloodhounds on the Jewish nation. It was a sop to Hitler as to the ex-Mufti and his gangs who for three years had been killing men, women and children, burning trees and fields and generally engaging in destructive work in Palestine.

To Jewry itself it was one of the greatest shocks in its history. British promises were regarded as sacred. On the basis of its pledges, reinforced by international law, Jews put the ardour of their soul, the passionate love for Zion, the vigour of their mind, their energy and skill to reviving their ancient home. Yet at the very moment when life in Europe was becoming a purgatory to millions of them, a policy was devised to destroy their hopes, their national home.

"Thou has beguiled my hopes; naught but mine eyes could have persuaded me . . . who should be trusted now when one's own right hand is perjured to the bosom."

That treacherous act against the Jews was committed shortly before the long, horrid night began.

* * *

When Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, in the name of Britain, turned the Palestine Mandate into a scrap of paper, the positive provisions, according to the law of nations, to reconstitute the national home, became a dead letter. Having enforced the policy without the consent of the Council of the League of Nations and contrary to the decision of the Permanent Mandates Commission, British rule in Palestine is arbitrary. The Jewish people as a whole, and the Yishuv in particular, had rejected the policy of the White Paper; they have openly and unequivocally declared that they would resist any rule in Palestine which was in conflict with their right under the Mandate.

The General Council of the Zionist Organisation, at a meeting in Jerusalem on the eve of the Mandatory's decision, drew the attention of His Majesty's Government to the grave consequences involved in the adoption of a policy which would be contrary to the international obligations of Great Britain under the Mandate, condemning the Jews to remain a permanent minority in Palestine, and depriving them of the right to settle in parts of the country.

"The Jewish people," the Zionist Council declared, "and especially the Jewish community in Palestine, will not shrink from any sacrifice in opposing the setting up of any regime calculated to destroy the only hope left to them. The Jews will persist in returning to Palestine whatever the restrictions imposed or the sufferings entailed. It will not be possible to impose any regime destroying the Jewish National Home except by force of bayonets and the shedding of Jewish blood. The Jewish people is anxiously concerned for the preservation of peace in Palestine and the maintenance of friendly relations and the closest co-operation with Great Britain, especially at this grave moment in international affairs."

And in a manifesto by the Yishuv in May, 1939, it was stated: "The Mandatory may repudiate the promise to our people, but history cannot deny the eternal promise to the

Jews." The manifesto which followed a demonstration of 500,000 people said: "The Jewish people will fight for its rights and its future: the struggle will be hard, and the centre of the struggle is with the community in Palestine. It will not yield."

And the Palestine Labour Party, at a special conference, declared that the new policy of the Mandatory Government, imposing a political maximum for Jewish immigration, "is a flagrant breach of faith with the Jewish people at the most tragic period in their history and a violation of the trust placed in England by the League of Nations. The Palestine Labour Party denies the Mandatory Government the moral and legal right to maintain its rule in Palestine while repudiating the moral and legal basis for that rule—namely, the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration.

The twenty-first Zionist Congress on the eve of the outbreak of the war unanimously declared that "the policy of the White Paper threatens the very existence of the Jewish National Home; it widens the gulf between Jews and Arabs; it is not conducive to peace in Palestine; it cannot be carried into effect.

"The Congress declares that the Jewish people will not acquiesce in the reduction of its status in Palestine to that of a minority, nor in the subjection of the Jewish National Home to Arab rule."

* * *

The Mandatory Power took no heed of the appeals, warnings and requests, supported by eminent men in Britain, to submit the case to the Court at The Hague.

It remained unmoved by poignant scenes witnessed at Haifa when, after having remained for days in custody, having been caught off the shore at Nathanya, one ship after another carrying Jewish refugees from Germany, Austria, the Sudetenland, and the new "Protectorate" of Czechoslovakia, was sent away to sea by the British custodians, who refused the wanderers an asylum in their national home. Hundreds of men, women and children, travel-weary refugees who had been at sea for over a month, vainly seeking a haven, were driven back from Palestine territorial waters to the Nazi-oppressed territories. They were sent back to the death-traps of Hitler. They were thrown to the wolves.

Is it denied that these unfortunate people were driven back like sheep to the slaughter-house? Slaughtered they were. Yet when Jews became restive when—after three years of Arab terror and violence, during which hundreds were killed monthly—they received the blow from the Mandatory, and "their blood not so cold and temperate as not to be stirred by indignities and cruelties," and there was serious tension, Ben Gurion, in a striking article, which appeared in all the Hebrew papers, strongly condemning any act of terrorism, appealed to the Jews "not to defile a legitimate struggle by contemptible aberrations such as demented miscreants have been guilty of in Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa and Biyar Adas." The killing of innocent Arabs and Jews, he wrote, and acts of senseless sabotage are only calculated to help their enemies.

When the war broke out, Ben Gurion in Palestine, as Dr. Weizmann in London, urged upon Jews to co-operate with Britain in the war effort as if there had been no White Paper. The response was immediate, and there is no need to recall the Jewish contribution to the war effort despite all the obstacles placed by the Palestine Administration to their co-operation.

The process of Jewish extinction in Europe had not yet commenced, but all preparations were being made. Some Jews were still in a position to escape. They wanted to take refuge in their National Home. Had they been allowed to do so they could have been saved. But no. The road of rescue was blocked. Without justice, contrary to law, contrary to honour, without humanity, without mercy, the gates of the National Home were bolted. Jews who had reached the shores of their ancient land were not admitted: they were sent "to die, and go we know not where: to lie in cold obstruction and to rot"; the door of the National Home was locked as firmly as the heart of the holder of the key.

* * *

The power of the grave conquered; six million Jews were extinguished. Nations expressed regret, words and sorrow, sighs and sympathy. Yet there is no sense of guilt. No sense of shame that some of these victims might have been saved, that tens of thousands might have been rescued but for the callous indifference to the cries of agony of the martyrs. There was one reply to all appeals by Jews and British humanitarians: Wait till the war is over. The war came to an end. The common enemy was defeated. British

Labour secured political power. The British Labour Party, in common with the late Lloyd George and other Liberal leaders, and in common with Mr. Churchill, opposed the policy of the White Paper because it was illegal and unjust, because it was a breach of faith, and, in the words of Mr. Herbert Morrison, "evil." In the words of Mr. Noel-Baker (who, on behalf of Labour, moved a vote of censure against the Government in connection with that document), the policy was that of Dr. Goebbels' watch-word: "Judenrein"; a violation of the law of the Mandate; and, in the words of the present Prime Minister, the Government were "flaunting the authority of the League and International law." These men are now in power. They know the situation. They know that scores of thousands of lives were lost through the outrageous act; they themselves had frequently drawn the Government's attention to the fact; they were not alone, but they took the lead in the fight. And they made promises; they were pledged to change the situation.

They know, too, that the remnants were rotting in the concentration camps. They are aware of the terrible picture of the remnants, "dying eyes gleamed forth their ashy lights, like dying coals burnt out in tedious nights."

What have they done? Nothing. Words of sympathy, promises, delays and evasions. "To-morrow, and to-morrow creeps in this petty pace from day to day." And on top of it one of their leading spokesmen, who also aspired to become an architect of the Jewish future, jeered and joked at a tortured nation, a people mourning six million of its martyrs.

These are incontrovertible facts. They do not atone for abominable crimes by Jews. But they explain the unforgivable act in Jerusalem, following as they did shortly after the rule in Palestine had been handed over to military control and the arrest of Jewish leaders, who for years had done their utmost to restrain violence and who frequently exposed their own lives to prevent the loss of other lives.

Jews and gratitude. The gratitude Jews owe to Great Britain is being continually rung into our ears. Friends and enemies alike remind us of the fact, as if Jews had ever been ungrateful to any country that accorded them fair treatment.

World Jewry was more than grateful to Britain for many generations. No other nation had engaged the affection of the Jewish people as did Britain. That was enhanced by the Balfour Declaration which some members of the Government at the time characterised as partnership. It was thanks to the Jews, and to no sect on more than American Jewry, that Britain was entrusted with the Mandate.

But it was the Mandatory that let down the Jews; pushed them when they were on the edge of a precipice. What is the sense of suggesting ingratitude? On what is the sense of charging Jews in the United States with making anti-British propaganda, because they press for what they regard as the legitimate claim of the Jewish people?

Jewry, of course, still remembers "the kindness of thy youth." As long as there are people in Britain who continue to champion the cause of justice to Jews and to uphold the old British tradition of fair play—and the debate in Parliament strikingly illustrated that there are many who cling to the old tradition—the Jewish people will not sever its old attachment.

But it is hardly reasonable to expect from Jewry gratitude to that Britain which had broken its faith to them and broken the law of nations in regard to Palestine! The tragic story of the Jews in Egypt began when there arose a new king that knew not Joseph and wanted to "deal wisely" with them lest they multiply.

Jews are grateful to the Britain of the Bible, the Britain of fair play, the Britain that valued moral force and had the will and courage to be just and the magnanimity to be humane. The statement issued from 10, Downing Street is in accord with the spirit of the occasion which produced it—the wicked act of dragging away martyred people, tortured Jewish souls, from the shores of their fatherland. The document boasts of Britain's kindness to Jews. But those responsible for the misleading, malicious pasquinade, are the last to take credit for kindness. The trotting out of the virtues ("there are no pogroms in England"), the perversion of truth and distortion of facts, the half-truths, are hardly in the traditional British spirit which has always inspired reverence and even affection in Jewry.

The use, or misuse, of the British navy to force away from Palestine hunted and haunted Jews, after all their tragic

experiences, to new captivity is as alien to British justice as the statement justifying it. But the action in Haifa—a product of a hard, cynical realism of power politics—however ruthless, was at least open and straightforward; the statement explaining the action is mean and unscrupulous. It is unprecedented as a State document which, though applauded in certain quarters, is not likely to heighten the prestige of the British Government. It is easy to malign and libel the Jewish people (or "extreme Zionism"), but a statement strangling the truth does not strengthen a case. It should on reflection, weigh heavily on the conscience of those responsible for it.

HAMADIT.

LIFE IN THE YISHUV LETTER FROM PALESTINE

THE arrest of four members of the Jewish Agency Executive and of the president of the Vaad Leumi; searches in more than 25 of the agricultural settlements; the occupation of the Agency buildings in Jerusalem by British troops; searches in Tel Aviv in many public buildings; the arrest of more than 3,000 persons, and a curfew after dark—this is a brief summary of recent happenings. It is pretty tough, but it cannot in the least convey the impression of the events. Palestine has had a chequered history from the beginning of the first world war and Palestine Jewry has gone through trying experiences before. But none of them produced feelings of such bitterness and excitement as those of recent days. It is, indeed, quite impossible to gauge the effects of these happenings. But it can be said that it will take a very long time before the damage done in the last few days is repaired. Not the material damage; although it might turn out to be heavy, but the moral damage: the rift between the Jews and the British.

Palestinian Jewry was hurt at two of its most sensitive points by the raids on the Jewish Agency and the agricultural settlements. The occupation of the Agency building by British troops and the arrest of the Jewish leaders came as a complete surprise to everyone. The announcement of the High Commissioner that there was no intention to proscribe the Agency could not alter the fact that the building was occupied and searched, that none of the staff was allowed to be present, and that the leaders were arrested. The declaration by the Government that the quiet citizen had nothing to fear, as the action was taken only for the suppression of the terror, could not alter the fact that the agricultural settlements had to suffer one after the other under military searches, which upset one of the main sectors of Jewish colonisation. The result is, of course, a further closing of the ranks within the Yishuv.

During the last months differences as to the measures to be adopted by the Jews in Palestine were apparent everywhere. Wide sections tried to find means to eliminate terrorism. But the action which the Government began on Saturday, June 29, roused the deepest opposition in every quarter.

The meeting of the Inner Zionist Council and the Vaad Leumi, held in Jerusalem immediately after the military operations began, was attended not only by the members of these two bodies and the members of the Agency who had not been placed under arrest, but by representatives of municipalities and local councils and by leaders of the Agudath Israel. The resolution adopted unanimously at that meeting was suppressed by the censor. But there was no need for resolutions to show that the Jewish public is united in its opposition and resentment against the action taken by the Government.

The deep resentment against the arrests and searches was accentuated by the manner in which they were carried out. The searches in Tel Aviv were made on Saturday and during Sunday big crowds gathered in front of the buildings which had been occupied by the troops. As doors were forced open by the throwing of bombs into the buildings, damage was severe and the rooms of the offices showed that the soldiers had done their job with more than necessary force and with complete disregard for the damage caused. Broken doors, shattered windows, papers scattered everywhere, made a depressing picture of destruction. Even more depressing was the fact that dozens of thefts have been reported, in Tel Aviv as well as in the settlements. Government at first denied these reports. But a day or two later it was stated that one soldier was arrested and that following a search of a battalion several stolen articles were returned to the police. Some shops in the neighbourhood of the buildings in Tel

(Continued on page 212.)

THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE. GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS AND DEBATES IN PARLIAMENT.

July 1st, 1946.

PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT.

MR. S. S. SILVERMAN, by private notice, asked the Prime Minister, whether he had any statement to make concerning the attack by British troops on the premises of the Jewish Agency and other places in Palestine and the detention by force of its Executive Members and more than one thousand persons; under what international authority this step was taken; and who would now perform the functions which by international treaty devolved on the Jewish Agency.

MR. ATTLEE replied that he would like to make a full statement on the position in Palestine.

"The House has been informed from time to time of acts of sabotage and terrorism in Palestine. In the face of those incidents the military and civil authorities have shown the greatest forbearance (cheers) and their action has hitherto been local or directed only against those immediately responsible for the particular incident.

It has, however, become increasingly clear in recent months that these incidents formed part of a concerted plan, prepared and executed by a highly developed military organisation with widespread ramifications throughout the country.

The Anglo-American Committee called special attention to the development of illegal armed forces as a sinister feature in recent years in Palestine. The largest is the Haganah estimated to be 70,000 strong with a mobile striking force, the Palmach, of some 5,000 strong. This force has been developed on highly organised military lines armed with the most modern equipment. In addition there are two Jewish terrorist organisations, the Irgun Zvai Leumi, estimated to have between 5,000 and 6,000 adherents trained in street fighting and sabotage, and the Stern group which specialises in assassination.

The Haganah have been responsible for many incidents in the destruction of property and armed resistance to the Government. The other two organisations have been responsible for numerous acts of violence, murder, and the recent kidnapping.

The Jewish Agency have been repeatedly warned by the High Commissioner and H.M. Government of the gravity of these developments and the dangers to which they would lead. The Anglo-American Committee in their Report said that private armies constituted a danger to the peace of the world and ought not to exist. They expressed the view that the Jewish Agency should at once resume active co-operation with the Mandatory Power.

In my statement on May 1st I drew attention to these passages in the Report and said H.M. Government regarded it as essential that the Jewish Agency should take a positive part in the suppression of these illegal activities. In spite of those warnings, the situation has not improved. On the contrary, there has recently been a recrudescence of terrorist activity. In the past three weeks, sabotage to road and rail communications, including the blowing up of the principal bridges over the Jordan, has caused damages estimated at over a quarter of a million pounds. On the night of 17th June, railway workshops at Haifa were seriously damaged by explosions and fire. The climax came on 18th June when six British officers were kidnapped and two others seriously wounded. Three of the kidnapped are still held captive.

These were the culminating events of a campaign of violence which since December has caused the death of 16 British soldiers and 5 police, including 7 soldiers murdered in cold blood at Tel Aviv on 25th April, and material damage exceeding £4,000,000.

H.M. Government as Mandatory have the international duty of maintaining law and order in Palestine (hear, hear) and have full authority to take all necessary steps to that end. It was clear that we could no longer tolerate this direct challenge to our authority without abdicating this duty. I know what deep sympathy there is for the suffering of the Jews of Europe and I appreciate the natural intensity of the feeling of those who have experienced the atrocities of the Hitler regime, including murder and the taking of hostages but this cannot condone the adoption by the Jews of Palestine of some of the very worst methods of their oppressors in Europe.

The Government, accordingly, after consultation with civilian and military authorities in Palestine, have authorised the High Commissioner to take all necessary steps to restore order, and break up illegal organisations, including the arrest of individuals believed to be responsible for the recent campaign of violence.

I am sorry to say it included some leading members of the Jewish Agency. Action to this end was taken on 29th June. Certain buildings in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv were occupied, including the Jewish Agency building in Jerusalem. Searches were also conducted in part of the Jewish settlements.

The manner in which these measures were carried out reflects great credit on the military forces and the police, who showed greatest restraint throughout their extensive operations. Three Jews were killed and thirteen wounded have been admitted to hospital. One British soldier was accidentally shot and killed. About 2,000 Jews have been detained for questioning. There will be releases, but I have not yet received particulars of those set free. Vast amounts of arms and ammunition and explosives have already been found. The quantity is not yet assessed. These operations are not directed against the Jewish community as a whole, but solely against those who have taken an active part in the campaign of violence, and those responsible for instigating and directing it.

Although individual members of the Jewish Agency have been detained it is not our intention to close or proscribe the Agency as such. I should like again to make it clear that the Government will not tolerate any attempts by any party to influence a decision on the Palestine question by force. I appeal to all people of good will in Palestine to co-operate with the authorities in rooting up these illegalities and restoring normal conditions of life. Meanwhile this will not obstruct our considerations of the Report of the Anglo-American Commission.

Following on this, arrangements were made for discussions with officials of the United States Government. We have done our utmost to expedite this. Some preliminary discussions were completed. We hope

that a further body of American officials will arrive here in a few days to complete the examination of the Report. We shall persevere with our attempts to arrive without delay at a just and lasting settlement of these problems."

MR. ATTLEE added that they would try to have a discussion on the Palestine problem before the House rose for the summer recess. Meanwhile he would keep the House fully informed of the situation in Palestine.

MR. S. S. SILVERMAN asked the Prime Minister if he proposed to publish the evidence which had led anyone to believe that the Jewish Agency had been responsible for acts, all responsibility for which he disclaimed. Would he say why it was that of all the recommendations of the Commission the only one which the British Government had adopted in isolation from all the others was the one which the Commission themselves advised them not to take in advance?

MR. ATTLEE replied that when full consideration of the documents had been made, the evidence would be published. On the second part of his question he would remind the Hon. Member that what had happened was not simply that the Government had taken action, but that there had been a series of kidnappings and murders.

MR. W. MONSIEU asked whether the tragic events of the past few days would mean a non-implementation of the Commission's Report.

MR. ATTLEE replied that on the contrary the Government would not be stopped from going ahead with consideration of that very important Report.

MR. OLIVER STANLEY stated that the opposition would support the Government in any action which the facts justified for the suppression of organised violence which no Government of any complexion could tolerate. The opposition was very grateful for the proposed publication of evidence, but he wanted Mr. Attlee to treat the matter as urgent as, in view of the gravity of the situation, it was essential that the full facts should be available at the earliest possible moment.

MR. ATTLEE replied that the full facts would be published as soon as possible, but that would take time, as it involved the seizure of some documents.

MR. M. ORRACH asked whether, in view of Saturday's statement by the High Commissioner for Palestine, that for a considerable period a campaign of vilification and incitement to or threats of violence had been going on but which was not confined to only one community, the Government proposed to take steps to deal with the leaders of the Arab community.

MR. ATTLEE: As I have stated, we shall not tolerate any violence from any party in this Palestine question.

MR. ATTLEE did not reply when MR. J. RANKIN asked whether full consideration had been given to the fact that the arrests were carried out on the Jewish Sabbath.

MR. CLEMENT DAVIES said that he associated himself with Mr. Stanley's remarks. The Government would have the fullest support of everyone in maintaining law and order. He wanted an assurance of an early date when the House could discuss all those matters.

MR. ATTLEE said he would like discussion to take place through the usual channels about fixing a day for debate.

MR. R. JANNER asked whether the United States Government was consulted before the arrests.

MR. ATTLEE: The American Government were fully informed.

MR. JANNER: Did you consult them?

MR. ATTLEE: No, Sir. The Government has to take full responsibility for its own actions as the Mandatory. It would be quite unfair to put the onus on another Government.

MR. ATTLEE told MR. K. W. M. PICKTHORN that he would certainly consider the point that the word "Zionist" might be better than "Jewish" when considering such matters.

Asked by MR. WM. GALLAGHER why the Sabbath and not the days before or after were deliberately chosen for the arrests, MR. ATTLEE said that the matter was left entirely to the authorities in Palestine.

MR. S. S. SILVERMAN: As you say that this is a matter for the Mandatory Government, will you say whether you propose further discussion to allow 100,000 Jews now in Concentration Camps in Europe to enter Palestine?

MR. ATTLEE: Certainly not. This suggestion of the 100,000 came from the United States Government, and it is right that we should associate ourselves with them. What I said was that the Government charged with the responsibility of preserving law and order must act on its own authority.

VISCOUNT HITCHINGBROKE: Will you express the appreciation of the House of the skill and humanitarianism with which the policy has so far been carried out.

MR. SILVERMAN asked leave to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to a matter of urgent public importance, namely the arrest and detention of Executive Members of the Jewish Agency and other persons in Palestine, and the occupation by armed forces of its premises and other places. Forty members stood up in favour, practically all Labour members. Leave was accordingly granted.

The debate on the motion was fixed for 7 p.m.

DEBATE ON THE PALESTINE SITUATION.

MR. SYDNEY SILVERMAN (Nelson and Colne): I beg to move, "That this House do now adjourn."

I do so by leave of the House, for which I am grateful, in order to call attention to the happenings in Palestine over the week-end. I think perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister will not complain, for he must be aware that these events have caused the gravest misgiving, indeed dismay, all over the world, and if he can do anything or say anything to alleviate those anxieties and that uneasiness, that feeling with many of us that we are on the eve of a major tragedy, then he will not, I am sure, blame any of us for giving him that opportunity. If, on the other hand, he is not able to do so, then I hope that the House will be grateful that it has this opportunity, which may be the last opportunity, of warning the Government against proceeding on a path that may end in things which not only they would regret but which we and all humanitarian and all progressively minded people the world over would regret.

I cannot help feeling that my right hon. Friend's statement this afternoon, framed as it was with his customary restraint and moderation, may have misled the House into thinking that this matter is less grave than it is. Listening to him to-day one would have thought that all that was involved here was a form of limited action against a few people or a small group in order to restore to Palestine law and

order, which had been taken from it by the actions of a small group or a few people. My right hon. Friend knows that that is not so. This is not a limited, moderate, administrative action. This is plain naked war upon the Jewish national home, war of the White Paper of 1939 condemned by the right hon. Gentleman, by this Party, by Members sitting on the Front Bench now and by the Leader of the Opposition at the time. Let no one think that nothing else than this is involved. Look at my right hon. Friend's figures. He said—and I am not concerned to dispute it—that the Hagana consisted of 70,000 to 80,000, I think was the figure. The total Jewish population of Palestine, man, woman and child, both sexes and of all ages, is 600,000. Can it be denied that the attempt by the Administration by naked force to disarm 80,000 people out of a population of that kind means nothing else than war, war in every city in Palestine, war in every settlement? This House may wish to justify it; this House may think that it is necessary; this House may think that there is no other way; this House may think that the action of the Government is justified; but if it is to come to that conclusion let it be with full realisation of what is involved, and not on the assumption that it is some small, limited and restrained administrative action that is over in 24 hours.

It is not merely that which is involved in Palestine. I fear it will be resisted. It is not for me to say whether it should or should not be, but let Members of this House consider what the people in Palestine ought to do in these circumstances when the tanks and the Bren gun carriers arrive in the early hours of the morning in their settlements. Let hon. Members think instead what they would do if it were their houses, their villages, their towns or their streets that were being invaded in that way. Not merely is it that, but there is an international question involved. This is not merely war by the Palestine Administration to disarm the Jewish Defence Force of Palestine itself and attempt to put the Jewish Agency out of action. It is all very well to say that just a few members of the executive have been arrested, but British Military Forces have occupied the building of the Jewish Agency in Palestine, and they are still in occupation. Do the Government expect that any member of the executive of the Jewish Agency who is now at liberty will be prepared to negotiate for or to represent the Jewish people or to continue to perform the functions of the Jewish Agency while their colleagues remain uncharged, untried, in concentration camps?

Mr. JAMES GLANVILLE: They killed British soldiers.

Mr. SILVERMAN: The Agency has the same right in Palestine as the British Government (Hon. Members: "No"). The Agency has the same right in Palestine as the British Government. It is not there by the leave and licence of the British Government; it is not the creation of the British Government; it does not derive its status from the British Government or the Palestine Administration; it is a creation of international law. Further, the British Government cannot deny its right as a creation of international law without denying their own right to be in Palestine at all. Both of them are creations of the Mandate, and I am amazed that the right hon. Gentleman should have thought it right to make an attack of that kind, not a hastily conceived attack, but a long, premeditated attack, without consulting any of the other Powers involved. The mandatory power and the Agency are co-trustees. If the co-trustees fall out about the interpretation of the trust deed it will not do for one trustee to put the other trustee in gaol, and then proceed to shoot the beneficiaries.

I congratulated the Foreign Secretary at the time—when it was not a popular thing to do—when he succeeded in bringing the United States of America into active co-operation with Britain, so that the burden of responsibility should not rest on this country alone, but should be shared by other countries, particularly by those who were pressing the British Government to do things, and which would rightly have been asked to share the responsibility for doing them. I congratulated the Foreign Secretary on bringing the United States into co-operation with the British Government in the setting up of that joint Committee. Since that Committee unanimously reported, my right hon. Friend's reason for not even having done anything about it, or not even having indicated the British Government's attitude to it, even in principle, has been that they cannot do anything until they have agreed with the United States of America about how many people are to come in, who is to bear the cost, and who is to share the responsibilities, of defence. Not one thing could His Majesty's Government find to do alone, except this one thing—attacking the Jewish Agency and putting it out of action.

Why is this done? I listened carefully to the Prime Minister this afternoon. I have not, of course, had the opportunity of checking his words in the Official Report, and, therefore, if I misrepresent unintentionally what he said I hope he will correct me. I listened in vain in that statement for any accusation that the Jewish Agency, or any member of its Executive, was responsible, directly or indirectly, for any act of terror. I should like to know now, is that the charge made or not? Do the Government charge Mr. Shertok, head of the political department of the Jewish Agency, now in a concentration camp, of any active terror, either direct or indirect, by personal participation, incitement, or by encouragement or instigation? If he does, let me say that it is not merely a question of producing some day, some evidence somewhere. It must be his plain duty to bring his charge before a court competent to deal with it, and to give the people charged with specific offences an opportunity of dealing with the charges and replying to any evidence that was given. Do not do it in the way the Nazis did it in occupied Europe.

Mr. PICKTHORN: Although we did it with the "18B-ers."

Mr. SILVERMAN: The hon. Gentleman knows that I protested about that at the time. Do not let us do it the way we did it in India, or the way we did it in Ireland. Do not try and do it without formulating the charge, and without letting the charge be answered, if it can be answered.

Now about Hagana. One would have thought, listening to my right hon. Friend, that there was something new about this, or something new about the association of the Hagana with the Jewish Agency. I beg Members to draw the proper distinctions in these matters. It may be hard to do it, but it is a duty to do it before conclusions are drawn or acted upon. There is all the difference in the world between a highly disciplined and trained defence force like Hagana, and the two

small terrorist groups known as Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern group. Those distinctions must always be drawn. I say to my hon. Friend the Member for Consett (Mr. Glanville), who interrupted me a few moments ago, that nobody charges the Hagana with any active terror of that kind. The events he has in mind are the work of irresponsible small groups who, in so far as they have been restrained at all, have been restrained by Hagana itself. When the wicked act of the assassination of Lord Moyne took place, it was the Hagana who traced the culprits, arrested them, and handed them over to justice. My right hon. Friend knows the facts. This is no secret force, this is no unofficial or illegal thing. The Jewish Agency has had a share of the responsibility for the organisation of a defence force, to everybody's knowledge and with everybody's consent, for many years. When Mr. Grimsby-Gore, as he then was, gave evidence before, I think it was, the Peel Commission, the facts were clear. The Hagana came into real existence at the time when the mandatory Power was conspicuously failing in its duty to preserve law and order and security for life and limb in Palestine.

That is not the charge made by the Jewish Agency. It is not made by individuals, Members of this House, or otherwise. That charge has been made repeatedly in report after report of commissions set up by this House to inquire into this question. If the Hagana had not existed the national home in Palestine would have disappeared long ago. But not merely did it come into existence with the full approval of the mandatory Power in those times, but, during the war, it was armed and equipped by the British military Forces in the Middle East, and co-operated with them to the full. Its members fought on every battlefield in the Middle East and, indeed, elsewhere. When Rommel looked as if he might break through, and the British military authorities were looking around for anyone in the Middle East who could be relied upon to resist, was it to Egypt that they looked, was it to the Arabs in Palestine that they looked, was it to the Arabs anywhere that they looked? Certainly not. It was the Hagana upon whom they relied.

It is said that the Jewish Agency failed to co-operate. Co-operate in what? What was its duty? It was to co-operate with the mandatory Power in facilitating immigration and building up the Jewish national home. The mandatory Power, the British Government, stopped doing that in 1938. What was there to co-operate with? To co-operate with the Administration in implementing the White Paper, to co-operate in keeping refugee Jews out of Palestine, to co-operate with destroyers in firing upon wretched little ships, overcrowded almost to sinking point with people who had escaped with their lives, but only with their lives, and who were looking for a home in Palestine in the Jewish national home? How could they co-operate? If it be said that in those circumstances they ought to have compelled the population in Palestine to co-operate with the mandatory Power in resisting illegal immigration, I say to my right hon. Friend that he is expecting the impossible. Nobody with any pretension to leadership in Palestine could have endeavoured to offer that kind of co-operation without abdicating all authority and all influence with the settlements in Palestine.

It is all very well to say they were wrong; it is all very well to say that all that was illegal. But hon. Members must reflect. You can, of course, deal with illegality as it occurs. You can repress it. That is not a very easy thing to do, but if you are prepared to do all the dirty work that is necessary, it can be suppressed. The British Empire can do it; it is powerful enough to do it. If British soldiers and airmen can be persuaded to do what is involved, this illegality can be suppressed. But is it not better to look for the causes of it, and try to remove the causes? If you can remove the causes of it and stop it in that way, is not that a very much better thing than all this blood, this poisoning of the atmosphere, this turning back on ideals and hopes and dreams that you yourselves have built up? The causes are known. There is no secret about them. The cause of violence is usually despair. The cause of violence in Palestine is desperation.

Suppose that a Member of this House had survived five years in Belsen or Buchenwald, suppose that he had held on during all those years hoping when hope itself was dead, and suppose that there had come to him at the end of five years of that, liberation. Suppose that he had no friends left in the world, no wife, no children, no parents, no relatives; suppose that his house had disappeared, and he were alone there in the camp; suppose that you gave him a new hope, and then you disappointed that hope day after day, week after week, month after month. Hitler never promised them anything. He did not promise them life, or a future, or a national home. The British Government did. Our Labour British Government, our Socialist British Government, are committed up to the hilt, as much as the Jewish Agency, or more, to the Jewish national home. I know they have had much to do and much to think of. I know they have faced up to it manfully, with courage and with vision. I can forgive them the delays and vacillations. I know their difficulties, and how complicated it is. But I am living in safety. I can afford to be generous and tolerant, I can afford to wait. If I were living in Belsen or in any other displaced persons' camp, I might not be quite so patient, just as the friends who feel responsible for them in Palestine are not so patient.

They have not done so badly. They have waited all these months in vain for a single word from any Member of the British Government of hope or encouragement. I beg my right hon. Friend to look back on the record of his own speeches, and see how painfully frigid they are in this matter. I know it does not mean them to be frigid, but they are read by people of warmer, more emotional temperaments than his own. What we know is that nothing has happened yet, and the only thing that they have found they are able to do by themselves, without consulting anybody or anybody co-operating with them, is the events of this last weekend. Is there not some excuse for desperation? Is there not some excuse for impatience? If you could end it all by a simple declaration and produce peace in Palestine to-morrow, would it not be your duty to do it?

Let me tell my right hon. Friend how, without guns, tanks and Bren carriers, and without lighting a flame of passion all over the world directed against our country, he can end all violence in Palestine to-morrow morning. Only one thing is necessary. It is that the Government shall say, in plain, clear terms, "We accept the recommendations of the Committee we insisted on having appointed." That is all. Let the declaration go further if the Government like. Let them say that, although they accept those recommendations in principle wholeheartedly, nevertheless the responsibilities involved are such that they cannot bear them alone. Let them say that they are negotiating

with other Powers—the United States of America, I think, is the only one involved—for co-operation in what is necessary. Let them say, if they will, that they cannot begin to implement the recommendations until that co-operation is secured, but let them say that, for themselves, they accept the recommendations in principle, and will begin to operate them as soon as agreement with the United States about its share of responsibility has been achieved. My right hon. Friend has never said that. Why not say it? If he cannot say it because that is not what he means, do not leave it in doubt, and do not blame the Hagana, the Jewish Agency, for what would then be the consequences of his own policy or failure to have a policy. Make that declaration, make it in good faith, make it so that it is believed and violence ceases in Palestine, and there will not be this difficulty.

The House has heard me with considerable patience, and I ought not to keep it longer. If some of the things I have had to say have sounded bitter or heated, it is not because I want to do anything or say anything to make this very difficult position worse. It is because, I think, it is better to face ugly facts early and not try to burke them, camouflage them or hide them, so that whatever we decide to do we decide with our eyes open, and go forward firmly with courage to an objective we have clearly envisaged and clearly wish to pursue. I do not believe that my right hon. Friend means to commit an act of betrayal or treachery in this matter. I do not, and will not, believe it. The Government came into power ten months ago; they were a new hope, an unexpected hope, to all the tortured, persecuted and oppressed of the world. I believe they are the last hope of those people. Do not let them down.

Mr. CROSSMAN: I beg to second the motion.

I shall not be able to compete with the emotional remarks of my hon. Friend the Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. Silverman): I am not a Jew and not even a Zionist, but I happen to be one of the two Members of this House who had the unique privilege of seeing this whole problem in the course of 120 days in a sort of bird's-eye view. Since the bird's-eye view had brought me to feel that the policy now being prosecuted by the Government is decidedly dangerous and can lead this country into something approaching disaster, I felt that it was my duty to state my reasons for that belief to the House.

Ever since we returned from Switzerland I have felt that there has been a most dangerous gap between the view of Palestine held here, both by public opinion and by the Cabinet, and the view of Great Britain held in Palestine itself. It is that gap, in my view, which is the major cause of the present danger. If one talks to the leaders of the Hagana, as some of us had the privilege of doing, or talks to those who, if not leaders are responsible for them, one is aware that there are people out there, as I have told Jews in this country, who are playing with very dangerous fire and believe—with excellent historical reason, if I may say so—that the only language a British Government in Palestine understands is the language of force. They believe that they have learned that lesson from the Arab revolt, which, after three years of violence, resulted in a complete appeasement of the Arab claims. It has been our duty to give every possible warning to the people of the Hagana and the people of Palestine that they should not misjudge the temper of this country with regard to that sort of attitude, but that playing at war may really lead them into war. I believe it has been our duty to tell them that as persuasively as we can. But equally it has been our duty to inform the Cabinet that their view of Palestine is as remote from the truth as the view of the Jews in Palestine on Great Britain and the British Government. This view seems to be that there are just a small handful of wicked men in Palestine who are causing all the trouble, and that if these men could be hand-picked out of the Jewish community war can be averted.

The view that the Hagana is a "private army"—although I know that this is a phrase which appeared in the report I signed—when in fact it is a very large-scale conscript organisation which includes all the available manpower, both male and female, is as far fetched and absurd as the Hagana view that they could challenge us to war without the risk of war. We in this country underestimate the fanaticism, the ferocity and, I might say, the totalitarianism of Jewish nationalism in Palestine. We underestimate it because we do not like to feel that it is an insuperable problem, and we underestimate it as badly as the Hagana underestimates the Government. If I stress that gap it is because, in my view, it is the major cause of the impasse into which we are now drifting. The arrest of a couple of thousand Jews is only an instance of the lack of understanding between the two.

My right hon. Friend the Prime Minister mentioned in passing the Anglo-American Committee's condemnation of terrorism in its Report, and he was fully justified in doing so. Every member of our committee was against it and condemned it in the Report, but I think it is reasonable to point out that terrorism was not the only aspect of Palestine to-day which the Anglo-American Committee pointed out or condemned. Linked with the Anglo-American Committee's condemnation of terrorism was its statement in the first chapter on Palestine, that Palestine is now a semi-military or police State. In another passage the Report describes how Palestine is now ruled without consent from either Jew or Arab. That seems to me a relevant factor to the consideration of the restoration of law and order. We are faced with the intolerable situation in Palestine that at great cost to this country in men, material and money, we are maintaining a so-called rule detested by Jew and Arab alike. We are facing a situation there where it is the cordial longing of the Jewish and Arab communities to get rid of it as soon as possible and to fight it out between themselves.

When, therefore, the Prime Minister speaks of the necessity of restoring law and order it is important to remember that what he really means is the restoration of the authority of the police, the restoration of the authority of a State hated both by Jew and Arab. Granted that, the form of restoration which he has chosen in arresting 2,000 Jews may gain somewhat greater consent from the Arab population, it remains true that, so far as the Jewish population is concerned, no consent to such methods can possibly be achieved. I hesitate to believe that when we talk of the restoration of law and order we on this side of the House are meaning that kind of restoration of law and order which has occurred in past history. We cannot be referring to what has happened in several countries—pushing down by brute

force people who are genuinely struggling for their liberation. It would be terrible if our side accepted the slogan:

"Oderint dum metuant"—"Let them hate as long as they fear."

It is right that this House should be deeply concerned about the cost of British lives—and I would add that this has been very much smaller in the Jewish revolt than in the Arab revolt—but it is always as well to remember that while we are indignant that British soldiers should be killed we shall be even more indignant if we discover that they are being killed in an unjust war. Is the form of suppression which is now being carried out by our soldiers completely and fully justified? There I must ask the House to recall some previous examples. We all remember that there was a time in the beginning of the Irish troubles when this House was also very concerned with British soldiers being killed. It was a long time before it was recognised that some right lay on the other side and that it was impossible by sheer force to restore law and order, because the community, man, woman and child, was determined not to accept the order we were trying to impose.

I must say frankly to the House that what we are trying to impose on the Jewish community is a re-imposition of the White Paper, something which no Jew in Palestine accepts as either law or order. This affects not only the extremists of the Left or the Centre. No Jew anywhere, least of all Dr. Weizmann or the Hagana, can be won over to support the Government by the arrest of thousands of their brothers. May I refresh the memory of the House on the subject of our report, since the Prime Minister referred to our report in his remarks? In our report we did bring the attention of the Government—I am referring to Chapter 5 of the Report—to the fact that:

"They (the Jews) were with Britain in the fight against Fascism; they were against Britain in the struggle against the White Paper, which they now felt was not only unjust but totally inhuman as preventing the escape to Palestine of men, women and children in imminent danger of death in Nazi Germany and Nazi controlled Europe. When the war ended and the Labour Government came into power, the White Paper still remained in force. The Jews, who had expected an immediate fulfilment by a Labour Government of the Labour Party programme with regard to Zionism, felt a sense of outrage when no change of policy occurred. The bitterness reached a new peak of intensity, and the position of the moderates"—

I stress those words:

"became almost impossible. The Jewish agency frankly stated in public hearing that, after VE-Day, it was quite futile for it to attempt to co-operate with the Mandatory in suppressing illegal activity."

Notice the next sentence:

"Any decision on the future of Palestine will be futile and unrealistic unless it is made in full cognisance of the political tension among the Jews in Palestine and the reasons for it."

A little later the Report says:

"To use the words of one Jewish leader: 'Our present crisis in Europe and in Palestine is felt by us to be our Dunkirk.'"

That part of the Report was just as important to those who wrote it as the description of the terrorism. The terrorism, the frustration and the despair are the direct result of the decision of this Government to maintain the White Paper, when it was pledged by conference decision after conference decision to repeal the White Paper in the shortest possible time.

May I turn now for a few moments to the consideration of the Hagana? I have already stressed the importance of the illusion under which some people seem to be, that the Hagana is a private army or a small group. The only way realistically to look at the Hagana, or at the Jewish community as a whole, is to regard it as a resistance movement. In this country we have had experience of resistance movements because we have been very successful in organising them against our enemies. I would remind the House that many of those who are now leading the Jewish resistance movement received their training first of all in one of the European countries or even actually by the British military authorities in Palestine, where they were trained in sabotage in case Palestine was over-run by the Germans.

It is impossible to crush a resistance movement which has the passive toleration of the mass of the population. A resistance movement can only be destroyed if it is hated by those whom it relies on for succour or refuge. If the passive part of the population who do not go in for violence is sufficiently active to succour and give refuge to the active minority of the community, so Government, however ruthless, can smash that resistance movement or disarm it. That is not only my view. That view was given to us in Cairo and in Palestine by military experts who ought to know. They said: "Frankly, you can't do it if the whole community is one hundred per cent. behind the resistance movement. You can do what you like but you will never get far if it has the support of the people." As the Nazis found, as we have found in the past, as history has always proved, as we found in Ireland and with the Boers in South Africa and as we shall find in this case, where we are fighting against the people's natural rights, those people will be determined to die for those rights. That is the position of the Jews in Palestine. The Jews will die fighting against the White Paper policy rather than give in. He is a foolhardy man who says that by chopping off the tall corn he can destroy the whole field of resistance. He does not do it. He merely creates new resistance.

There is only one way of smashing the resistance movement. That is to liberate it by smashing the conditions out of which it has grown. That way is to give to the people who are willing to die the thing for which they are willing to die. That is what we ought to notice carefully, in regard to the Hagana. I shall not waste the time of the House with sophistical arguments or with trying to determine who is or who is not responsible for terrorism in Palestine. I say bluntly that whoever is responsible for terrorism or for the resistance movement is misguided, and may cost his country dear. I cannot pretend that we can dissociate completely from the rank and file of the Hagana. Those people are committing acts of terrorism. But the fact remains that the movement is not a resistance movement against the Germans or against the Nazis but against the country which every Jew regards as the best friend of the Jew. That is the fact which makes the situation so terrible in Palestine, so that when one visits the country one's heart is torn by emotional conflict in watching the tragedy going on. A people which trusted and believed in British

protection is now, it believes, forced willy nilly into the shooting of the British soldier. I hope that no one in this House believes that any Jew in Palestine likes doing it any more than the British soldier likes shooting the Jew. It is a terrible matter from both points of view. We are not Nazis, and we are not prepared to take the step of liquidating the Jewish community, which would be necessary in order to crush the resistance movement.

That brings me to my next point. I have risen to second the Motion for the Adjournment because I feel desperately that the Government's present line of action will not work. I assure my right hon. Friend that if for one moment I believed that the arrest of this couple of thousand of people and the Executive of the Jewish Agency would avoid war in Palestine, it would be something I would not oppose, but I am perfectly convinced that it will not. That is why I am here this afternoon to discuss this question. Is it intended to smash the ringleaders? We know what has happened. To begin with I have my doubts whether the ringleaders have been found. The Jewish intelligence knows all about the British while the British military seem to know nothing about the Jews. The Jewish Intelligence Service is among the best in the world. It is extremely difficult to operate in that country against the Jews. One military commander told me that every order of his was in Jewish hands within 24 hours. I am therefore gravely concerned to know whether the Government have succeeded in capturing the ringleaders of the extremists. I shall be extremely surprised if they have.

Whom have they arrested? Practically every trade union leader and Socialist leader in Palestine, practically every leader of the Palestine Labour Party, of trade unions, co-operatives and co-operative retail organisations. They have arrested the whole of what we might call the political Left. These have been chucked into gaol in the belief that they are the leaders of the resistance movement. I cannot pretend to be expert on the resistance movement but I fancy that it is a great deal smarter than to have such obvious leaders.

Secondly, I believe that the Government's intention is to give the moderate Jews a chance. That must be the prayer of every Member of this House. That was the very aim of our Report, to create a basis from which the moderate Jews could regain their lost authority in Palestine and make a real attack upon extremism and liquidate it, in the interests of law and order. All of us must hope for that, but the Government's latest action has made it impossible for Dr. Weizmann or for anyone associated with the moderate views to do anything. How can he, or any leading moderate associate himself with our Government, when 2,000 leading trade unionists and Socialists are in gaol, with no charge against them? If some of them are released and only a couple of hundred are detained, is it expected that the Jewish moderates will then come forward after the big stick has been used in that way, and thank us for the big stick? If they did so, they would have no support.

No one, even if he wanted to, could dare now to associate himself with any bogus Jewish Agency which anybody might try to set up in Palestine to replace existing organisations. That is the reason I agree with the hon. Member who proposed the Adjournment—that the course which the Government are now pursuing can only lead to war. It will not stop the violence. It will precipitate violence. The Jews are a stiff-necked people, as stubborn as some Members of the Government Front Bench. They are tough men, and so are the leaders of the Hagana. It is this terrible obstinacy on both sides that is bringing us into—I see that some hon. Members laugh and smile—[Hon. MEMBERS: "No, no."] This is bringing the possibility, not of a large-scale operation, but of shooting from behind walls and windows in Tel-Aviv and Haifa at night. No one can eliminate a resistance movement in a large built-up or urban district. The collective settlements may be winked out one by one. We can bomb them heavily from the air and use heavy artillery and tanks. That is the way to wipe a collective settlement out but we cannot do that in Tel-Aviv and Haifa. The more we try to winkle out the members of the resistance movement the tougher the resistance will be. I warn the Government that is the way they are going as a result of this initial act of arresting 2,000 people ostensibly for the reasons of preventing bloodshed.

Why am I so certain? Because of all the military experts in the Middle East, not one pretended that if this plan, which, after all, has been on the cards for some time, were carried out it would stop at the arrest of 2,000 leaders. No, this is the plan for the liquidation of the Hagana, and that means the liquidation of a large number of men, women and children in Palestine.

Perhaps the Cabinet has some special knowledge or some different military advisers. I ask the Cabinet to refer to the secret minutes of our Report which are available in the Foreign Office. Unless I am completely wrong any large-scale arrest of this sort was a preliminary to a large-scale campaign, and no expert I met in Palestine advised that the campaign could be avoided.

Mr. PICKTHORN: On a point of Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but I do not understand the point of the argument. If I heard the hon. Gentleman aright, he is now adducing as part of his argument a secret document which he knows by reason of his membership of a committee, which is otherwise known only to the Cabinet. I cannot believe it would be easy for the rest of us to continue the Debate if that is so, and I submit that it cannot be proper that the Cabinet by such arguments should be compelled to publish what would not otherwise be deemed to be publishable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was under the impression that the hon. Gentleman was quoting conversations. Of course, it would not be in Order for him to quote from secret documents.

Mr. CROSSMAN: I was most careful to quote from conversations and was merely referring in passing to substantiate the fact, to the fact that there were secret minutes available to the Cabinet. I did not quote them.

I would like to say one or two words on the Arab side of this problem. It would be grossly improper for a Member of this House who was not a Jew to regard this as solely a question between the British Government and the Jews. If I believed that by arresting the members of the Jewish Agency and the trade union leaders, by giving the Jews the big stick, we would solve the Arab problem, I might believe there was something in that policy. But I do not believe it. The Arabs have a great respect for honour, pledges and

integrity. The Arabs already suspect that we evacuated Egypt, not, as I believe, because we have great plans for the development of the Middle East, but for reasons of appeasement. The Mufti has made it perfectly clear that once the British Government has liquidated the Jews in Palestine he will demand and achieve by violence the removal of the British from Palestine. The trouble is that it is believed by Jews and Arabs alike that they are the puppets of a British strategic consideration, and that we do not believe in justice and morality but back them because we want them in a war with Russia. What has ruined Jewish confidence in us is the belief that we are trying to knock them on the head because we want a British C.H.Q. in Palestine instead of in Cairo. We shall not get good relations out of the Jews and Arabs by playing strategy and disregarding morality and justice. I believe our Report gave a perfectly fair basis for a fair deal between Jew and Arab. It deeply distressed me that all the sections of the Report dealing with the Arabs have been left out of account in the discussions, but I realise the difficulties of the Government in implementing the Report.

I have one more point to make. The Government say that they would, of course, deal with Arab violence. Let me remind the House that Arab violence is organised from outside Palestine. There are no fewer than six Arab States which could organise arms and hire guerrillas and send them into Palestine. Although the Government have cracked down on the Hagana, it cannot crack down on these Allies and the armies we have created and built up, these Allies who have said they will use violence to get their way. It is a somewhat one-sided destruction of private armies which is being done by the disarming of the Jews in Palestine, while the Iraqi Army, the Trans-Jordan Army, are all there, and the Arab League, with a British Brigadier to consult, denounces the Anglo-American Report, and breathes fire and slaughter.

I suggest that in this action of the Government we are drifting into war. We are drifting first into war with the Jews and after that into war with Arabs. We are losing every friend we had in the Middle East. I have been told that the Jews are in the wrong. I believe that the Great Powers should be magnanimous, and, as to some extent this Government is in the wrong, it should show more magnanimity. I should like to remind the House of one of the major reasons for Jewish violence in Palestine. One of the major provocations is the statements previously made by Members of the Government on this subject. It is ironic to think how this debate would have gone if the Conservative Party had arrested the members of the Jewish Agency. If I might remind the House for a moment of the way the debate might have gone, I can imagine a speech made by, for instance, the Lord President, considering that, in 1939, in debating the White Paper, he made a most important remark. He said:—

"... It ought to be known by the House that this breach of faith, which we regret, this breach of British honour, with its policy with which we have no sympathy, is such that the least that can be said is that the Government must not expect that this is going to be automatically binding upon their successor. . . ."

Would not any Jew have expected that the Labour Government would rescind the White Paper overnight? But after one year the Labour Government have not done it.

I should like now to refer to something which the Chancellor said speaking only a few weeks before our party came to power:—

"It is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of any Jews who desire to go there."

That was said in the summer of 1945. Then the Members of the Government had been Members of the Coalition for years. They had access to every State paper, and they had weighed the situation and agreed with me and other members of the Commission that the White Paper was wrong. They came to that conclusion and announced it gravely. Let me give one other quotation which refers directly to the problem of the use of British troops in Palestine. The present Minister of State, in a most moving speech, said on that occasion:—

"The Jews of Palestine will go by the tens of thousands down to the beach to welcome and to cover and protect their landing. The only way to stop them is to tell those kindly British soldiers to shoot them down . . . for that, if for no other reason, this policy is bound to fail. It will fail because, in the most tragic hour of Jewish history, the British people will not deny them their Promised Land."—[Official Report, 22nd May, 1939; Vol. 347, c. 2047.]

I agreed with every word. I believed at that point that the Members of the Government who then spoke in the Opposition really understood the problem of Palestine.

Mr. BOORMAN: When was that speech made?

Mr. CROSSMAN: On the debate on the White Paper in 1939. I could quote much more violent speeches made on the land regulations of 1940; I could quote speeches made in 1941 and 1945. The point is that the Government must take some responsibility. When they say that it is all the fault of the Jews, who led the Jews to believe that there was that certainty of repeal? It was Members of the Government who did it with the whole-hearted support of this Party, and the only difference is that the back benches still hold by their pledged word to the Jews on this subject. One reason is because we think it is right, and secondly, because it is bad to break your word, and a very dangerous thing in the modern world. If, then, we speak of a return to law and order, I believe it is a two-sided return which must be achieved. If the Jews must do something, the British Government must do something. Both sides need to bridge that gap of obstinacy which is bringing us into this catastrophic collision between a great and a small people.

May I suggest the following solution to my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister? I suggest that he should stop the drift to isolation. War with the Jews will isolate us from a great community whose financial backing we sadly need; it will isolate us from the world more than any war since the Boer War. It is a shameful thing, but we have to take that into consideration. Let us stop that drift to isolation. Let us stop that drift into a war, which neither we nor the Jews want, by the Government announcing its acceptance in principle of the Anglo-American Report, a Report which advised them to carry out their pledged word to the Jews—or rather slightly

less than their pledged word to the Jews. Having done that, let them state quite clearly that the implementation of this Report is impossible by the British Government alone. Let them state that they need two things for that: American assistance, and the collaboration of the Jewish Agency in preventing terrorism.

Let them call on the Jewish Agency, in return for our acceptance of what we all believe anyway, to join once again in the suppression of the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern gang. Let them go farther. Let them call on the Jewish Agency to do what it can do, namely, to tell the Hagana to come out and be what it once was, the territorial force of the Jews in Palestine, co-operating actively with the British Government. That would not be refused. None of those things would be refused, but I must remind the House that no request for Jewish co-operation has been made since the publication of the Anglo-American Report. We have drifted without contact until we are in grievous danger. So I beg the House to agree that here, and here alone, lies the way out of the difficulty—acceptance in principle of that Report, and then to work out with the American Government and with the Jewish Agency the way to implement all those ten clauses of the Report which hang together and without which we can have no peace in Palestine and no peace in the Middle East.

Mr. OLIVER STANLEY (Bristol, West): No one in this House, and, I hope, no one in the country outside, should be under any illusion as to the gravity of the situation which we are discussing this evening, or the possible implications which may flow from it. It is true that we on these benches did not support the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. Silverman) in his demand for this Debate. That was not because we underestimate the gravity of the situation, it was because we thought that at this actual moment the Debate was premature. I am glad to think—and I am sure both mover and seconder of this Motion will agree with me—that we are not discussing any question of an accusation against the behaviour or the actions of the British troops involved. The matter of moment is the orders that they have received, not the way that those orders have been carried out. There have, of course, been searches in Palestine before. There have, after various acts of terrorism, been large-scale arrests. What distinguishes this case from any other is that, for the first time, actions designed to sustain law and order have reached into the very headquarters, the very tabernacle of Jewish administration in Palestine, and amongst those who have been arrested are all, or nearly all, of the leaders of the Jewish community.

We felt it was really impossible to discuss with any effect a situation as grave as that until the House had in its possession what has already been promised to-day, and that is the evidence which will, for the first time, implicate the leaders of the Jewish Agency with the acts of terrorism that have been carried out in Palestine. I gathered—I think rather differently from the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne—that the implication of the Prime Minister's speech was that such evidence was available, and that such evidence would in due time be given to us. I can only say that if, when we have an opportunity of reading that evidence and of studying it—

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: And of hearing any reply.

Mr. STANLEY: And, if you like, of hearing any reply; if, indeed, then we feel that some of these leaders have been implicated in some of these acts, then it will not be what the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman) said a case of our declaring war upon the Jewish community, it will be their having declared war upon us. I do not think that in any quarter of the House there can be any division about the necessity for suppressing the sort of violence that we have seen in Palestine in the last few weeks. I regard arguments which seek to justify some of those acts on the grounds that the community to which the criminals belong feels deeply, either on what is being done, or on the delay in doing anything only as casuistry. But in the particular circumstance of Palestine, I regard it as the most dangerous casuistry.

Mr. S. SILVERMAN rose—

Mr. STANLEY: I did not interrupt the hon. Gentleman in his speech, so perhaps he will let me continue. Any argument that can be applied to violence by Jews, because they firmly believe in the Jewish cause in Palestine, can equally be applied to violence by Arabs, because they believe in the Arab cause with equal determination, and it seems to me that all of us have to agree that in Palestine there is no solution of the Palestine problem by terrorism, and no solution by yielding to terrorism. We have heard with great emotion the sincere speeches of the hon. Gentlemen who have spoken, and their reference to Jewish feeling. At the same time, none of us in this House, especially those like myself and many others who have relations and friends serving in Palestine, can ignore what their feelings must be. None of us can forget that we have during the last few weeks seen perpetrated in Palestine, acts for which there could be no excuse. There have been such events as the horrible murder in the quarters of the Airborne Division and the kidnapping of officers, and there is the fact that there are to-day in this country still three families to whom every minute must be an agony of suspense as to the fate of a loved one. All this must leave some impression on the minds of hon. Members. I say it is the responsibility of this Government—of any Government which is in power to-day—to take those steps which are necessary, and which they are advised are necessary, to prevent the repetition of acts of that kind. The action which they take should be taken without any prejudice to the eventual decision on the long-term policy which is to be employed.

I cannot join in any condemnation of the present Government on the ground that before they took this action they did not consult the United States. The responsibility is theirs. Up to now, the results of any action in Palestine have always fallen upon us, and upon us alone; to-day the results fall upon us, and on us alone. It must be for this Government, and for this Government alone, to take the steps necessary to protect life and property, and to repress violence. It is difficult, in the absence of evidence—evidence connecting the leaders of the Jewish Agency with these events which we all deplore—to discuss the present situation. During the years when I was at the Colonial Office, there were, at various times, sporadic acts of violence by the Jewish community, horrible acts some of them, such as the murder of Lord Moyne, to which reference has been made—

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: By the Jewish community?

Mr. STANLEY: By Jews. I was quite convinced during that time and during those episodes that they did not in any way involve the Jewish Agency, and the major part of the Jewish community. They were the action of those two minor extremist groups, the Stern group and the Irgun Zvai Leumi group. But I must confess that, to an outsider such as I am, merely reading newspaper reports of what has happened in Palestine in the last few days, there would appear to have been a change, and some of the incidents which have taken place seem on a much bigger scale, involving more men and a higher degree of planning than the sporadic incidents of the years when I was in office. We cannot be blamed for feeling that what before were the actions of the Stern group or the Irgun Zvai Leumi group may to-day be the actions of the Hagana. The hon. Member for Nelson and Colne told us to remember that it was a disciplined force. I agree it is disciplined, well-disciplined, and that it will obey its orders. But, the mere fact that it is disciplined and will obey orders, and has been trained in how to execute the orders, makes it all the more dangerous, if the orders given to it are wrong. Neither of the hon. Gentlemen who have spoken will deny that although the Jewish Agency not only had no connection with, but, I believe, had the greatest reprobation for, the other two extremist groups, they have a very close connection with the Hagana, a connection they themselves will not deny. If there is evidence in existence to show that the Hagana has been responsible for some of the outrages which have taken place in Palestine in the last few weeks, then the Jewish Agency will have to disclaim the actions of a body for which, hitherto, it has had a large measure of responsibility.

Since it is difficult to discuss this matter to-day in the absence of that evidence, I urge the Prime Minister to give us that evidence as soon as possible, and as fully as possible. No one can deny the effect that the action of the Government must have had, not only upon Jews in Palestine, but upon Jews all over the world. It clearly must have an effect which at the moment might well prejudice any chance in the future, of a settlement of the Palestine question. I believe that not only in the world as a whole, but in Palestine too, if evidence can really be offered, and is really offered, which implicates these men and these leaders in outrages which everyone must deplore, then no one will condone the action that they have taken, and no one will condemn the action of the Government. But we must have that evidence soon, and we must have it in full, or else the ripples from this great stone which has been cast into the waters will go to the ends of the world and may swamp not only our chances in Palestine but our friendships across the Atlantic.

I press again on the Government what we have pressed several times in the last few weeks. That is a request, which these grave events have reinforced, for an early announcement of their decision on the Palestine Committee. I regard the matter we are discussing to-night as too grave, as having too many consequences for our own people in Palestine, and for our own position in the world, to use it as an opportunity to make party capital for ourselves by the reference to the pledges of the Government which have already been made. I refer to that only for this reason. Surely the fact that a year ago they were in a position to give such categorical statements of what they were prepared to do in Palestine, leaves less excuse for such a delay when the time for that decision has come. It is now over two months since the report of that Committee was received. During that time there has been, I am afraid, a steady deterioration in the position in Palestine. The publication of the report itself, whether it was rejected or accepted by the Government, would earn an increase in the hatred of the Arab world. The events of the last few days have earned an increase in the hatred by the Jewish world, and even to-day solutions, which might have been possible in the beginning of May, are probably, if not impossible, certainly more difficult. Every day this delay goes on, it is going to be more and more difficult to find a solution. I am not saying what solution the Government should propose. But whether one believes in the report of the Anglo-American Commission, or is against it, I think all of us will say, "Let us know." Even if they decide in a way we dislike, we would rather have it than that they should not decide at all.

I know that the Government have a particular difficulty in this matter. It was an Anglo-American Committee, an Anglo-American Report, and they want to make it an Anglo-American decision. We know perhaps of the difficulties in doing that. Administrative machinery in America does not always run on the same lines, or, I will suggest, not always with the same speed as it does in this country. But the Prime Minister can wait little, if any longer, even for the benefits of a joint decision. The sands are running out and the time is passing in which to make any decision of any value. In a few weeks, nothing can avert the war in Palestine to which attention has been called. Therefore, we on this side of the House urge that we should have that decision quickly, that we should be able to debate it in this House, and that this House should be able to come to a decision on what our future policy in Palestine is to be. Once having come to that conclusion, we can proceed to put it into execution, without fear and without favour, in justice to both sides, and in determined strength to carry it through.

Mrs. AVRON COULD: I do not think that anybody in this House, or, I believe, in the country, would ever justify any of these acts of violence to which reference has been made. What some of us on this side of the House feel acutely distressed about is the source of the acts of violence, what has caused them, and whether these causes cannot be eradicated. Although, of course, we want the people who have committed the acts of violence to be punished, we know perfectly well that the acts of violence are bound to go on if the canker is not cut out. We feel very distressed about that canker, because of the history of our Party, which forms the present Government. I have been a member of the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party for 16 years, and throughout that period the Party has passed decision after decision about a Jewish national home in Palestine, and, more recently, about the immigration of all Jews who wanted and needed it, into Palestine. As has been pointed out by my hon. Friend the Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman), the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, as late as 1945 said:

"It is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of any Jews who desire to go there."

That statement was made at the Conference at Blackpool in 1945, two months after the national Executive Committee, with the Prime Minister as leader of it then, as he is now, had unanimously issued to the Press a statement precisely along those lines. The Chancellor's statement was a reiteration of what we had issued to the Press, which was endorsed by the Conference.

What has happened between April, 1945, and now—not just recently, but up to a few months ago? What happened was that, in July, the Labour Government came into power with a large majority. There was no change in the Jewish position, either in Europe or Palestine. There was a tremendous change in the spirits of the Jews throughout the world, who thought that after the promises that had been received from the Party that had become a Government, those promises would be put into action, as we all believed, and as we have been busy doing, as a Government, on the home front. The Jews were inspired to believe that there would be free immigration into Palestine of that miserable remnant in Europe of the people who had been almost completely destroyed by the Nazis. None of that has taken place.

All that has happened was that first of all an Anglo-American Committee was set up. I venture to remind the Government that as early as last October I asked the Prime Minister whether he did not feel that a postponement of taking any action to endorse the policy of the Government, and of the Party, would make it impossible for the Jewish Agency or the moderate Jews to control the terrorists? He answered that nothing would have any effect for a short time. The Anglo-American Committee was set up; it reported unanimously. Two months have passed and still no action has been taken. Illegal immigration has gone on, and that has been roundly condemned this afternoon by the Prime Minister. What is that illegal immigration? It is that of people whose last hope has been to get into Palestine.

I would like the House to know that some of these illegal immigrants are men who have been in concentration camps throughout the war, and two of whom have a document signed by General Alexander pointing out that they had helped British airmen to escape from concentration camps. These are two of the illegal immigrants who are being condemned. Others of the illegal immigrants are people who fought in the Forces, in the British Army, and were taken prisoner. There has been much more trouble in Palestine than has been stressed or expressed in the Press. The largest Jewish communal settlement is practically in ruins. That settlement contained people who have lost their homes, people who have lost everything; some of them have been wounded—women and children whose husbands and fathers are now fighting in the British Forces. Indeed, Shertok, one of the heads of the Jewish Agency, who has been arrested, has to-day a son in the British Forces in Belgium.

The Prime Minister said this afternoon that His Majesty's Government, as a mandatory, have an international duty to maintain law and order in Palestine, and full authority to take all necessary steps to that end. As the mandatory authority, and as the Government who, in no uncertain terms when they were not the Government, undertook to see that Jewish immigration went on, they have also, I suggest, mandatory powers to see that the Jewish people have fair play, at any rate particularly in the short-term programme of the Anglo-American Commission, in seeing to it that those emigrants who most need it shall be enabled to go to Palestine as legal entrants. I say again that although no one could deplore violence or the hideous incidents that have happened more than I myself, we must be warned in time that unless we put an end to the cause of the horror, nothing we can do will stop the horror from being increased a hundredfold until we have in Palestine a bath of blood.

Mr. PICKTHORN: I hope that I shall say nothing that may exacerbate any feelings or that may seem to underrate the gravity of the occasion; and I hope I shall say nothing that may seem to bring against His Majesty's Government the charge of underestimating the gravity of the factors with which they are now confronted. I thought, indeed, the hon. Gentleman who seconded the motion—I think it was he; it may have been the mover—was rather less than just to the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, in suggesting that he, the Prime Minister, had spoken as if he did not think the matter was of any such very immense gravity. I did not think that charge was quite just. I think I was the only hon. Member on this side of the House, and I think also the only Member not more or less Zionist in sympathy, who facilitated the initiation of this debate. Though I am fully conscious how unimportant to anybody but myself was my personal motive in that individual action, I think perhaps the House will forgive me for spending two minutes to indicate that my reasons, my objects and my method were not the same as those of most of the other 39 hon. Members who stood up. I suppose, if we are to take the normal conventional interpretation of Parliamentary action, that they stood up for the most part by way of repudiating the statement of His Majesty's Government. So far as I could judge it, with the great rapidity with which one has to judge a State document of that sort when read aloud, I was not dissatisfied with it, or, at least, I was not so dissatisfied that I should naturally have moved or collaborated in moving the adjournment.

But all through this Parliament—and hon. Members who were here in the last will do me the justice of saying that all through the last, long as it was—I have, very ineffectively but, I think, pretty continuously, argued for the frequent full, lengthy debating of this particular subject and of all other subjects of this sort—the great subjects of external relations and defence, which seem to me infinitely more important than questions of nationalisation and so on. Our decisions will be wiped out anyway unless we answer these great questions, at any rate with 51 per cent. of rightness. Unless about the external questions we are at least as right as that, none of these other questions will interest the children. It seemed to me that for one who, as I have done, has continually pressed, especially in this Parliament, that this subject ought to be debated, to say now that it ought not—that, I thought, would be hardly defensible and on the whole, though very conscious of fallibility, I am inclined to think that in that I was right.

I do not wish now to raise all the great general questions that might be raised, and which I think mostly were indicated by the previous speeches—the great questions of Zionism, the relation between Palestine and distress in Europe, the legal questions, where I think the hon.

Gentleman was less than fair in some of his arguments and assumptions about mandatories and co-trustees. I am not the most competent person in this Assembly to debate these legal matters, though on occasion I should wish to debate them, and I think I could question some of his arguments. But there are one or two great general questions which, I think, however much we wish to be short, we must now ask ourselves. One is the general question of Zionism. I have never hidden my conviction that Zionism is one of the great mistakes of human history. I do not want to argue that; I think that is so, and I have always thought so. I have thought so more with every day that has passed, and I have certainly thought so more with every word that fell from the lips of the two hon. Gentlemen who moved this Motion, most especially when they told us how superior is the Zionist intelligence, in every sense, I gathered, and when they indicated that, at least, one reason for that was that no Zionist felt any scruples about any information that came into his possession in the service of the British Government.

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: I hope the hon. Gentleman is not attributing that remark to me. I did not make that statement.

Mr. PICKTHORN: I think I am in the recollection of the House—I am sorry the hon. Member who seconded the Motion is not here—but I believe I have not deformed or misinterpreted what he said, or the proper and natural implication of what he said.

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: The hon. Gentleman will, no doubt, speak for himself. I speak for myself. The hon. Member, in the part of his speech which I ventured to interrupt, used the word "they," including me in what he said. I therefore remind him that I said no such thing.

Mr. PICKTHORN: I am sorry the hon. Gentleman thinks I misinterpreted him. I said "they said," and I was going to refer to some of the things which they said. As soon as I began to say what one of them said, the hon. Gentleman got up and interrupted. It was not my fault that I had not time to go on. He said—if "he" suits him better, and it was he who said this one—that, if we were not very careful, there would be flames which would be dangerous to this country's life all over the world, and his seconder echoed that. I suppose we are conscious that the British people have a great history, have been supposed to be a great and proud people, who have just played, we may fairly say, the greatest part in winning what people call the greatest of wars, which is always the last. The British people have been proud, and the British people are now conscious of some of the weaknesses its Government now has in international affairs. It was the hon. Gentleman who told us that, if we were not careful, there would be flames dangerous to our policy in every country of the world, and his seconder threatened us that we might not be able to get the financial co-operation that we wanted elsewhere. Some of us have sometimes argued that this kind of allegation is not true and is not fair. We shall find it more difficult to use that argument if speeches of that sort are to be made, and it is my belief that speeches of that sort are implicit in Zionism, and, therefore, I have always thought that Zionism, in general, was a great mistake.

I have always been quite sure of this, and I am now more sure than ever, that one particular implication of Zionism was a great mistake; that is, the bundling together as two halves of one sum, to which it is supposed there is somewhere a solution, of (a) the difficulties we have got in Palestine, and (b) the miseries of Jews in other countries. It seems to me that there is no moral or logical excuse for bundling up these two things, and, when I first read the report of the Anglo-American Committee, I felt certain at once that it would not do as a basis from which we should get to more law and order. I still very much fear I was right, and the reason why I had that immediate decision was the 100,000 immediate immigration certificates which were recommended. I cannot believe that it can be right that the force of one Power should be used to compel a small ancient society, settled in a very small country, to go on admitting indefinitely an immigration for whose management, control and choice it has no part whatever.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is discussing the whole Palestine problem. After all, this Motion is very wide already.

Mr. PICKTHORN: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if I have been too wide. What I am trying to make plain is that hon. Gentlemen who take the opposite view to ours must do us the justice of the belief that it goes as deep into our moral perception and our intellectual rationalisation as their view does, and that unless it is fully understood that some of us believe that the whole population of Palestine has rights, then the two sides of the Debate becomes mutually unintelligible.

I will leave that point and will come to the exemplification of it which is directly and wholly relevant, and perhaps the most direct and wholly relevant thing in the whole of this Debate, and that is the immigration of Jews into Palestine. I do not want to argue how or why there are so many Jews who wish to go there.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Motion is devoted to the cause of the present troubles, and the hon. Gentleman cannot go further than that.

Mr. PICKTHORN: In my submission, Sir, it is the cause of the present trouble and what I wish to indicate is this, that when we have suggestions of possible solution, I cannot believe that this thing is so simple as to be a problem and, therefore, to have a solution, but if there is to be any chance of a basis from which we may move towards easier times, I would suggest that it can be only by taking those 100,000 elsewhere, by not leaving disposable the argument that this population is doomed to misery and destruction unless it goes there and there only, otherwise the force there must lead to outrage in the circumstances as they at present stand, that outrage must lead to repression. And the reason why it was necessary, in my judgment, to hold this Debate, is that it should be made clearly known that the House of Commons does not believe that any kind of surrender to outrage is as a general rule, politic or moral, or that this is any exception to that general rule, that, indeed, this case is an extreme case of the general rule, and not an exception to it.

Mr. JAMES: Unfortunately, the hon. Member for the Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn) was apparently not in Order when making the various references he did make and I will not follow him, although

I should like to, in reply to the allegations which have been made in certain quarters and which, of course, are entirely unfounded. But the question which this House has before it at the present time is one which does depend to a considerable extent upon whether we as a mandatory Power have fulfilled the obligations incumbent upon us and whether, in taking action against the Jewish Agency in Palestine, we are at all justified, not having done that which was due from us in order to establish our position under the Mandate. There is not the slightest doubt, and cannot be the slightest doubt, in anybody's mind that the Jewish Agency stands on a recognised legal footing in this question and to enter into the headquarters of a co-partner is nothing short of committing an offence which is entirely contrary to the terms of the Mandate. We cannot expect the Jewish people who have settled in Palestine, or any Jews in any part of the world, to stand by with equanimity and watch the arrest of those leaders who have done such excellent service from the time the Mandate was introduced, who encouraged the tremendous effort on the part of the Palestinian Jewish settlement in the course of the recent war, who were applauded from all sides for having provided by means of their efforts not only a miracle in the development of Palestine but a record of service the like of which had not been experienced anywhere else in the Middle East in the Allied cause.

Mr. WILSON HARRIS: Is the hon. Gentleman familiar with this sentence in the Report of the Anglo-American Committee?

"We recognise that until comparatively recently, efforts were made by the Jewish Agency to curb attacks; we regret that these efforts appear to have ceased. We believe that those responsible for the working of the Jewish Agency—a body of great power and influence over the Jews in Palestine—could do a great deal towards putting an end to outrages such as we have described."

Mr. JANKER: My hon. Friend has certainly misunderstood what I said. I said that the Jewish Agency, in which was vested the right to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home, assisted in the course of the years from the commencement of the Mandate until now, in a development of the land which has been described as a miracle by all who have seen it, and in the course of the war, gave their sons and daughters of a neutral country, Palestine—some 80,000 people—in order that the blood of Allied Forces should not be shed, and in order that they might preserve something like a strong position for the Allied cause in the Middle East.

In spite of the publication of the White Paper which has been condemned from every side of the House, which the late Earl Lloyd George, together with everybody else, in every party who knew anything about the Mandate, had described as being a complete betrayal of the Jewish people in Palestine, the Jewish settlement in Palestine was practically the only oasis of active help in the desert of the Middle East. It was from that settlement that these men who are now being accused sent some of their forces, the Hagana itself, in order to assist the Allies when it came to a question of attacking Syria. It was from this Hagana that there came some of the boldest and most courageous spirits who were at the service of the Allied cause. My hon. Friends know very well that so far as the Hagana was concerned, it was a movement which was encouraged by the Administration; it was practically created by the Administration because it gave some measure of possibility to the settlers to save themselves from attack which might come in their direction. How can we possibly deprive men, women and children of the possibility of saving themselves from attacks similar to those which took place under the aegis of that great and noble friend of the Allied cause, the ex-Mufti? It would be sheer disaster to those colonies and colonists. It is wrong to imagine that it is a terrorist body, or that it is a body which has indulged in the serious attacks on people which it itself condemned.

Surely the position is this. We have committed a great wrong in Palestine. We have told the Jewish settlers here that if they do what is necessary they will have a national home, which will be an appropriate place for the Jewish community to carry on its Jewish life. How on earth it is possible for us to go back on that I really do not know; and I cannot understand what arguments in support of that point of view could be adduced from any of these benches. We told the people: "You work, you build, you do what is an economic necessity and wrest life from the desert and you will be creating a national home." The moment that national home was in the course of being created, we said to the people concerned, "You cannot have your wife or your children there. You cannot have anyone of your relatives at all in that land. We are going to hold a committee." Ultimately my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary said more or less: "Very well. I will stand or fall, by what the joint committee decides." [Interruption.] More or less—otherwise he would not have had the committee. When that committee comes back and says one thing is imminently necessary, namely, to permit 100,000 of the wrecks from Europe to go into Palestine, we cannot deny these families that right. It is their national home. Who can possibly talk about illegal immigration into that "home"? What is a home? What is a national home?

Mr. SPEAKER: We are really basing our discussion tonight on the disturbances in Palestine.

Mr. JANKER: It is because of the feeling created in that manner that I say today, to arrest the Jewish Agency, to arrest the Socialists, the trade unionists, the whole of the persons, whom we have praised year in and year out, is literally nonsense. I ask my right hon. Friends who are dealing with this matter to regard that action as nonsense, and to realise their mistake before it is too late. Neither I nor anybody else want to see a single drop of blood shed. Of course not. Nobody wants to see a single hair of a single British soldier hurt. Of course not. The way to remedy the position is to have a full Debate on the matter. Let us decide on the real issues which, in my view, are absolutely clear. Let us do the right thing by the people who did the right thing by us. That is the point of view I wish to put before the House. I will not take up much time, because there are many other speakers who wish to take part in the Debate, and I appreciate their feelings. I ask my right hon. Friends to realise before it is too late, that justice is what is wanted—justice purely and simply. If justice is given to the Jewish national home the House may take it that the greatest force in support of civilisation and of this country will have been established for ever in the Middle East.

Mr. LARSON (Cheltenham): I desire to remind the House that the point at issue in this Debate is not Jewish immigration into Palestine,

or the White Paper. The point at issue is the action which His Majesty's Government have taken recently in Palestine. I do not agree that the arrest of some of the members of the Jewish Agency and others is war against the Jewish National Home. I regard it rather as a regrettable but necessary disciplinary action against Zionist law-breakers, for it is in the interest of the Jewish national home in Palestine as much as of anybody else that there should be the rule of law in that country.

Mr. JANKER rose—

Mr. LARSON: No, I have not got very much time. I do not think I ever heard a Motion for the Adjournment moved and seconded in this House in abler speeches than those made today, but, stripped of all their eloquence and all their rhetoric, what is the policy which the two hon. Gentlemen have advocated? It is nothing less than a policy of appeasement of violence in Palestine, and that is a strange policy to be advocated from the benches opposite. It is proposed to hand over Palestine to the Hagana, and it is said that the Hagana is not a private army because it is numerous. But whether an army is a private army or not does not depend upon its size, it depends upon the authority by which it exists. The Hagana has not the authority of the mandatory Power, which is the only legal authority for the Government of Palestine, and I submit that it would be an abdication of Britain's responsibility as mandatory Power to hand over Palestine to the Jewish agency and the Hagana at this moment, with their policy of violence.

My approach to this problem is different from that of the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. S. Silverman). I want to remind the House that in 1940 the Jews of the world faced the greatest menace that has ever threatened them in their tragic history, and that is saying a great deal. Jews everywhere were in real danger of sharing the fate of the Jews of Germany and of Poland, and one country alone, supported by her sister Dominions and her Colonies, stood in the way of this danger to Jewish survival—Great Britain. At a time when this country is being vilified in Palestine, in America and in this country by certain people, it is only right that I, speaking as a Jew, should remember this fact. I do not believe that you can regard the question of Palestine in isolation. Nor do I think the Jews should forget what they owe to Great Britain. Let them remember, too, that not only did Britain save them in the war, but also that it is in Great Britain and in her Dominions that the Jew holds a position of equality, not only political but social, which he does not enjoy in some of the countries which are vilifying this country for its action in Palestine. I support the action which has been taken against the Jewish Agency, because I believe that His Majesty's Government could not do differently from what they have done. After all, the first duty of a Government, surely, is to govern; and they must stand in Palestine, as they do here and elsewhere, for law and order. It was for the rule of law that this country took part in the war.

Not only is it right that this country should stand for law and order, but it is in the interest of the Jew, more than in that of anybody else, that law and order should prevail, because it is only where law and order prevail that the Jew can possibly hope to survive. When we are told that Hagana is not a terrorist force, let us remember that Hagana has been responsible recently for blowing up bridges, and for acts of sabotage, all contrary to the law of the land. The Jew can survive only where there is law and order. The methods of the terrorist are those which have in the past been responsible for the pogrom and Jewish persecution. Therefore, if one takes a broad and long view of where Jewish interests lie, it surely must be that this dangerous thing which has reared itself in Palestine should be put down, and that the Jew, as a Jew, is interested, in Palestine and everywhere, in the eradication of lawlessness.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to intervene in this Debate to indicate to the House that not all Jews in this country and elsewhere have forgotten the debt they owe to Great Britain, that not all Jews have forgotten what the Jew really stands for and it is because I have faith in the justice, in the tolerance, and in the sense of fair play, not only of this Government towards the Jew, but of any British Government, that I tonight welcome the opportunity to say that I support the action which His Majesty's Government have taken.

Mr. M. PHILIPS PRICE: I should like, in my very few remarks, to show that I am a back bencher who is going to give the fullest possible support to the Government in the action which has been taken. I do so without any qualms of conscience, because I have been perfectly consistent, right through, over this whole matter of the future of Palestine and Zionism. In 1939 I did not vote with the rest of my party on the matter of the White Paper. I supported the White Paper, and I have been absolutely consistent, right through, in saying that the action hitherto taken by my party, has been wrong. I know that there are members of the Government who are in a very difficult position, because some of them have made statements in the past which now are rather difficult to square with the action that they have got to take. I would beg them to be firm, and to show determination in the line they have taken, because it is necessary it should be taken.

The Government cannot permit terrorism in a country in respect of which we are the mandatory Power. When I was recently in Palestine, the kind of thing which I heard said all over the place by some extreme sections of the Jews was: "The Arabs got the White Paper through violence. We shall get the abolition of restricted immigration by the same method." In this respect the Government are perfectly right in striking at the Jewish Agency. When I arrived in Jerusalem one evening in January the police headquarters was lying in the street. Not very long before the whole place had been blown up by dynamite and many people killed. The leaders were not arrested. They were protected, and there was very strong suspicion that Jewish Agency people protected them. For that reason I say that the Government are perfectly right to take the action which they have taken.

Mr. TURNER-SAMUELS: I do not quite understand the point. Is the hon. Member suggesting that what was done then was done through the Jewish Agency?

Mr. PRICE: I am suggesting that those who are committing these crimes are being protected by the Jewish Agency.

Mr. GOODRICH: Has the hon. Member any evidence?

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: It is an outrageous lie.

Mr. PRICE: I say there is very strong reason to believe that. The Government probably have the evidence. I am satisfied that the

Government have information which gave them reason to take the action which they have taken, and I will leave it at that.

Mr. GOODRICH: On a point of Order. Has the hon. Member as a back bench member got more information than any other back bench Member?

Mr. SYKES: That is not a point of Order. An hon. Member is responsible to himself for what he says.

Mr. PRICE: I can assure the House that I have seen no secret documents. I am entirely responsible for the statements I make. I will go further and say that the Zionist movement has been adopting the tactics of their persecutors, the Nazis, and that the life of very moderate Jews in Palestine is now being made extremely difficult, if not intolerable, by what they have to submit to in the form of persecution and pressure. There are plenty of moderate Jews, and I have met several, who say that they repudiate the action taken by extreme Zionists who have captured the movement which is as dear to them as to any other Jew.

The Government must therefore resist this wave of terrorism and approach the whole problem on a much broader basis, and not force on the Arabs responsibility for taking a large number of immigrants from Central Europe, but to make other countries responsible, this country and America, to play their part. I greatly fear that the Jews are going the way they have sometimes gone before in their history, the same way as in the tragedy which befell them in the days of the Maccabees; they went then through a terrible trial, because they would not compromise and adopted a philosophy of all or nothing. That tragedy will come to them again, or some of them, if they do not, at this eleventh hour, relent.

Mr. MANNINGHAM-BULLER: I did not intend to intervene in this Debate, nor do I now intend to indulge in any form of controversy, for this does not appear to me to be a proper occasion for debating the recommendations of the Anglo-American Palestine Committee on which I had the honour to serve. The only reason that I have risen to my feet—lest it might be thought that I was in entire agreement with all the statements made by Mr. Crossman whom I regret to see is not in his place at the present moment. A great deal of evidence was given before that Committee in different parts of the world, and all I desire to say is this: I do not recollect having heard evidence from military experts of the nature to which the hon. Member referred, and, in particular, according to my recollection—and it will be appreciated that I have had no opportunity of looking at my notes, but my recollection is pretty clear—no evidence was given before that Committee in public or in private to the effect that any order given by high military authority, even if marked "top secret," was immediately known to the Jewish Agency.

Mr. GALLAGHER: I distinctly remember hearing the hon. Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman) say "in personal conversations he had when meeting people in Palestine."

Mr. MANNINGHAM-BULLER: He referred to two things—to personal conversations and also to evidence given before the Committee. So far as evidence given before the Committee was concerned, I can speak: I cannot of course speak for the conversations which the hon. Member had personally. I am not challenging that, but I think that it is right to say that I cannot agree with the hon. Member's recollection, if it be his recollection, that we were told in evidence in private that instructions and orders given by high military authority and marked "top secret" were immediately communicated to the Jewish Agency. I have risen to make that point absolutely clear. If it was clear already, there was no reason for me to speak, but I certainly thought that the hon. Member for East Coventry said that we had received evidence of that sort.

Mr. MICHAEL FOOT: I am sure that hon. Members recognise that this is a Debate of a most serious character, and I think that most of us who have listened to it will agree that it is a good thing that this discussion should have taken place in the House of Commons. Some of us hope that our expressions of opinion in this Debate may have some effect in persuading the Government to draw back from this action which they have taken. Even if that is not so, I believe that this Debate may have a good effect, even at this terribly late hour, in perhaps persuading our Jewish friends and colleagues in Palestine that there are some persons in this House who are prepared to speak on behalf of their cause and in their name. Very few speeches have been made in support of the Government's policy, and one of them came from the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean (Mr. Price). His attitude is perfectly consistent. It is perfectly proper for anyone who supported the White Paper of 1939 to support this action by the Government, but what we are here to discuss is the attitude of those who opposed, and not only opposed, but violently opposed, the White Paper of 1939.

Again one of the main arguments from the other side of the House to justify this action is that it is the suppression of violence and an effort to restore law and order. That kind of argument, put as simply as that, might appeal to hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, but on this side we have another tradition. We have a longer tradition of trying to discover when peoples engage in acts of violence, what is the cause of that violence. We have also a longer tradition of trying to discover, whenever there are great disturbances, what has provoked the people. In this case the people who are accused by the Government of instituting violence against law and order are men we know well, men who have come to our Socialist conferences, and who are colleagues of ours. These are the people who are accused, and that is the quarrel between the back benchers of this Party with the Government Front Bench that we are now debating.

No one in this House envies the terrible task which British soldiers in Palestine have to discharge to-day. Everyone deplores that innocent soldiers should have been murdered and killed on account of political disturbances which are certainly not of their making. However, it is not sufficient in this Debate solely to direct our attention to these acts of violence. No one who read the report of the Anglo-American Committee could fail to recognise that an explosive situation was being prepared in Palestine, and that if there was not soon a decisive change of policy, then an explosion would take place. Therefore, if we are to discover the cause of the situation and discover a solution which will make it possible for British soldiers no longer to be killed in Palestine it is necessary for us also to apply ourselves to the general policy pursued by the Government which partly provoked these actions.

First of all, I should like to refer to the specific and detailed question

which was put to the Government by the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. S. Silverman) at the beginning of this discussion. He asked for the precise evidence on which the military authorities have acted in Palestine. Leaders of the Jewish Agency have been arrested. The Prime Minister states that in some way they were associated with the Hagana, but it is not stated in explicit terms that they were associated with the two terrorist organisations. On the other hand, let us take the statement of the High Commissioner for Palestine. He says he is taking action against those who instigated the cases of violence. He is taking action against the Jewish Agency leaders, and, therefore, we must only assume both from the High Commissioner's announcement and the conjunction of sentences in the Prime Minister's statement that they have fresh evidence that the Jewish Agency leaders are associated not merely with the Hagana, but with the terrorist organisations.

If that is the charge it should be stated openly. Proof should be given, and if that is the reason which has persuaded the Government to give these orders to the military authorities in Palestine, then the proof must already exist. The Government must have it in their files, and if they have it in their files they should give it to the House of Commons. If they do not give it to the House, then this House condones actions by the military authorities in Palestine for which there are no stated reasons. Therefore, I suggest that it is only fair when the Prime Minister replies that he will tell us precisely what is the exact evidence of the association of the Jewish Agency with the terrorist organisations on which the military authorities have acted. If he cannot tell us that I suggest it is only fair to the Jewish Agency to acquit them of the charge of having been associated with the terrorist organisations.

The next question I should like to ask the Prime Minister is what general new evidence the Government have had of the activities of the Jewish Agency which have persuaded them to take this action since the Report made by the Anglo-American Committee. This is an important question, because, if the only evidence of the criminality of the Jewish Agency and its leaders which the Government possesses is, as the Prime Minister suggested in his speech, association with the Hagana, then that evidence has been in the possession of the Government for many months past, in fact for years past. If that is the only new evidence, I suggest that it is not evidence to excuse this violent action which has been taken by the Government. What did the Commission report? It gave a faithful and open account of the structure, strength, and power of the Hagana. The Commission also said, bluntly and plainly, that one of the causes of the distressing situation in Palestine, or, rather, one of the symptoms, was the decline in co-operation between the Jewish Agency and the British Government. The Report went on to say that if the essential co-operation was to be established between the Jewish Agency and the British Government then there would have to be drastic changes in policy.

The Prime Minister, in his statement to-day, said that the Government had given serious warnings to the Jewish Agency. It is also true that the Agency has given serious warnings to the Government. They have given serious warnings on the question of terrorism. The evidence is to be found in the Report of the Committee, where there is an account of a conversation which took place between Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Shertok, of the Jewish Agency, with the Government about certain acts of terrorism which took place recently. Page 41 of the Report quotes an extract from the "Palestine Post," and states:—

"It is learned that during the interview, Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Shertok declared that the Jewish Agency completely dissociated themselves from the murderous attacks on Government and army establishments perpetrated on Thursday night. They expressed their profound sorrow at the loss of life caused by the attacks. But, they stated, any efforts by the Jewish Agency to assist in preventing such acts would be rendered futile by the policy pursued in Palestine by His Majesty's Government on which the primary responsibility rests for the tragic situation created in the country, and which had led in recent weeks to bloodshed and innocent victims among Jews, Britons and others."

That is a statement of the Jewish Agency's attitude towards this problem. They have said, time and time again, that it is impossible for them to deal with the situation so long as His Majesty's Government follow their present policy. In that respect, their views have been upheld unanimously by the Report of the Committee. The Committee did not say only that action should be taken to disband private armies, or that action should be taken only against terrorism. Nor did they say only that co-operation should be restored between the Jewish Agency and the Government. I suggest that one of the reasons why they did not put forward those remedies as being alone necessary in the immediate future, as being the only immediate measures that will be required to restore law and order, is because they knew that any such proposal would have been utterly futile. Therefore, the Committee proposed, simultaneously and immediately, that there should be the issue of 100,000 certificates for Jews to enter Palestine. The Committee also stressed the urgency of the matter, and anyone reading their Report could realise that they were referring to the explosive situation in Palestine. There has been little urgency on the part of the Government in this matter. After all, this new Government, which were pledged up to the hilt to the Jews, was returned ten months ago. They set up a Committee. That Committee reported in April: it is now July, and it was announced yesterday that there will be further conversations and consultations. I do not regard that as a course of policy which is likely to make the Jews in Palestine very patient.

Despite all the outbreaks and acts of violence, I claim that in Palestine the Jews have been patient. They have been patient for 20 years under the threat of Arab violence. They were patiently ready to accept, in 1936, the division of Palestine according to the Peel Committee's Report, although that was far less than what they wanted. They patiently accepted, because of the threat of war, the White Paper of 1939. They did not take action against that White Paper, despite all the incitements to take action against it given by right hon. Gentlemen now on the Government Front Bench. They have been patient all these years. They were patient when a Labour Government came into office. They were patient when the Anglo-American Committee made its report. They were patient even when the American Government made a declaration about that Committee's Report, and we failed to do so. I believe that is a record for patience.

If I were a Jew I would certainly begin to feel a little impatient at the present time. If I were a Jew and lived in Palestine, I would be a member of Hagana, and would regard this action which has been taken against the Jewish Agency as action taken against the whole of the Jewish community.

That is why I say this is the most serious Debate which has taken place in the House since this Parliament was gathered together. It is the most serious Debate because, if we pursue this action, we shall drift into war with the Jews, the most terrible kind of war in which this country could be engaged, a war between peoples who should be allies, and who want to be allies and friends. Therefore, I appeal with all the earnestness at my command to the Prime Minister to say to-night that he is prepared to accept in principle not merely one item of the Anglo-American Committee's report, but all the items of that report. If he says that, I believe we may be able to draw back from this terrible catastrophe into which this country and this Government are drifting. But if we go on, we shall be engaged in a long, wretched and miserable war, a war that will leave a black and indelible stain on the record of this great Government.

Mr. THOMAS REID: The issue before the House is this. Were the Government justified in arresting the leaders of the Jewish Agency? I hope to keep to that argument, because that is the point at issue. Were the leaders of the Jewish Agency implicated in these acts of terrorism or other illegal acts in Palestine? I do not know. No hon. Member knows, except Ministers in the Government. If it turns out, from the statement that is to be made tonight, or later on when the evidence comes to hand, that the leaders of the Jewish Agency were implicated in terrorist activities, then I support the Government. I would add further that the people of this country would support the Government, because the people of this country are disgusted with the acts of terrorism which have been going on in Palestine. Therefore, on the face of it, unless we hear to the contrary, this action of the Government was police action carried out with military forces to put down illegal violence. And illegal violence should be put down, unless the Government are to abdicate and hand over Palestine to chaos.

It has been urged by some hon. Members that the people who committed violence in Palestine are fighting for liberty. They are fighting to establish their own policy by force. Nobody is attacking their liberty. If, as has been stated by my hon. Friend the Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. Silverman), this is a war, I ask hon. Members who started the war. It makes a great difference who started the war. The British Government certainly did not start the war in Palestine. It has been stated that this is a resistance movement on the part of the Jews in Palestine, and that it cannot be put down because it has the passive or active support of the people of Palestine. In fact, it has not the support of the people in Palestine, because the people in Palestine are 600,000 Jews and 1,300,000 Arabs, and there is not a single Arab who supports it. Therefore, that argument falls to the ground. Another extraordinary statement that has been made is that the Jewish terrorists were forced to fight our soldiers. Did anybody ever hear such a perversion of the argument? They were forced to fight our soldiers—forced by whom? The hon. Member for Coventry East (Mr. Crossman) said this.

Mr. CROSSMAN: I did not say that they were forced to fight; I said that they did not want to fight our soldiers, and fought them reluctantly.

Mr. REID: I am sorry, but I took it down, and the words used were, "forced to fight our soldiers." That is an extraordinary statement for any British subject to make in this House. My hon. Friend the Member for Nelson and Colne made one remark with which I thoroughly agree. He said that there is only one solution to this question, and that is to remove the cause of the trouble. He then went on to say that if we implemented the Anglo-American Report we should remove the cause of the trouble. In my view, if we implement that Report we shall set the Near East in flames, and everybody who knows the Near East will agree that what I say is true. Again, it is said that we must carry out our pledged word to the Jews. I think we have; we have established a national home, but what about our pledged word to the Arabs? Unless it is found as things develop that the Government have acted without proper proof of the complicity of the Jewish Agency leaders I shall support the Government.

THE PRIME MINISTER (Mr. ATTLEE): Everyone will agree that the situation in Palestine is serious and has been serious for many months—I might even say for many years. It is a situation that is not of the seeking of any of us in this House. We have to face this position where there are two races in one small territory and we are charged with a Mandate in which we have to deal fairly with both these peoples. That is sometimes forgotten, and one might almost think from what was said by the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne that we were in Palestine as partners with the Jewish Agency for the creation of a Jewish State. That is not so. The Jewish Agency has a position to co-operate on the economic and social side with the Government, but the Government of Palestine is the Government of the Mandatory Power.

I must confess that, listening to some of the speeches to-day, it seemed to me that they entirely lost sight of what preceded this action on the part of the Government. The suggestion was made that this was done out of the blue, as a sudden attack. The hon. Member for Nelson and Colne described it as a declaration of war; it was nothing of the kind. We have had a long series of outrages, a long series of terrorist and illegal actions. Let me say that these actions did not start when this Government came in; the right hon. Gentleman opposite had to deal with them, and others have had to deal with them and had to deal with them immediately after V-Day when some extremists said it was their D-Day. I claim that the authorities in Palestine and His Majesty's Government have shown the very greatest possible patience and forbearance in dealing with these matters. We have not taken action in a hurry.

We sought to deal with these activities, as I said, locally, acting against the immediate perpetrators, and I hoped that they were only isolated actions by irresponsibles and extremists. We were most reluctant to go any further than that, but we have been forced by events to see what is the real position, and it is clear that these activities are part of a wide-spread plan. It is perfectly impossible in a country where one is responsible for law and order to allow these

things to go on without taking action. No troops in the world can stand being placed in that position, and everyone will agree on the enormous forbearance shown by our troops.

We had the position that the only thing to do was to go further than dealing with isolated matters. Some of these activities were very large operations, such as the cutting of a number of railways and the blowing up of a whole series of bridges in a widely extended arc right round the whole territory. They were on a scale of military planning. Therefore, nothing could be more false than to say that we have declared war on the Jews or the Zionists.

Mr. SILVERMAN: The Prime Minister is unwittingly distorting what I said. I did not say that we had declared war on the Jews. I said that the carrying through of the policy initiated on Saturday morning was inevitably and in fact a war, and so undoubtedly it is.

THE PRIME MINISTER: I accept the hon. Gentleman's explanation, but I would like to ask him, if that is so, what he calls the carrying on of the operations that we have had to face? Soldiers have been attacked and murdered. Is that war, or not?

Hon. MEMBERS: Answer.

Mr. SILVERMAN: If the right hon. Gentleman wants me to answer, I say that it does not matter to my argument whether military operations are good on one side or bad on the other. I think they are bad on both sides. I was asking the House to realise that once the British Government embark upon the policy they embarked upon on Saturday morning they cannot carry it through without a large-scale war, which I think we are not prepared to carry through.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Once people embark upon a terrorist campaign there is bound to be action taken to prevent the continuation of that campaign. The hon. Gentleman took a line which I very much regretted. Towards the end of his remarks he said, "Let in the 100,000 immigrants, and the whole thing will stop."

Mr. SILVERMAN: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman does not want to be as unfair as in fact he is. I did not say, "Let in the 100,000 and the whole thing will stop." I said that he should not let anybody in. I said he should declare his acceptance in principle of all the ten recommendations of the Report and should go on to say that he declined to implement any one of them until he had achieved an agreement as to co-operation with the United States. That is quite a different thing.

THE PRIME MINISTER: I note the hon. Member's correction, but that was the impression I got. Perhaps the record will show that I am wrong. If the hon. Member says that that was not what he meant, I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. SILVERMAN: It is not merely not what I meant, but not what I said.

THE PRIME MINISTER: There is a great danger in any Member of this House seeming to support this kind of violence. The hon. Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman) said that this activity was similar to that of a resistance movement. That again is a very dangerous argument. Precisely the same thing might have been said about the Arab rebellion. The hon. Member said rightly that you should not yield to violence, whether it is by Arabs or by Jews and because we have yielded once to the Arabs is no argument for yielding to the Jews. In my view we must do justice in this case without allowing ourselves to be overcome by threats of violence or by violent action.

The hon. Member for East Coventry said that this was the White Paper policy. It is not the White Paper policy. This Government have never stood for the White Paper policy. Let us remember that pledges were given by the late Prime Minister and President Roosevelt that full consultations should take place before the White Paper policy was departed from. That departure involved some discussion. It is all very well for hon. Members to say that a word has been broken here or there. It seems to me they are very willing for us to break our word when it does not suit them. I quite agree that in this Palestine business, looking back to the past, there have been too many words given on too many sides. But we cannot cast these things aside lightly.

With regard to the White Paper policy, let me say that we did our utmost to induce the Jewish Agency to accept visas, but they refused them at the time, and since the end of the White Paper period we have continued the migration of Jews into Palestine. It is quite wrong to say that we are carrying on the White Paper policy. On the contrary, we endeavoured to make a new start by getting together with the United States of America for a solution. I hope that out of the discussions on that solution will come the settlement of this problem, but to hear some hon. Members talk one would think that the Report had been accepted by everybody with acclamation. It has not been accepted by the Zionists or by the Arabs. I am told that if we will accept this straightaway without any further thought, everything will be all right. I cannot accept that. What we did say when the Report was issued in consultation with the United States of America was that we sought to get the opinion of both Arabs and Jews on the question. We then arranged for consultations to take place between the experts on the Report. These have been proceeding. It is really not the fault of this Government that the talks have not proceeded more quickly. I have endeavoured to speed them up myself, but one cannot speed up people more than they are willing to be speeded up. One must do the best one can.

The suggestion is thrown out that because after that Report a period has elapsed in which it is known that discussions have gone on, somehow or other that excuses violence. It does not to my mind excuse or condone this kind of violence. We have got to face the fact that there are strong forces in Palestine and in the Jewish world that have not accepted the idea only of a Jewish home, but are pressing for a Jewish State. It is no good blinking that fact—

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: Like the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE PRIME MINISTER: That is a perfectly irrelevant point. I am dealing here with the facts of the situation between the Arabs and the Jews. One has to realise this, too. I quite agree that the Hagana started off by being an orderly and useful body of people, but there is no doubt whatever that, especially since the end of the war, it has to some extent changed, and we have evidence—I will produce the evidence in due course—of a very close link up between the Jewish Agency and Hagana. Indeed, the hon. Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman) made that point very strongly himself. We also have evidence of the close connection between the Hagana and the Irgun.

We cannot get away from the fact that these are working together, and, according to the information which we have, the only possible way of dealing with these widespread disturbances is to deal with the organisation of the higher command. The last thing in the world we want to do is to destroy the Jewish Agency. We want to keep the Jewish Agency doing magnificent work, but the Jewish Agency cannot be a cover for running an illegal army in illegal actions. That is why we have had to take this action—because all the evidence that came to the hands of our authorities was that the Hagana has been closely connected with the Irgun and that the Hagana acts under the general direction of members of the Jewish Agency. I am not saying all the members, but certainly some members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency.

We are told that this is a dangerous action, a dangerous policy. I agree, but it is a policy which has been forced upon us. And what is the alternative? I really did not hear any alternative from the hon. Member for East Coventry, except that we should at once proclaim, without further consideration, that we had accepted the Report of the Committee. Well, we are not prepared to accept that until we have discussed it fully with the Government of the United States of America. That is the course we have set before us, and I am bound to repeat that I have seen no evidence yet of the acceptance of that Report, that it would at once get the approbation of either of the two great communities in Palestine or of their supporters outside.

Dr. SEGAL (Preston): May I ask the Prime Minister, does action depend simply on agreement between the British Government and the United States Government, or is it also contingent upon the acquiescence of both communities in Palestine?

THE PRIME MINISTER: What we want to get at is the greatest possible agreement between ourselves and the United States, and then to try to get a policy which will be agreed and will bring peace.

Dr. SEGAL: That means postponing a settlement.

THE PRIME MINISTER: I do not think the hon. Member would desire us to enforce some policy, by force of arms, which is not accepted by the communities. As I have said before, I think this Report is a very good basis for discussion, I think it is a very valuable Report, but if I am asked here and now if I accept that Report, I cannot accept it because we have not fully discussed it, and its implications are very far-reaching and need very wide and careful examination.

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: This is a very important point. I apologise for interrupting again. Are we to understand, from what my right hon. Friend has just said, that no solution of this problem either arising out of the Report or otherwise, even if agreed between this country and the United States of America, will be applied unless the Arab community in Palestine agrees to it?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I said nothing of the sort. What I said was that you have to examine this very fully because it is not our policy to enforce a policy on Palestine at the point of the bayonet, whether that policy is dictated by one side or the other in favour of one side or the other. We are trying to get a settlement on this most difficult question, and I am endeavouring in this debate to try to escape from the atmosphere of suspicion which has been created as the result of the past handling of this whole question. In this matter we are trying to deal fairly with the Jews and with the Arabs in Palestine. It is really no good suggesting that we have not an obligation to Arabs as well as Jews. That is our Mandate. It may be unfortunate, but that is the position. Now, at the present time, we hold that Mandate. We are responsible for preserving law and order. It is suggested that we should not have taken this action. I do not know what was suggested. I notice in the Report it was said if British Forces were withdrawn there would be immediate and prolonged bloodshed, the end of which it was impossible to predict. We should like to get our troops out of this difficult position, but, unfortunately, we have this responsibility and our troops are there. While they are there they must carry out the primary duty of a Government.

That enforcement of law and order, the preserving of law and order, really does not mean the enforcement of a White Paper policy. The hon. Member who said that ought not to have said that. He ought not to have drawn a comparison either, suggesting that this was the same as the case of Ireland, because the hon. Member knows perfectly well, and so does the Jewish community and the whole world, that we are discussing definite, concrete proposals put forward to us by a Committee. We are discussing this on the basis of having accepted for a basis of discussion a report which is being put forward by representatives from two great countries. Surely it is unreasonable to suggest that somehow or other any delay justifies violent action of this kind. I seriously ask what possible good does any hon. Member think can be done by wrecking trains, destroying bridges, shooting soldiers, or kidnapping officers? How can that conceivably bring us one whit nearer to a solution of this problem, unless it is really true that by bringing violent pressure this Government can be forced to take some action which it would not otherwise take? No Government worthy of the name will yield to that kind of pressure, and certainly this Government is not going to do so.

Mr. ZILLIACUS (Gateshead): Will my right hon. Friend say on this question of not yielding to violence, why the Foreign Secretary stated at Bournemouth that the Government would not admit 100,000 Jews, as recommended by the Committee's Report, as it would mean stationing a further division in Palestine? Is that not yielding to the threat of Arab violence?

THE PRIME MINISTER: Not at all. If we are suddenly going to admit something like a 20 per cent. addition, I think it is, of the total population into a disturbed country with all kinds of economic difficulties and so on, we have to contemplate that we may get disturbances, and may need more troops stationed there. The Foreign Secretary said nothing in regard to the Arabs. But we have to take into account that steps taken in this matter must be taken very carefully if we do not want to precipitate violence on one side, or the other. Therefore, I ask the House to realise that the Government have not been actuated by some desire to attack the Jewish Agency, the Jewish people or the Zionist movement.

We have been trying for a very long time to see whether ordinary police action, persuasion, would not stop this terrorism. It has not done so. It has got worse, and I claim that no Government could

have failed to act under these circumstances. Our information is, as I told the House, that there is the closest possible connection between Members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency and the Hagana. That is not denied. There is evidence of a close connection and joint working between the Hagana and some of the terrorist organisations, and under these circumstances it was essential to deal with the whole network of this business, as soon as possible, to clear up the matter. We want to go ahead and get down to the business of dealing with the Report of the Commission dealing with this problem. I earnestly ask all my friends—whom I know feel very deeply on this matter, indeed hon. Members in all parts of the House feel very deeply on this matter—I ask hon. Members to use some control.

I do not think the remarks of the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. M. Foot) were really helpful, or really did justice to the situation in which any Government would find itself in dealing with a problem which has lasted not for decades, but for centuries. That requires for its solution the utmost patience and the utmost good will, but it requires at the same time, if our hopes are not to be shipwrecked, a firm administration in carrying out the ordinary fundamental duties of a Government, distasteful as these may be. I think hon. Members have already agreed, that whatever they may think about the action that has been taken by the Government, the action of the troops in carrying out those duties has been exemplary. I assure the House, in conclusion, that as soon as possible the House shall be put in possession of all the facts available. I can also assure the House that I am pressing on constantly—only this very week—in order to try and get forward with the discussions on the Committee's report.

Mr. HENDERSON STEWART (Fife, East): The Prime Minister must be aware that a large number of hon. Members who wished to speak to-night could not, within the short time available, do so, and also of the great importance attached to this matter. Could he give us an assurance that a full opportunity for a discussion of this grave matter will be given before the House rises at the end of this month?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I have already promised that. I should have liked a full day's Debate on this, not a rushed Debate in a short time which does not give anyone full time to develop their case. It has already been said that there will be an opportunity for a full Debate before the House rises.

Mr. R. A. BUTLER (Saffron Walden): Is the Prime Minister aware that a great many Members would like a full day's Debate on education?

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: I think that many Members of the House will feel that my right hon. Friend has not really justified this action, but since I did not move this Motion in order to divide the House at this stage on these matters, but merely in order to give the Government an opportunity to hear what we thought, and give the House an opportunity to hear the Government's explanation, I will, with the leave of the House, and of my hon. Friend who seconded, ask leave to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

GOVERNMENT'S PALESTINE PLAN.

Mr. Herbert Morrison's Statement

July 31, 1946.

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): This Debate takes place in the shadow of a tragedy that must have moved the most war-hardened among us. In the destruction of the Government offices at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, 84 men and women—Arabs, Jews, British—were killed, and 46 injured, while 22 are still missing. These were people innocent of any crime, members of the public going about their ordinary business, and many loyal and single-hearted servants of the community. I am sure that the whole House would wish me to express again the deep sympathy felt by the whole British people for the victims of this outrage. Police and military forces have, on each occasion of acts of terrorism, instituted measures to track down and arrest those responsible.

The greatest obstacle to success in these operations has been the refusal of the Jewish population in Palestine to co-operate with the forces of law and order. Jewish settlers have resorted to passive resistance of the most determined kind against searches for terrorists. The Government have been equally determined to bring the perpetrators of these outrages to account, and reached the conclusion that radical action was needed against the organisers of illegal armed forces, and the organisations they control. Action to this end was initiated on June 29, when widespread arrests and searches were carried out by all the Security Forces in Palestine. The examination of detainees and the scrutiny of documents seized in those searches was still proceeding, when the latest and most tragic incident occurred—the destruction at the King David Hotel. Immediate action was taken to pursue the perpetrators of the outrage, and 446 Jews were arrested, whose records showed association with the terrorist organisations. As there was clear evidence that some, if not all, of the persons responsible for the Jerusalem crime came from Tel Aviv, military operations in that town took place on July 30 to apprehend them.

The House will expect me to say a word about the letter which, according to newspaper reports, General Barker, the military commander in Palestine, sent to his officers forbidding British soldiers from relationships of a social character with Jews, and stating that any association in the way of duty should be as brief as possible, and kept to the business at hand. First, let me say that though the Government are satisfied that the instructions given by the Commander were justified in the present disturbed state of the country, at the same time, making all allowances for the provocation to which our Forces are exposed, and recognising that the letter was written shortly after the outrage at the King David Hotel, the Government feel that they must dissociate themselves from the actual terms in which the letter is couched. The Chief of the Imperial General Staff is dealing with this aspect of the matter, and I am sure that it can be safely left in Field-Marshal Montgomery's very competent hands. But the House will, of course, bear in mind the difficult and delicate nature of the operations on which our Forces in Palestine are at present engaged, and I am confident, too, that the House will wish me to say that we fully appreciate how heavy is the strain under which both the Army and the civilian officials have been carrying out their duties, and to express our admiration for the magnificent way in which they have discharged them.

At this point, I should like to say a word on the subject of the compensation payable to the dependants of the dead and to the injured. Nothing we can do can make up to them for the irreparable personal loss they have suffered, but it is the duty of the Government to ensure that they do not suffer more than is inevitable and that they should be spared financial anxieties as far as is possible. The families of British and Palestinian civil servants and police are provided for by special legislation which has been operative since 1935, dealing with pension and compensation questions arising out of acts of terrorism. This legislation will be interpreted and administered with the maximum generosity and special provision will, if necessary, be made to deal with cases which may for technical reasons fall outside its sphere, or in which special circumstances make the compensation provided under the legislation inadequate. The provisions of the Royal Warrant will apply to the dependants of soldiers who lost their lives. Dependants of other victims not included in the above category, will be provided for by special arrangements as necessary. In the meantime, instructions have been given to ensure that payments continue to be made to families pending the conclusion of final arrangements for their financial support.

The shock of the King David Hotel explosion has surely aroused us to a fuller understanding, if that were needed, of the horrible and monstrous nature of those "evil things"—to borrow a phrase used on a famous occasion—against which we are fighting. The curse of Hitler is not yet fully removed. Some of his victims fleeing from the ravaged ghettos of Europe have carried with them the germs of those very plagues from which they sought escape—intolerance, racial pride, intimidation, terrorism and the worship of force. We are reminded that, in discussing the Palestine problem, we are dealing not only with the question of the displaced persons in Europe—though, as I shall show, we have given most anxious attention to that aspect—but also with the clash of political forces, deeply rooted in history and stirring strong and, if unwisely directed, terrible emotions. Zionism is regarded by its supporters as the expression of a profound and splendid impulse in the soul of the Jewish people, and its purpose as transcending the material needs of the immediate present. Let them beware, however, lest this modern perversion of their faith brings ruin upon them and it. Sane and healthy nationalism has inspired many of the finest achievements of mankind; its perversion spells only degradation and depravity.

The leaders of the Jewish community in Palestine have, we feel bound to say, failed to preserve their movement from the contagion of those false ideals of which I have spoken. Many of them seem to have been drawn into courses which their own consciences must at first have condemned. The death of Lord Moyne in November, 1944, came as a startling proof of the evil nature of Palestinian terrorism and the lengths to which it would go. After that, for a time, the Jewish Agency co-operated with the Government in a campaign against the illegal organisations, the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang. There was, for some months, a lull in terrorist activities, but in May, 1945, following threats by the Irgun Zvai Leumi that V-Day for the world would be D-Day for them, there was a renewed outbreak of violence.

The Anglo-American Committee have recorded how the Jewish Agency ceased to provide that co-operation with the Mandatory which is the duty expressly laid upon them by the Mandate. Indeed, after the attacks on the police headquarters and police stations in December, 1945, when eight lives were lost, Mr. Ben Gurion, the Chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency, in a statement issued to the Press by his authority, describing an interview which he and Mr. Shertok had had with the High Commissioner, indicated that the Agency could not assist in preventing such acts, excusing themselves on the ground that, in the words of the statement, it was difficult to appeal to the Jewish community to observe the law at a time when the Mandatory Government was itself consistently violating the fundamental law of the country embodied in the Palestine Mandate.

Several leaders of the Agency had already become directly implicated in the terrorist campaign. Of this His Majesty's Government have ample evidence, of which selections have been published in the recent White Paper. The cumulative effect of this evidence in recent months was such that, anxious as we had been to avoid any additional disturbance of the situation while the Anglo-American discussions were in train, His Majesty's Government were driven to the decision that drastic action could no longer be postponed. The High Commissioner was accordingly authorised to carry out the operations which began on June 29th, with a view to breaking up the illegal organisations and detaining those responsible for the campaign of violence. I do not propose to dwell further on that matter now, though there will be ample opportunity to raise it, if hon. Members so desire, during the course of the Debate. I should myself prefer, and I think the House, generally, will take the view that it would be more profitable, to turn away from the sombre record of the past, and direct the attention of the House forward to the way by which we believe the peoples of Palestine may be led to a brighter and happier future.

Representatives of His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States, whom I shall describe as the expert delegations, have completed their examination of the recommendations made in the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on the problems of European Jewry and Palestine. The experts made unanimous recommendations on both sides, British and American, as to the policy to be adopted in respect of all the matters covered by the report of the Anglo-American Committee; and I think that I should outline, inevitably at some length, the main features of their proposals.

The expert delegations first dealt with the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee regarding the position of the Jews in Europe. The events of recent years, after Hitler's rise to power, have given a special emphasis to the character of the Jewish National Home as a sanctuary for those who could reach it from among the tragically few survivors of European Jewry. It is the pressure of immigration from Europe that has so intensified the difficulties of the Palestine problem. The Anglo-American Committee recognised that Palestine alone cannot meet the immigration needs of the Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution, and recommended that our two Governments, in association with other countries—for the whole world shares the responsibility—should endeavour immediately to find new Homes for all displaced persons, irrespective of creed or nationality.

The expert delegations proposed that our two Governments should adopt the following means of making an immediate contribution to the solution of this problem. First, they proposed that our two

Governments should seek to create conditions favourable to the resettlement of a substantial number of displaced persons in Europe itself, since it is recognised that the overwhelming majority will continue to live in Europe. In the British and American zones of Germany and Austria, our two Governments are doing their utmost to assist resettlement and to eradicate anti-Semitism. In Italy and the ex-enemy satellite States the authorities will be required by the Peace Treaties to secure to all persons under their jurisdiction human rights and the fundamental freedoms. As regards the countries in Europe, the expert delegations recommended that our Governments should support the efforts of the United Nations to ensure the protection of those rights and freedoms. Further, by assisting to re-establish political and economic stability in Europe, we should continue to contribute to the restoration of those basic conditions which will make possible the reintegration in Europe of a substantial number of displaced persons, including Jews.

But, when all that is possible has been done in Europe, it is clear that new homes must be found overseas for many whose ties with their former communities have been irreparably broken. The expert delegations outlined the following measures—some of which are already in train—designed to promote this movement. First, we should continue to press for the establishment of an International Refugee Organisation designed to deal effectively with the problem of refugees and displaced persons as a whole. Secondly, we should give strong support at the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations to an appeal calling upon all Member Governments to receive in territories under their control a proportion of the displaced persons in Europe, including Jews. I should here interpolate that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have already given a lead in this matter by accepting a commitment to promote the resettlement of about 235,000 Polish troops and civilians and their dependants. This is, of course, in addition to refugees admitted during the period of Nazi persecution, of whom some 70,000 Jews remain in the United Kingdom. His Majesty's Governments in the Dominions have been informed of the action being taken by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, and they will, we hope, support the appeal to Member Governments of the United Nations, an appeal which will include an invitation to receive a number of displaced persons in the territories under their control. I also understand that the United States, where 275,000 refugees, including 180,000 Jews, have permanently resettled in the same period, are now resuming normal immigration and expect to receive some 53,000 immigrants each year from the European countries from which the displaced persons are drawn. Finally, pending the establishment of an International Refugee Organisation, we shall, in co-operation with the Government of the United States, continue to promote the resettlement of refugees and displaced persons through the agency of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. Plans are in preparation, in co-operation with the nations concerned, for resettling large numbers of displaced persons in Brazil and other South American countries.

It will thus be seen, from what I have said, that the broader aspects of the refugee and displaced persons problem have not been overlooked, nor the restoration of conditions in Europe permitting the reintegration there of as many displaced persons, including Jews, as may wish to remain. The ability and talent of Jews and others is needed for the difficult tasks of reconstruction that lie ahead. At the same time, we are taking urgent and practical steps to ensure that other countries as well as Palestine will contribute to the resettlement of those displaced persons, including Jews, who must look elsewhere than to Europe for their permanent homes.

In formulating a new policy for Palestine, the expert delegations accepted as a basis the principles laid down in the third recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee, that Palestine as a whole can be neither a Jewish nor an Arab State, that neither of the two communities in Palestine should dominate the other, and that the form of Government should be such as to safeguard the interests in the Holy Land of both Christendom and the Moslems and Jewish faiths.

The expert delegations argue as follows. The political aspirations of the two communities in Palestine are irreconcilable. The conflict which these aspirations have provoked is so bitter that there is little hope of securing within any reasonable period that measure of co-operation between Arab and Jew which would make possible the establishment in Palestine of a unitary system of Government, consistent with these basic principles, in which each people played its part. The only chance of peace, and of immediate advance towards self-governing institutions, appears to lie in so framing the constitution of the country as to give to each the greatest practicable measure of power to manage its own affairs. The experts believe that, in present circumstances, this can best be secured by the establishment of Arab and Jewish Provinces, which will enjoy a large measure of autonomy under a central Government.

It is their proposal that, for this purpose, Palestine shall be divided into four areas, an Arab Province, a Jewish Province, a District of Jerusalem and a District of Negeb. The Jewish Province would include the great bulk of the land on which Jews have already settled and a considerable area between and around the settlements. The Jerusalem District would include Jerusalem, Bethlehem and their immediate environs. The Negeb District would consist of the uninhabited triangle of waste land in the South of Palestine beyond the present limits of cultivation. The Arab Province would include the remainder of Palestine; it would be almost wholly Arab in respect both of land and of population. The provincial boundaries would be purely administrative boundaries, defining the area within which a local legislature would be empowered to legislate on certain subjects and a local executive to administer its laws. They would have no significance as regards defence, Customs or communications, but, in order to give finality, the boundaries, once fixed, would not be susceptible of change except by agreement between the two Provinces. A provision to this effect would be embodied in any trusteeship agreement, and in the instrument bringing the plan into operation.

The provincial governments would have power of legislation and administration within their areas with regard to a wide range of subjects of primarily provincial concern. They would also have power to limit the number and determine the qualifications of persons who

may take up permanent residence in their territories after the introduction of the plan. The provincial governments would be required by the instrument of government which establishes the fundamental law to provide for the guarantee of civil rights and equality before the law of all residents, and for the freedom of interterritorial transit, trade and commerce. The provincial governments would have the necessary power to raise money for the purpose of carrying out their functions.

There would be reserved to the Central Government exclusive authority as to defence, foreign relations, Customs and Excise. In addition, there would be reserved initially to the Central Government exclusive authority as to the administration of law and order, including the police and courts, and a limited number of subjects of all-Palestine importance. The Central Government would have all powers not expressly granted to the provinces by the instrument of Government. An elected Legislative Chamber would be established in each Province. An executive, consisting of a Chief Minister and a Council of Ministers, would be appointed in each Province by the High Commissioner from among the members of the Legislative Chamber after consultation with its leaders. Bills passed by the Legislative Chambers would require the assent of the High Commissioner. This, however, would not be withheld unless the Bill is inconsistent with the instrument of Government, whose provisions would afford safeguards for the peace of Palestine and for the rights of minorities.

It would also be necessary to reserve to the High Commissioner an emergency power to intervene if a provincial government fails to perform, or exceeds, its proper functions. The executive and legislative functions of the Central Government would initially be exercised by the High Commissioner, assisted by a nominated Executive Council. Certain of the departments of the Central Government would be headed, as soon as the High Commissioner deems practical, by Palestinians. The High Commissioner would establish a Development Planning Board and a Tariff Board composed of representatives of the Central Government and of each province. In the Jerusalem District, a council would be established with powers similar to those of a municipal council. The majority of its members would be elected, but certain members would be nominated by the High Commissioner. The Negev District would be administered, for the time being, by the Central Government.

This plan for provincial autonomy would greatly simplify the problem of Jewish immigration into Palestine. Though final control over immigration would continue to rest with the Central Government, this control would be exercised on the basis of recommendations made by the provincial governments. So long as the economic absorptive capacity of the province was not exceeded, the Central Government would authorise the immigration desired by the provincial government. It would have no power to authorise immigration in excess of any limitations proposed by the provincial governments. Thus, though the Government of the Arab Province would have full power to exclude Jewish immigrants from its Province, the Jewish Province would, normally, be able to admit as many immigrants as its Government desires.

As part of this plan, the experts suggest that it would become possible to accept the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish immigrants into Palestine, and for continuing immigration thereafter. The experts prepared a plan for the movement of 100,000 Jews from Europe into the Jewish area of Palestine, and this plan could be set in motion as soon as it is decided to put into effect the scheme as a whole. The immigration certificates would be issued as rapidly as possible, and every effort would be made to complete the operation within 12 months of the date on which the immigration begins. The immigrants would be selected, primarily, from Jews in Germany, Austria and Italy, and priority would be given to those who have already spent some time in assembly centres in those countries and to others who, though no longer in those centres, were liberated in Germany and Austria. Within those groups, priority would be given to building craftsmen and agricultural workers, young children, the infirm and the aged. The bulk of the 100,000 would be drawn from Germany, Austria and Italy; any certificates available for the Jews in other countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe would be issued only to orphan children. Shipment would proceed at the maximum rate consistent with the clearance of the transit camps in Palestine, in which the immigrants would be temporarily accommodated until they could be absorbed.

Under this plan, the United States Government would be asked to undertake sole responsibility for the sea transportation of those Jewish refugees, to whom I have referred, from Europe to Palestine. They would provide the ships and would defray the whole cost of sea transportation. They would also provide food for the immigrants for the first two months after their arrival in Palestine. The cost of transferring and settling this number of persons in Palestine would, of course, be considerable. The Jewish organisations have accepted the financial responsibility, and the experts saw no reason why the required finance should not be found from reparations, from contributions by world Jewry and from loans. The experts accepted the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee that improvements of the economic and social conditions of the Arabs in Palestine were desirable. The programme which they suggested would include the provision of a health service comparable to that already available to the Jews, an expansion of educational facilities, the provision of cheap credit for the Arab cultivators, and other measures designed to increase the productivity of the land, the promotion of the co-operative movement, the development of light industries and improvements in both rural and urban living conditions.

The expert delegations gave warning that, for some years, the implementation of these and other plans for the improvement of economic opportunities and living standards in Palestine would impose heavy capital costs not eligible for loans, and would constitute a severe strain on the finances of Palestine. The setting up of the provincial system would also entail a deficit in the budget of the Arab Province which would have to be met by a Central Government subvention. Further financial aid for Palestine would be required if the plan, as a whole, is to be carried out. To meet this situation, the experts suggested that the United States should be asked to make a substantial grant to the Government of Palestine, to be used principally for financing Arab development projects not suitable for self-liquidating loans, and for assisting in the meeting of extraordinary expenditure during the transitional period, while this country should be asked to take ultimate

responsibility for meeting Palestine's annual budgetary deficit up to the time when increased revenues made this unnecessary.

The experts believed that the need for economic development in Palestine should be considered against the background of the Middle East as a whole. They understood that the governments represented in the Arab League were now examining the possibilities of economic development in their countries, and they, therefore, suggested that if any of those States found difficulty in obtaining international loans for this purpose, the United States should authorise large-scale development loans. These loans would be made through an appropriate agency for the development of the Middle East region, including Palestine. Most large-scale development from which Palestine could benefit should be undertaken in co-operation, at least, with Transjordan, and probably with Syria and Lebanon. The experts proposed that, subject to the consent of the Government of Transjordan, the common water resources of both Palestine and Transjordan should be surveyed as soon as possible by consulting engineers acting under Government auspices.

I have now completed my outline of the recommendations of the expert delegations. His Majesty's Government, believing that these recommendations represent the best line of advance towards a solution of the problem, informed the United States Government of their willingness to accept them as the basis for negotiation. We had hoped before the debate to receive from President Truman his acceptance, but we understand that he has decided, in view of the complexity of the matter, to discuss it in detail with the United States expert delegation who are returning to Washington for the purpose. The President is thus giving further consideration to the matter, and we hope to hear again from him in due course.

Meanwhile, however, the situation in Palestine will brook no delay. We are inviting the representatives of the Jews and Arabs to meet us for discussion of these problems, and we hope that we shall be able to bring before them as a basis for negotiation the plan recommended by the expert delegations. If it is found acceptable, our intention would be that it should be embodied in a trusteeship agreement for Palestine. But I should make it clear that we mean to go ahead with discussion with Arabs and Jews of a constitutional scheme on these lines. We believe that it offers many advantages to both communities in Palestine.

The Jews will be free to exercise a large measure of control over immigration into their own Province, and to forward there the development of the Jewish national home. The Land Transfer Regulations will be repealed. It will be open to the Government of the Arab Province to permit or to refuse permission to Jews to purchase land there, but the area of the Jewish Province will be larger than that in which Jews are free to buy land at present. The Arabs will gain, in that the great majority of them will be freed once and for all from any fear of Jewish domination. The citizens of the Arab Province will achieve, at once a large measure of autonomy, and powerful safeguards will be provided to protect the rights of the Arab minority left in the Jewish Province. To both communities the plan offers a prospect of development, of which there would be little hope in a unitary Palestine.

In the long term, the plan leaves the way open for peaceful progress and constitutional development either towards partition, or towards federal unity. The association of representatives of the two Provinces in the administration of central subjects may lead ultimately to a fully developed federal constitution. On the other hand, if the centrifugal forces prove too strong, the way is open towards partition. Our proposals do not prejudice this issue either way. We believe that this plan provides as fair and reasonable a compromise between the claims of Arab and Jew as it is possible to devise, and that it offers the best prospect of reconciling the conflicting interests of the two communities. This, however, must be made clear. The full implementation of the experts' plan as a whole depends on United States co-operation. I hope that that will be forthcoming. If not, we shall have to reconsider the position, particularly as regards the economic and financial implications, and this is bound to affect the tempo and extent of immigration and development.

These, then, are our proposals. I ask the indulgence of the House for the fact that I have had to stick closely to my notes in the circumstances in making this speech, because a great deal of this speech was necessarily based upon the recommendations of the expert delegations, and I was exceedingly anxious to be accurate in what I said. It would, in any event, be impracticable to enter, at this stage, into greater detail regarding proposals which it is intended shall form the basis of discussion with representatives of the Arabs and Jews whom we have promised an opportunity for consultation before a final decision is reached.

I commended these proposals to the House and I would urge upon both communities in the Holy Land to give them their most earnest consideration. While our consultations are proceeding, I would appeal to all men of good will on either side to co-operate with the Government in suppressing terrorism and in bringing to justice those responsible for crimes of violence. Let nothing be said or done that will render it more difficult to reach a final settlement. The world is weary of this senseless strife of Jew and Arab, and sickened by its barbarous incidents. It calls upon them to end a sordid chapter of history, and join with the civilised nations in building the foundations of a nobler and happier world. Their friends everywhere will anxiously await their verdict. Mere negation, however, does no good and would be particularly dangerous and regrettable in a combustible situation of the kind with which we are dealing. There is a responsibility on both Jews and Arabs to be willing to sit down as practical people to discuss, to negotiate and to talk with a view to reaching a practicable solution, with the expedition and with the sense of urgency which this grave problem demands.

Mr. Oliver Stanley: I think that in this matter this House has been treated in a rather extraordinary way. I say "this House" and not the Opposition, because I think it is a matter in which hon. Members on all sides are interested. For many months now, since the end of April, many hon. Members have desired a Debate upon this subject. We have postponed that Debate at the desire of the Government, in order not to embarrass them. That, I think, must have convinced them that the desire of the House when it came to debate the matter was, not to debate it in a hostile controversial spirit, but to enable hon. Members on all sides who take differing views, which do not differ necessarily according to the side of the House on which they sit,

to give some expression to their feelings about the problem and its solution. It has been obvious from the Press in the last ten days that there has been in existence this agreement, document, or whatever it is called, of this committee of experts to which the Lord President has referred.

My point is this. I cannot see why it would not have been possible to have issued to this House in the form of a White Paper the substance of what the Lord President has told us to-day. He has given us a very full and very detailed statement. However, it is one which is almost impossible for anybody immediately to discuss and to dissect with any value. Although it has been an interesting statement, it is not a novel one. I cannot see that there is any secret in it which could not have been divulged last week. Naturally, we would not have expected the right hon. Gentleman to say before the Debate whether His Majesty's Government or the American Government agreed. But if we could have had the substance of this report before, it would have enabled us, I am sure, to discuss the matter with much greater intelligence, and, I think, with much greater assistance to the Government as well. As it is, we must all try to do our best to deal with a complicated proposal which we have not previously had the opportunity of seeing. Therefore we can only deal with it on rather broad lines, and as a matter of personal impressions.

Before I come to a discussion of the Government's plan, I would like to say a few words upon some of the other matters which were raised by the right hon. Gentleman. He dealt first with the problem of the resettlement of Jews and other displaced persons elsewhere than in Palestine. Of course, we welcome any attempts which can be made in that way. We do not believe either that Palestine is the only destination which might provide a happy home for Jews. We hope with the right hon. Gentleman that a large number of Jews will, in fact, decide, under better conditions, to make their homes still in the countries in which they have resided, because we feel that during a period of European reconstruction the complete abandonment of Europe by Jewry, the complete exodus of the Jewish race from the Continent, could only have upon that reconstruction a damaging effect. They have much to contribute in the task which lies before Europe.

Mr. Sydney Silverman: Would the right hon. Gentleman compel them to stay there?

Mr. Stanley: No, but I think the whole House would feel it a matter of regret if, in fact, every Jew felt that there was no future life for him in Europe. I have not had an opportunity of studying the actual proposals that have been made. At first sight they do not appear very novel, with one exception, which it might be possible perhaps for the right hon. Gentleman, or somebody else to expand later in the Debate, namely, the negotiation for extensive settlement in Brazil and South America; that, indeed, would be a new development, and might be a very valuable one. The other point to which the right hon. Gentleman referred was the letter of General Barker. In view of the fact that, as he states, it is a military matter in which the C.I.G.S. is now concerned, I want to say little about it, except this. It does not require much imagination to realise the strain under which our troops in Palestine have been in the last few months, the strain under which officers are who have seen their men murdered, under which people are who have seen their friends, their subordinates and their co-workers killed in a brutal manner. It is easy enough for us, sitting here in comfort and security, to criticise language which we ourselves would certainly never use, and to forget that the conditions under which it was used may not have been quite the same. Although in those circumstances, in a military officer, nothing, no amount of strain, could excuse an irresponsible action, strain of that kind may well be held to excuse a certain bitterness of words.

I now wish to say a few words about the question of law and order in Palestine. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman, whatever is the long-term policy, whatever the long-term solution—if there is one—it will have to depend eventually upon the growth of confidence between the two communities. It is impossible that that confidence should ever begin, or should ever grow, if it is known that either one or both of the communities has not only the will but also the means to seek a solution in its own favour by force and not by argument. Unfortunately, for the last four years we have seen in Palestine a steady deterioration in the security position. I have seen it myself, during my term of office, pass from the lull which there was when I first came in, to isolated action on the part of the Stern gang, from that to bigger scale action by the Irgun Zvai Leumi, at first under conditions which were carefully arranged to prevent the loss of life, and then I have seen that limitation abandoned and life as well as property become exposed to danger. All that time the Hagana and the Jewish Agency who control them not only stood aside but condemned those outrages by dissident bodies, and, as the Lord President says, after the murder of Lord Moyne, co-operated with the Government.

Unfortunately, it is clear that since those days the position has changed. When we last debated this matter on the adjournment, the Prime Minister, speaking for the Government, said that he would produce in a White Paper evidence that would implicate both the Jewish Agency and the Hagana in responsibility for those outrages, and would show that they had co-operated with the other dissident bodies which they had condemned before. Having seen the White Paper, I regret to have to say that I find that the Government's charge is proved. I say I regret it, because it is a matter of great regret that a policy of violence, which before was followed merely by a small and dissident minority, should have received the approval of a body such as the Jewish Agency, which represents so very much in the whole Jewish community in Palestine. I feel that the incident at the end of October, and the exchange of telegrams in connection with that incident which are published in the White Paper, show quite clearly that a definite planned outrage was undertaken by members of the Jewish Agency, and that in that outrage they were acting in the closest co-operation with the Irgun Zvai Leumi and with the Stern group.

There is no allegation, and I do not believe that any hon. Member will allege, that those telegrams have been faked by His Majesty's Government. If they are not faked, if they are genuine, as all of us believe them to be, published as they are on the responsibility of the Government, to my mind they can bear no other meaning than that which the Government have attributed to them. In that light,

I certainly do not question the action the Government have taken, and have had to take, to restore the position, to maintain their authority, and to stop, if possible, the murderous attacks upon our own troops. In fact, the question I would ask them would be a different one, namely, why did they not act earlier, because it is the evidence in the White Paper with reference to October and November of last year which to me is the conclusive part of the evidence? The various incidents in connection with the radio later on in the year, though they may confirm the conclusion, add very little to it, and I should have been as convinced by the earlier evidence as I am convinced to-day by the whole paper, of the complicity of the Agency and the need for action.

If this White Paper has justified action in July, the early part of the evidence contained in it would have justified action last December, and who can say that action taken last December might not have been more efficacious than action taken to-day, might not have avoided some of the incidents that have occurred, and, by bringing home to the Agency in Palestine at any earlier date the horror with which the whole world would receive the news of these outrages, and of their implication in them, might it not have prevented them from being so deeply committed as they have become to this policy of violence? But I echo the appeal made by the Lord President of the Council for the co-operation, even now, after all that has passed, of the whole Jewish community, both in Palestine and in the world at large, in ending atrocities such as these, which cannot do any good to their cause but which can only alienate the sympathy which up to now has been extended to them from all parts of the world.

I myself believe that the time for merely verbal denunciations of these outrages is passed, even if they are wholehearted denunciations, and they are not always wholehearted. On Monday I came across in the *Daily Telegraph* a report of a meeting presided over, I think, by an hon. Member of this House, which had been called to denounce these crimes, and one of the speakers at that meeting was a Mr. Locker, a member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency in this country, or certainly a man who holds a responsible position. These were some of his words:—

"We abhor crime, but non-Jews and the British people, the British Socialist Government, should ask themselves, 'Is not the sin of these misguided criminals also on us?'"

I am a critic of the Government, and I shall have something to say later about their handling of this situation in the last 12 months, but to suggest that, say, the Foreign Secretary or the Colonial Secretary share the sin of the criminals who placed the bombs in the King David Hotel is, to my mind, monstrous. And what effects can such statements have on the people for whom they were presumably intended? The object of that meeting was to express the horror and abhorrence of the Jews of this country at the action taken by their more violent compatriots in Palestine, but when those compatriots read a speech of that kind, do they read into it condemnation or do they read into it condonation? I hope that we shall have not only wholehearted denunciation by the whole community of the outrages, which they must regret, but that we shall also have real and definite co-operation in bringing to book the participants in this particular culminating outrage, and thereby have afforded to us a proof that the Jewish community as a whole reject those methods, and will have nothing to do with the criminals.

To-day, for the first time for 12 months, we have some idea of the Government's long-term policy in Palestine. Twelve months has been a long time to wait. Who would have believed, after hearing some of the declarations given during the Election, that we should have to wait 12 months for a declaration of policy? Who would have thought that the world would have to wait 12 months. Anyone reading those declarations would have been justified in believing that they were made by people who had made up their minds, who knew what they were going to do it, as a result of those declarations, they were returned to power, and who were in a position immediately to announce their decision. The fact that they were made by right hon. Gentlemen who were not in Opposition but in the Government, who must have been presumed to know the difficulties and reactions, and who must have been presumed to have discounted them in advance, must have strengthened the belief that the people who made those pledges in June, 1945, would be in a position to announce a policy earlier than July, 1946.

Now, of course, having to speak immediately after the announcement of this policy, I am, as I think other hon. Members will be, in some difficulty. I confess I had expected that we should spend most of our time discussing the Report of the Anglo-American Palestine Committee. But as I understand from the Lord President's statement today, that Report is dead, although, it is only fair to say, it has been buried with the very highest honours. The Committee were 12 very distinguished people, people who had a great many responsibilities of their own, and a great deal of valuable work to do. They were, however, called by the two Governments to this service and they came, they saw—and it appears now that they have vanished. I have my own opinion upon their Report, and I propose to deal with that later; but I do feel that the treatment to which this Commission has been subjected—in fact, the whole history of its appointment and the reception of its Report—is rather extraordinary.

The solution which the right hon. Gentleman has read out to us now was in the Colonial Office last autumn. The discussion of these experts could have started last September. We could have got as far as we are today last November; and the policy, which we can only hope now will be implemented in the next two or three months, might have been in force at the end of the year. Instead of that, everything has been at a standstill for a Report of a Commission, which, as soon as it is received, is abandoned. There is in the Commission's whole report only one definite statement without any reservation, provision or condition, and that is the condemnation of partition. I do not know—perhaps, the right hon. Gentleman would tell us—whether the particular scheme which is the basis of the Lord President's statement today was submitted to that Commission in evidence, and forms the basis of the rejection. It does really seem that the result of the self-sacrificing labours of those gentlemen has merely been to postpone a solution for a number of months, at a time when a decision is imperatively urgent. And then, when the solution is arrived at, it is an entirely different one.

But the point I am making is that these proposals, to which we are listening now, were not the proposals of the Anglo-American Commission, and in fact, were rejected by them. I am glad that the Government have taken that decision. I did not think that the proposals of the Commission did, in fact, offer any permanent solution to the Palestine problem. Their Report, of course, was in the nature of a compromise. That it was bound to be, I have no complaint of that, because any solution in Palestine must be in the nature of a compromise. But, frankly, it struck me as not a very good compromise, a compromise in which one side got all the action and the other side just got the word.

The main fundamentals of the Report are the entry of 100,000 Jews immediately into Palestine, and a declaration that neither Jew nor Arab is to dominate the State. Well, of course, if one has to choose between the two, there is considerably more value in the act of the administration of 100,000 Jews which, once done, cannot ever be repealed, than in a mere statement that a certain situation may never be allowed—a statement which may, in time, be altered, as similar statements about Palestine have been altered in the past. The result has been that the Arabs have seemed to detect in the Commission's Report a complete acceptance of the Jewish case, whereas, on the other hand, the Jews have seen in the words which are supposed to be, and should be, a reassurance to the Arabs, something which they need not accept, and have not accepted, but which they can wait to reverse when the time is more propitious. I did feel that the mere introduction of this Report would settle nothing; that it would, of course, produce a violent reaction immediately; and that violent Arab reaction would barely die away, before new demands would be made, and new violence created.

Nor, frankly, do I think we are any nearer a solution by going to the other end of the scale; by trying, instead of accepting the Report of the Anglo-American Commission, to go back to the full implementation of the White Paper. I know there are some who think that that is correct policy; I myself cannot agree. I agreed to the White Paper in 1939, but I—and I think many others would agree with me—at that time had certain hopes, which have since been shown to be incapable of fulfilment. We thought that the White Paper might provide a period of cessation in immigration; and that, during that time, tempers might fall, accommodations might begin, and an experiment of government, which was also an integral part of the White Paper, might have some effect in bringing Jew and Arab together, and that, therefore, that provision, that there should be no further immigration without the acquiescence of the Arabs, was not an empty one but might, in time, be fruitful of good. No one can now believe that, at the present moment, those hopes have been fulfilled. It has been impossible, owing to circumstances, even to start on the experiment of self-government. Jews and Arabs are further apart, much further apart, than they were in 1939, and it is idle to believe that one can hope to look, according to the White Paper policy, to the acquiescence of the Arabs in Jewish immigration into Palestine.

That being so, I do not believe that this solution, either, will bring any permanent hope to that country. Can we really leave 600,000 Jews as a permanent minority in an Arab State? I do not believe anyone could contemplate doing that, and still be faithful to the pledges that we have given. Certainly, we could not contemplate doing that without bloodshed on a terrible scale. If that is not so, if immigration is to stop and the number is always to be fixed as it is now, and there is to be no Arab State in accordance with the Arab majority, what is the alternative before us? If this country has forever to rule Palestine as a sort of police State, and is able to hold out no hope to two progressive peoples—make no mistake that the Arabs today are becoming progressive as well—of ever really having any effective say in the government of the country in which they live. I do not believe that that is a prospect which this country can look forward to with any belief that we shall be able to carry it through to the end.

I and many others have, over the last two or three years, been forced to consider whether the dreams with which people started this great experiment in Palestine—it is now nearly 30 years ago since the Balfour Declaration—may not have been proved incapable of attainment. The dreams which everyone had—all the objective and neutral people—was of a Palestine in which Jew and Arab would settle down together, would be members together of a Palestinian State, where they would be able to rule themselves, and not desire to rule each other, and where the division between political parties and political thought would not be purely on racial and religious grounds, but on grounds of economic and social interest. For many years, in pursuit of these dreams, various solutions have been proposed for Palestine, and various actions have been taken. Every time the dream has proved further away from realisation than ever before. I wonder whether the time has not come to say to ourselves that we are deluding ourselves if we really believe there is any prospect, in any period which politicians or statesmen can consider, of an outcome of that kind in Palestine. The Peel Commission warned us of it in their Report. They warned us of something else—a prophecy quite apart from the state of things as they found it then. They said:—

"The estranging force of conditions inside Palestine is growing year by year. The educational systems, Arab and Jewish, are schools of nationalism and they have only existed for a short time. Their full effect on the rising generations has yet to be felt."

That, I think, was a true prophecy. Year by year we have seen the nationalistic feeling growing. We have seen this gulf widen, and I am forced back on the conviction that it is idle any longer to base our attempts to solve this problem on the belief that in any reasonable period of time these two people can ever come together in the way in which the English, Welsh and Scottish peoples have come together in this country, and themselves share the Government of a unitary State. For that reason, when I was at the Colonial Office, I gave a considerable amount of time to trying to work out some scheme of partition. All of us with any interest in this problem are familiar with the Peel Report, and we are familiar with the theoretical case for partition. No one pretends that partition is an ideal solution, but because it is not the ideal solution, it does not mean that it may not be the only solution.

The difficulties of partitions are obvious. To take a small country, divide it, and then set up no less than three Governmental machines is uneconomic. It is wasteful, it is extravagant, and it leaves all kinds of common problems, such as communications, Customs, and

so on, to difficult arrangement. Anyone can see at once the technical practical difficulties in the way of partition, but if you can solve these problems, then the advantages are very real. It gives both Jew and Arab one great advantage. To the Jews it gives an area in which they can have a life of their own, governed by their own people in the interest of their own people. It will give them control of immigration into their own State, limited in number only by their own decision as to the economic life which they can give to the people coming there. It is true that the State they would have would be smaller than the State which they have desired in the past. I see that some leading Jewish spokesmen in America talked about this as bringing the Jews back into the ghetto, but that kind of exaggerated argument really defeats its own ends. It is a smaller State, but I think that the important future function of the Jews in Palestine is not agricultural but industrial. I know that the right hon. Gentleman can go through all his usual contortions, but I am supported in that belief by the Report of the Anglo-American Commission and by the fact that 85 per cent. of the Jewish community in Palestine do, in fact, live in the towns. If it is to be, as I believe it is to be, an industrial economy, then the mere size of land does not matter nearly so much. It certainly does not matter nearly so much as the friendliness of the natural markets upon which their industry might have to depend.

For the Arab it offers one real advantage. The Arab territory in Palestine, if joined, as it might be, with Transjordan, would make a solid sovereign State. As such a sovereign State, it might well become part of a greater Arab federation in the future. They would have within that State, complete power to prevent any further encroachment of the Jews, and no longer would they have to feel that the only barrier which stands between them and further Jewish immigration into their own area, is a Mandatory Power which may be subject to political pressure from outside. I have often been asked by those who support the Arab case, whether the disadvantage is not this: That partition might secure two or three years of peace, but during that time the Jews would bring immigrants in large numbers into their own area and fill it to overflowing, and then immediately begin pressing for elbow room outside, and the demand for living space would be heard once more.

My answer always has been that under partition there would be a fundamental difference. Such pressure in future, would not be pressure between two communities, both subject to our authority—perfectly legitimate pressure upon the political authority—because in the new circumstances it would be pressure by one sovereign State upon another, and any encroachment would be an encroachment by one sovereign State upon the other. It would not be merely a matter for discussion in Parliament on the Colonial Office Vote, but would call into question not only the treaties under which we would naturally guarantee the frontiers, and the treaties with which any other great Power might be prepared to enter into as a guarantor, but would also call into play all the machinery of the United Nations.

It would be a definite infringement of the sovereignty of one Power by another, an infringement which quite clearly might lead to war, and one, therefore, which the United Nations organisation would expect to deal with, and where their power would inevitably have to be given to the protection of the Arab State.

We have heard to-day the Government's scheme. As I understand it, it is not that form of partition which was recommended by the Peel Commission in Chapter 20 of the Report, but that form of partition which was rejected by the Peel Commission in Chapter 21 under the name of cantonization, although it is now called federation. During my time, some work was done at the Colonial Office on a scheme of this kind as an alternative, in case the final definite scheme of partition, for some reason or other, proved unacceptable. I always regarded this scheme as a second best. It is, at any rate, some step towards cantonization, towards giving some separate life to Jew and Arab, but it is far from going the whole way.

Mr. S. Silverman: Could he tell the House whether, in the scheme which he says he thought of when he was Colonial Secretary—the partition scheme—any power was reserved to a non-Arab, non-Jewish Central Government?

Mr. Stanley: None at all. The Jewish part and the Arab part in conjunction, possibly, with another Arab country become sovereign States. There might be treaty rights between us as the administrators of the Jerusalem enclave; but they would both be sovereign States. We, as administrators of the Jerusalem enclave, would have treaty rights, but would not be responsible—

Mr. H. Morrison: I wonder why, when the Rt. Hon. Gentleman is accusing us of indecision and delay, he did not carry this through.

Mr. Stanley: The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that it was the unanimous decision that the Coalition Government expressed to this House and to both Jews and Arabs that nothing in this matter should be done until the end of the war. I see in this scheme of federation certain very obvious advantages over the scheme of full partition. It removes a great many of the technical difficulties with regard to such things as Customs, communications and strategic necessities—many of the things in which division is extremely difficult, but, under this scheme, they are still kept together, and, therefore, those difficulties are avoided. Certainly, I for one when I have had time to consider the scheme, shall hope to be convinced by it. To my mind, it certainly goes some way towards recognising the keeping of two compartments. It presents certain obvious advantages in technical matters, but it has one serious disadvantage. It cannot give any sense of finality. It does not give sovereignty to these two States. It retains for the federal Government certain authority, which I have not yet had time to study. As I gather, on the whole, immigration would be in the hands of the two provinces, but in the last resort, the central authority might have to come in. The central authority would be responsible for law and order, although the provincial governments would be responsible for immigration, which might well be, and usually is, the cause of any breach of law and order.

I am not myself convinced, and I cannot at the moment see exactly how that division of authority is to work, and whether there is not a danger that we might appear to the world to be responsible for something over which we have no control. I hope that in any further consultations with the Americans, and with the Arabs and the Jews,

it might be considered whether, if all minds are moving towards partition—all minds moving towards the abandonment of a unitary State—it might not be to advantage to take the bolder, rather than the more cautious, step; and whether, in fact, it would not be more in accordance with the facts of the problem and the desires of all those concerned to go straight to some form of partition, rather than take the intermediate step, which, as the right hon. Gentleman quite properly said, might well, in time, lead itself to the full partition.

As the right hon. Gentleman has told us, this policy still awaits the agreement of America. Until that is received, he can make no definite statement on behalf of His Majesty's Government. I think we all realise the immense importance of getting American agreement upon a policy. I do not say upon any policy, or upon a policy which we ourselves would not feel was fair and just. But I, quite frankly, say that I am prepared to accept a policy which is not exactly the one which I should consider best, if the other enabled us to go forward, step by step and hand in hand, with America. Therefore, all of us on this side of the House must express the hope that we shall be able in the future to deal with this problem in agreement with America; and, above all, we must express the hope that whatever is necessary to enable these policies to go forward, will be done soon. I recognise the difficulties of international negotiations in which, quite rightly, the agreement of another Power is desired. But time has been going on, tempers have been rising, and the situation day by day has been growing tenser; and the solutions which are possible today may tomorrow or next week become impossible.

Captain Delargy: I want to make reference to one point which is not usually raised in this House when Palestine is debated, probably because it is a subject that is rather disagreeable—the danger of a fresh outburst of anti-Semitism, not merely in Palestine among the Arabs but here and everywhere. It is a danger which does exist and is particularly acute after the recent explosion in Jerusalem. No good whatever can come from hiding the fact and pretending that the danger does not exist. However strongly and sincerely the Jewish leaders and people deplore and condemn the recent outrages in Palestine, nevertheless there still remains in the minds of many people a suspicion, and more than a suspicion, that these outrages have some connection at least with the extremist political attitude of some Jews here, and more particularly in America. Indeed, the very fact that these acts were committed by Jews makes them appear to some people even more shocking than if they had been committed by other people, simply because there does exist a latent and potential hostility to the Jews.

Mr. Clement Davies: We are meeting today at a sad and most depressing moment. Not only have we been deeply shocked by the murders, the inexcusable acts of terrorism which have been committed recently in Palestine, but there is at this moment a strained feeling between the people of this country and the great Jewish race, which is an even sadder thought. I wish all Jewish people would recall how much the British Government and the British people have endeavoured to assist them over the generations. We not only opened our shores to them, but opened every office to them. I know of no other country where a member of the Jewish race became the occupier of our most cherished position—Prime Minister. Jews have occupied the highest positions in law and on the Bench, and we are under a deep debt of gratitude to them for all they have done in art, culture and science, and for what they have contributed to the well-being of the world.

I myself probably have a closer sympathy with them, because I belong to a small and minority nation. In our younger days, in our close adherence to our Sunday schools, I expect that we people of Wales knew the history of the Jewish race better than we know our own. So, there is naturally imbedded in us a deep debt of gratitude for the great part that they have played, not only in the philosophy but also in the religion of the world. It is, therefore, a sad moment for me that there should be any breach of the good understanding there has been between the Government and peoples of this country and the Jewish race. Nothing that anyone can say can in any way mitigate the horror of, or lessen the condemnation for, the acts that have been committed recently by young, maybe old, but at any rate thoroughly irresponsible members of the Jewish race. But, at the same time, without condoning those acts, one cannot but have regard to certain events which have happened. This country was the first to suggest that there should be a possibility of a Jewish return to their ancient home of Palestine. I myself have had no doubt whatever, ever since it was issued, of the meaning that I attached to the wording of the Balfour Declaration. We all know that those words were most carefully chosen. They appeared above the name of one of the most honoured statesmen that this country has ever had, a Prime Minister in his day, and a Foreign Secretary under a coalition. It never occurred to me, at any rate, that the word "home" could be applied to lodgings. I thought that it meant a place where the occupier was in charge—

Mr. S. Silverman: And with the key of the door.

Mr. Davies: I never thought that any other construction could be put upon it except the one which I have suggested. Moreover, there is not the slightest doubt that that was the construction that was put upon it when disputes arose, and the matter was again discussed in 1922. That is the interpretation which has been put upon it by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill), who is responsible for drafting the Declaration of 1922. A new hope was given to the Jewish people, a new hope of returning to the land with which they were so closely associated by their religion. With our help and assistance they have gone back until, today, they number over 600,000. They must also remember that we took upon ourselves the responsibility of protecting them, and that we did it when the United States of America was refusing to do it. She had the opportunity, and the request was made to her before we undertook to do it. We undertook to do it not only on our own behalf but on behalf of all the United Nations which are at present in Paris to sign the Peace Treaty which is supposed to bring peace on earth.

We held the Mandate under international law, and the hope that we instilled in the Jews was a great hope. I have nothing but admiration for the way in which our people in Palestine, commissioners, civil servants, police and army, have carried out their difficult duties during the whole of the period. They have conducted themselves with tolerance, understanding and patience. But the Governments of this country, from that time on, have not been without blame. Hope deferred certainly maketh the heart sick. There was comparative quiet

until 1929, but then, unfortunately, outbreaks occurred from time to time for which both the Jews and the Arabs were responsible.

Then we came to the period 1937, 1938 and 1939, to the Peel Commission and their Report. As the Woodhead Commission promptly found out, partition, such as was suggested by the Peel Commission, was not possible. The suggestion that was put forward was one that really could not be carried out. What happened? There was the unilateral issue by the Government of this country of a White Paper which brought disappointment and disillusionment to Jews the world over. Unfortunately, I was unable to catch Mr. Speaker's eye on that occasion, but, as far as I could, I registered my protest against that White Paper in the Lobby. I shall never forget the powerful speech made at that time by the right hon. Member for Woodford. I only wish that he had had the courage to come into the same Lobby with us to register his objection.

After that period of disappointment and disillusionment came the period of the war. The Members of the present Government—who at that time had not become the Government—in June, 1945, while we were still awaiting the decision, not only condemned the White Paper but went further and gave to the words of the Balfour Declaration the definition that I myself have given—that "home" meant, eventually, control of affairs within that home, which meant a Jewish State. That was in June, 1945. The Government came into power a month later, and not a word was then said; now they say, "We are in power, and we propose to undertake the following measures with regard to Palestine."

If there is a minority feeling itself helpless at any time, losing its optimism, undoubtedly some of the hotheads will leave reason and resort to terrorism and underground movements. The hope of a minority is that the power of its own reasoning will succeed. Unfortunately, no hope came from the Government at that time. Every one of us welcomed, however, the effort they made to bring in America; we welcomed the fact that America came in, and that the Anglo-American Commission was formed, and set about its work. When that Commission reported one expected that at any rate there would be a declaration somewhat similar to that which had been made today, on the lines that the Government of this country, for their part, would do certain things; but unfortunately all that was said was that the Government would consult with America and would do nothing until they had carried out those consultations—again deferring hope about what might happen.

There was, then, a speech which, to my mind, would have been better undelivered. The words that were used by the Foreign Secretary at the Bournemouth Conference were unworthy of the occasion and of the Foreign Secretary, and would have been better not uttered. (Hon. MEMBERS: "Why?") They were insulting to the Jewish people, and it is not wise to insult anybody, still less a Jew. Never sneer at anybody. I was glad to hear the Lord President today, on behalf of the Government, dissociate the Government from a sneer that appeared in another communication. I have every sympathy with the people in Palestine who are at present responsible for the maintenance of law and order. One can well understand that they are deeply moved at the moment, but that does not justify anyone in using words which have only a sting and a sneer behind them. I am glad the Government have dissociated themselves from that.

There has been a vacillating policy for a great number of years. We are faced now with a new situation. I only wish that the Government had given us a longer opportunity of considering a document which is to settle the fate of at least 600,000 Jews present now in Palestine, and 1,000,000 Arabs, and is worthy of longer and quieter consideration than a rapid reading from the Government Front Bench. It puts each one of us under a disadvantage. What we want is peace in our time for all peoples. The Jews for 2,000 years and in every country have suffered. The Jewish problem has been a problem for everyone and for every Government throughout those 2,000 years.

No people have ever suffered as these people have suffered, no people have had one-third of their number exterminated in five years as they have. It is time all the peoples and governments of the world got together to put forward a solution which will put an end to all this misery, agony, and murder through which these people have passed during generation after generation. I do not know whether the solution which has been presented now will bring peace for the time being; I hope sincerely that it does, but at the best I should imagine that it would be only a very short term policy. The best part of it that I heard was that the doors of Palestine are to be opened again and opened immediately to those Jews in Europe who have suffered so much and desire to go. One realises that there are the two problems concerning the suffering Jewish people who still survive after all the horrors, and who are in Europe. I agree that as many of them as desire to remain in those countries where they were born and brought up should be encouraged to do so. They add to the proper wealth of the people amongst whom they are. I agree also that it might not be possible to accommodate them all under one State, but, at any rate, the hope that was given them in 1917 should not be closed down upon them in 1946. Those gates should be opened again. Whether the rest of the proposals will bring the benefits which have been suggested, I do not know; one needs further time and a further inquiry.

May I end with this comment? As I have said, this has been a problem which has worried every country over a long period. At one moment a country opens its gates, and the next thing, in another generation, we hear that it has closed those gates and that there is a pogrom there and murder and slaughter. The problem of Palestine is not a Jewish problem alone, it is not merely an Arab problem, and it certainly is not merely a British problem; it is a problem which concerns every country in the world, and I would ask this Government to bring the matter urgently before the United Nations now sitting. Let them put forward their suggestions for dealing with this, bringing in the Arab as well and saying to him, "If you will help us with regard to this, is there anything we, the rest of the world, can do to show our gratitude to you for coming in to help us to settle this long problem that has lasted for two millenniums?" It is in that spirit that I would approach this matter, not reproaching anyone any further, but looking forward to a new future and a new hope for these amazing people wherever they may be.

Mr. G. Lang: Neither in this Parliament nor in any other during the time that I have sat here have I risen with a greater sense of anxiety and responsibility than I do now, to say something in this debate. There are things which should be said and which must be

said, but nobody would desire. I think, to add in any way to the difficulties of the present situation, either here in this House with His Majesty's Government, or in Palestine itself.

When Mr. C. Davies was speaking, I felt that he made a very important point which I should like to reiterate at once, when he spoke of the distinguished positions held and the very great services rendered to the community in which we live by members of the Jewish race. I go a step further than that and say that it is those instances which make me realise how much the whole world has lost by not having, in the last centuries, the focal point of this culture in the Jewish National Home itself, to be directed once again to the world as it was thousands of years ago. These outstanding cases are indicative of the general thing, and who can say what great genius and what powerful contributions to our civilisation have been cut short in the appalling carnage to which the hon. and learned Gentleman so feelingly and so eloquently referred?

The loss in numbers is awful to think about, the suffering is indescribable, and the loss to the culture of the world is, I believe, incalculable. The time has come when we in this House must say clearly not only that justice must be done to the Jews, but that these outrages must not again be possible. There has never been before, and there will never be again, quite such an opportunity for this House to rise to all its possibilities, and make it an actuality that at long last these suffering people return to their own home.

If I may say so with great respect to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Stanley) who spoke with great care and moderation, I think the episode of General Barker's letter was passed over much too lightly. It will not do merely to talk about the intolerable conditions under which officers and men are acting. I agree about that, and greatly regret what has happened, and we all condemn with horror and emphasis the outrages that have taken place. I am certainly fully aware of the work which the British soldier has to do in all parts of the world. Even while I speak and plead for justice and the Jewish National Home, I feel inclined to say at once, "For mercy's sake, let our own country's soldiers return from their trying task in Indonesia, Greece, and God knows where." I am not satisfied that there has always been the consideration for the British soldier that there ought to be, at home as well as abroad, but it will not do merely to say that letters such as General Barker's were written under great strain. If we are to have the vicious circle of intolerable circumstances producing wicked and criminal acts, and then those wicked and criminal acts are used as a sort of excuse or reason for continuing the intolerable conditions, we shall never get anywhere at all. If a thing was right a month ago, the mere fact that some people have committed criminal acts between then and now does not make it wrong now, and a very grave responsibility must lie upon those persons who have now had for a considerable time the unanimous report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry and have not acted upon it. Are we again going to see the Report of the Commission which was set up brushed aside for another committee of experts? That is what I understand to be the position hurriedly outlined to this House this afternoon. It will not do, and I wish to register as emphatic a protest about that as I can.

May I now turn for one moment to this letter of General Barker's? It is one of the misfortunes of this Government—and I do not know whom to blame for it—that its beneficent activities and its general policy are very largely hamstrung outside this country by the maintenance of most reactionary people in key positions. How can it be expected that the Government can carry out their policy? This is a matter about which hon. Members on the other side of the House may be pleased, but, sitting on this side, I am not pleased about it, because I know that it exists. Take this letter of General Barker. I should like to know, and I hope an answer may be given to me presently, why it was sent. With great respect, I suggest that the letter is just vulgar anti-Semitism. I would like to know whether there is any connection between that attitude and the fact that the recent attack made upon Jerusalem took place upon the Jewish Sabbath day. Not a word was said about that by the right hon. Gentleman this afternoon in outlining the case, although I regard it as one of the most deplorable things that has happened in our time. I remember the horror with which I read of the entry of Mussolini's barbarians into Albania on a Good Friday. I am not a Roman Catholic, and I am not a Jew, but I thought that was quite a dreadful act. I had exactly the same feeling on that Sunday when I heard what had happened on the previous day.

I would like to know whether that had been deliberately arranged and whether the loathing and contempt which General Barker so freely expresses in his letter inspired it. He is certainly not a man with a judicial mind, if the reports of his letter are accurate, and he ought not to assume the position of judging the rights of the general mass of the Jewish population of Palestine. Anything more immoderate and injudicious than this letter I can scarcely conceive, and I earnestly hope that somebody will deal with it on behalf of the Government.

It is time that the House was given some reason for the incarceration of the people who were protesting against violent activities. I hope we shall hear from the Minister who is to reply something more about this letter of General Barker. I am not the only hon. Member who has received from men in the Army in Palestine letters of protest, or more often of plain inquiry, asking what the attitude is at home towards the Jews, because they have been told that there is now, definitely, a note of anti-Semitism in official propaganda. We had better face these facts. I should like to hear something more about them. I was thoroughly glad that my right hon. Friend dissociated the Government from this letter, but I hope we shall have something much stronger than that. I should like to know whether it was this gentleman's idea of loathing and contempt of the Jews which led him to launch the attack recently on the Sabbath Day and to order the arrest and transport of aged rabbis, as was done.

The people in Palestine were among many, at home and abroad, who were full of great new hope after the General Election. They felt that now there had come into power a Government of freedom and humanity that would not carry on the stupid tradition of saying that what was done by higher authority must be right, and that there must never be any advance. I am sorry that, in some ways, those people have been grievously disappointed, and I hope that their questions will be answered. I hope that the matter will be dealt with adequately by later speakers who know exactly what the Jewish reaction to all these things is. Once again, if my poor words can have effect, I would re-emphasise what the hon. and learned Member for Mont-

gomery has so eloquently stated. The sufferings that we have witnessed in our time, and which have been visited upon the Jewish people, are not only a crime that calls for justice but they are apt to make us hardened to these things. Our capacity for tragedy is becoming blunted. Tragedy is becoming so usual that it no longer makes us indignant and anxious to put things right.

As one who is not a member of the Jewish race but who is just—God help me!—attempting to be a practising Christian, I believe that it is the Divine Will of Almighty God that Palestine should be the National home of the Jewish people. The more I become convinced of that, the more ephemeral and evanescent the present situation seems. It will be a fatal thing if we attempt to put ourselves in the path of what I believe is a Divine Ordinance and Decree.

I know, and I regret it, that it is not now fashionable to talk of these things here. There was a time, as I have read with pleasure and longing, when matters of deep moral conviction could be voiced in this House, and when hon. Members were not afraid to quote Scripture to one another, in endeavouring to base their case upon the Scriptures.

Fashions no doubt change, but fundamental things do not. Eternal values do not. I am certain that there will be no permanent peace in this world and no real prosperity for humanity until right things are done, and one of those right things is that the Jewish people shall, once again, return with songs to their own land and be domiciled there. For so long they have had no land of their own, and no rest for the soul of their people. They have borne for many of us the brunt of the misery, cruelty and infamy of man, and, despite that, so often in their tragic history they have had from the people they helped far more kicks than halfpence. Yet they still come to their aid, as they did to ours during the last war, and as they would come to our aid again. Let nothing of the dreadful acts of violence which have taken place cause us to lose our sense of proportion. This is a great and fundamental matter. This is a crying aloud for real justice. There is an opportunity for the reassertion in this House, in this country and in the world of a great spiritual truth. I hope and pray that this Government will have the courage to take this decision, and to grant the Jewish people their rightful place.

Major Legge-Bourke: I deeply regret the fact that we have not had time to consider this in a White Paper before we debated it. We should have had the White Paper to study at great length and in detail, but we must take it as we find it. My own immediate reactions to the scheme put forward are, first of all, that it errs fundamentally in the fact that in the provinces to be set up there will be a minority of the population other than that ruling the province. That is the beginning of trouble, and whether we have partition or provinces it seems to me that if you put Jews or Arabs in command in any area in Palestine, with the opposite race in that area, it will be extremely difficult ever to achieve very much success.

Also, it is absolutely essential to any successful outcome of this settlement that immigration is divorced utterly from any land settlement. I do not believe that we can implement the report of the Anglo-American Committee at the present time. As hon. Members know, it heard a great deal of very valuable evidence, and I think it has served a very useful purpose. I will go so far as to say that I agree with a great many things in it. In fact, I disagree with only three things in it, and one is the 100,000 Jews. We cannot allow 100,000 Jews in according to the line of the Report. Furthermore, it seems to me that some hon. Gentlemen opposite, and particularly supporters of the Jews, have given the impression in the world that the recommendation of that Report was that 100,000 Jews should go into Palestine straightaway. That is an unfortunate impression because it has raised false hopes, and is far from being the truth of the matter in the Report as I understand it. I would have thought it better if the right hon. Gentleman had said today, "We will get agreement outside Palestine as to who takes the Jews. We will not send another Jew to Palestine until we have come that." If we had done that, then conceivably we might have produced a different reaction in the Arab world from what there has ever been before. The one thing which the Arab cannot understand is why he should be made to take Jews when nobody else will take them.

Mr. Crossman: Let me deal with the crisis of Palestine in three parts. I wish to deal with the immediate crisis, the Government's federal plan, and the general problem of the Middle East. The last time we debated the question on the adjournment we raised this matter because, in our view, to use my own words in that debate:

"That the course of policy adopted by His Majesty's Government will not stop, but precipitate, violence."—[*Official Report*, Monday, July 1st, 1946; Vol. 424, c. 1883.]

In that debate I used two arguments in support of that view. I suggested that as far as I knew the situation there, it was almost certain that the British would arrest everybody except the real terrorists. I suggested, further, that they would lock up the moderates whose influence would be absolutely essential to prevent acts of violence in Palestine. Thirdly, I suggested that resistance cannot be broken by pure repression. I believe that what I said on that occasion has been lamentably and tragically confirmed by events. It has been confirmed, indeed, that among the 3,000 Jews locked up without charge, the active members of the Irgun were not to be found. All the elements who could have co-operated with the authorities, who could possibly have restrained the Irgun from acts of lunacy, were put into prison camps and could have no influence against such action. Since that day, four and a half British divisions have been in action against 5,000 terrorists. It is indeed like searching for a needle in a haystack—this house-to-house search by British soldiers who do not know the language of the Jews and who are given lists of names of Jews translated into English. It is highly unlikely that more than a small percentage of the terrorists will be found by the methods which are now being adopted in Tel-Aviv.

I wish to refer to one or two of the statements of the Lord President of the Council in regard to the relationship of the Hagana and the Irgun. He stated, and I think he was quite right, that after the murder of Lord Moyne there was co-operation between the Hagana and the Agency on one side, and the British authorities on the other, to find out the people behind the plot. No less than 25 Jews in Egypt who had taken part in the plotting of the murder of Lord Moyne were handed over to the British authorities by their fellow Jews of the

Hagana. He should have added that long before the murder, indeed ever since the founding of the Irgun and its breakaway from the Hagana in 1939, the Hagana had co-operated with the British in checking on Jewish terrorism. I would like to ask whether it is not in the Colonial Secretary's knowledge that more than 1,000 men, members of the Irgun, have been handed over to the British police authorities in Palestine by the Jewish Agency and the Hagana in the course of that period. There was a prolonged and steady co-operation between the Jewish illegal army and the legal Intelligence of the British Army. Strange things have happened in Palestine, and no one should be shocked by that strange relationship. It happens in relation to the Arab side as well.

I think it was twelve months ago that the Hagana came to the police authorities in Jerusalem and told them that the Irgun had developed a new rocket weapon for shooting at the King David Hotel. The pipes from which the rockets were to be shot were placed in a field 400 to 500 yards from the King David Hotel in a position so deep in the earth that they could not be seen. It was thought that there were two bombs there. The British police, I believe, sent out mine detectors, but failed to find the bombs with mine detectors. They came back to the Hagana and asked for more accurate information. The Hagana thereon, with great risk to themselves, kidnapped a member of the Irgun and extracted from him—by means which I cannot indicate as I do not know them—the precise location of one of these things. With the British they discovered the thing and took it to pieces. I am told that the British G.O.C. admired the mechanical ingenuity of the instrument. That particular outrage was, in fact, prevented owing to the assistance given to the British by the Hagana intelligence service. I am putting these things forward for check. I do not know whether they are wholly true.

I am also told that on no less than three occasions since the discovery of the V3, as the rockets were nicknamed, the Hagana Intelligence have warned, and repeated their warning to the British security, that the King David Hotel would one day have an assault from the inside, and that better security should be employed by the police and military there. All these warnings were disregarded at a moment when all the Hagana were locked up, and the terrorists of the Irgun were given a free hand. No further security was imposed on the King David Hotel, and the kitchens and night club were left inadequately guarded. In considering the responsibility for this terrible outrage, part of it at least must rest with those concerned with security. It is time one said this. A partial responsibility rests on anyone who knows the King David Hotel and left it, in this time of crisis, in this unguarded condition.

Let me return to the Government White Paper on the subject of collaboration between the Agency, the Hagana, and the Irgun. I have described the intimate relation between the Hagana Intelligence Service and the British authorities. Indeed, one might say that the British C.I.D. regularly reckoned to set a Jew to catch a Jew, as Arabs were set to catch Arabs. In the autumn of last year came the fatal decision—I described it as fatal every time I spoke of it to the Jews—that it was futile to continue collaboration with us against the terrorists. It was a criminal thing to say, but my own view is that it was impossible at that time, and that that was literally true. The men of the Hagana were despairing of the situation in Europe, and convinced, rightly or wrongly, that the Labour Government were not carrying out their pledges. In those months, none of them was prepared to go on kidnapping further members of the Irgun. The strain and lack of confidence had reached a point where this extremely delicate and unpleasant operation, in the best of circumstances, was literally impossible. The men were not prepared to carry out an arrest. But this does not excuse the political leaders who publicly stated the futility of doing so. At that time they should not make such statements as though they positively approved of being unable to collaborate.

There was at that time an appalling problem facing the Agency. Before the House makes up its mind that the right Hon. Member for West Bristol (Mr. Stanley) is correct in saying that the case against them is proved, they should understand the problem that was being faced. As the White Paper states, there were members of the Agency who wanted to keep their hands clean, and not touch the Irgun, unless the British would back them up.

There were obviously others who said, "If you do that, they will blow up the King David Hotel and commit all sorts of appalling outrages, and our men will not be there to check them." It was an impossible dilemma with which the Agency was faced. If they broke the contact which had existed for years with the illegal organisations in Palestine, they knew that the Irgun would go ahead and do the appalling and atrocious deeds of which the men of that particular organisation are capable, men who, as my right hon. Friend has said, have had the poison of national Socialism soaked into them, which has turned them into what is indistinguishable from Fascists. That was, I believe, the battle which was fought out in Telegram 5. "Shall we keep our hands clean or shall we attempt to prevent the Irgun's operations against human life, and attempt to limit them to blowing up railway bridges and other lesser outrages which do not take such a toll of human life." That might appear to some of us to be a fine distinction, but in Palestine it is a real one. Rightly or wrongly, certain members of the Agency regarded it as their duty to try to keep in check the terrorists with whom they had contacts. I was indicating an inference from Telegram 5. I conclude from Telegram 5 that it illustrates this conflict of view; one group is saying one thing, and another is arguing a plan which would limit the loss of life. I do not intend to judge who was right or wrong. But I say that the problem which faced them was very difficult. Before they are condemned as criminals, it must be admitted that the only motive the Government have proved in the White Paper, for Agency collaboration with the Irgun and the Stern gang is to prevent loss of life and atrocious crimes. That is the only thing those people were doing. I do not defend the decision to co-operate, but I say that we have to understand it before we say that these men are pariahs and must be condemned.

There is one other point. We have now locked up all the leaders of the Left in Palestine—the trade union leaders, the co-operative leaders and the leaders of the Hagana. Simultaneously, we are demanding the co-operation of the Jewish people in the extermination of terrorism. But a people can only co-operate through its leaders. We can, if we wish, try to smash the terrorists on our own, without Jewish co-

operation, as we are attempting to do at the moment. But no one can expect people to co-operate with them when those people are being arrested in the streets and their homes are being searched house by house. If we wish to have co-operation, we must permit the Jews to have leaders whom the people trust and with whom we can co-operate. I believe that the Government have still to make up their mind whether they are determined to smash terrorism by the present method—excluding the co-operation of the Jewish people—or whether they wish to have their co-operation. In the latter case they should release from prison the men with whom they will have to co-operate, because the Jews recognise them as their legitimate and elected leaders.

Palestine is a land with a history of violence. We cannot judge it by the standards of law and order of this country. We are in consultation with the members of the Arab Higher Committee, every one of whom has crimes of violence on his conscience, extending over no fewer than the three years of Arab revolt. If I had been speaking in this House at that time, I hope that I would have given the same advice to the Government about the Arab resistance movement as I am now giving about the Jewish resistance movement. We must make up our minds whether we intend to smash resistance to smithereens without the co-operation of the Jews. If we want co-operation we cannot say that anyone whose hands have in any way been sullied by any contact with violence must not be excluded. If we said that we should exclude all the host leadership in Palestine. It is all tough and determined, and not too constitutional. On neither side, Arab or Jew, is there much leadership which is not prepared to do these things when it comes to the worst.

Very wisely, the Government have taken the view that it will be unwise to seize the Mufti of Jerusalem and put him on trial. I believe that they were quite right in that decision. I would have turned him into a martyr. But if that applies to the Mufti, who, goodness knows, has crimes on his conscience, not merely of violence but of active co-operation with Hitler, how much more does it apply to Jewish leaders who throughout the war, as it is not denied, actively stood by us, who actively aided us in this difficult job of dealing with the Irgun, and then certainly made one political mistake? Is it not the better way to let bygones be bygones, as the Lord President said, and if we are to let Arabs of the Mufti type not be tried not to act differently towards the Jews whom we have imprisoned indefinitely without trial? One thing is certain: If the four members of the Agency who controlled the Hagana are put on trial, it will be a magnificent demonstration for Jewish extremism and fanaticism. Whether they are condemned or not, it will make no difference to the effect on the Jewish mind.

But if they are not to be tried, how can we know that they are guilty? If they should not be allowed the right to defend themselves, to tell their side of the story of the C.I.D. in Palestine—and if a quarter of what their friends say is true, there is another and interesting story about the contact of British officers with the Irgun during and after the war—where is democracy and justice? I suggest that it would be unwise to put them on trial, or to detain them for an indefinite time. It would be far wiser to call upon the Jewish Agency now to co-operate in suppressing terrorism, to release these men on condition that they come out and do again the job they did for years, and reverse the lamentable mistake of a few months ago.

May I turn to General Barker? I am not so much concerned with him as with anti-Semitism. I was a little shocked at the roars of applause on the Benches opposite when the right hon. Member for West Bristol defended General Barker from the point of view that there was a great strain in Palestine, and that little errors of tact must be explained or excused. When one's troops are doing a military operation against the Jewish people, the danger of anti-Semitism is extraordinarily high. The natural instinct is to dislike the race or people one is fighting. There is an inclination rather to have it out with the Jewish community rather than to limit one's hatred to terrorism. This is a natural inclination, and it is all-important that the men at the top should give no sign of countenance, by word or praise, to support anti-Semitism. They should not officially give those under their command the feeling that it will not be ruthlessly penalised.

We are living in a strange world. I spent 120 days meeting and talking with Jews and others in Palestine, and elsewhere. I became aware of the deep unconscious anti-Semitism which there is in us, a virus, a poison which has been put into us by Hitler. I became more aware of it last Monday, when I listened to a moving Debate on Germany, in which I heard hon. Members advocating that Habeas Corpus must be given back to S.S. men; that it was impossible, as two hon. Members said, to indict a whole people. One even said that to indict an organisation was impossible. One Member said, "After all, liberty means liberty to be a Nazi." Those are sound sentiments. But I thought it a monstrous irony that a year after the war has finished hon. Members are making speeches forgiving the nation which killed six million Jews and pleading from all sides of the House that we should be fair to the Germans at a moment when they are condoning the removal of Habeas Corpus altogether in Palestine. There has not been a right to Habeas Corpus for any Jew or Arab in Palestine since the emergency regulations were introduced. They have been living under a more ruthless form of dictatorship in Palestine than the people living in the control division of Germany or Austria.

Mr. Paget: The hon. Member has referred to what I said in another Debate. I would like to make it quite clear that I have not condoned the removal of Habeas Corpus in Palestine. I disapprove of the imprisonment of Jews or Germans or anybody else.

Mr. Crossman: I am very grateful to the hon. Member. He is, I am sure, one of the logical people who does not extend to the ex-enemy better conditions than he would extend to the ex-enemy's victims in Palestine. I indicated that there was an unfortunate tendency at the moment on the other side of this House to condone General Barker for his indictment of a community, of a race, for the sins of 5,000 terrorists three weeks after the High Commissioner had stated expressly that this military operation was directed for the benefit of the Jewish community and against the terrorists only. Such, in three weeks, was the decline from no anti-Semitism to anti-Semitism. I hope the Government will do something more than merely dissociate themselves from that statement. I hope the Government will make it overwhelmingly clear that we are determined not to wipe out the Zionist Movement, not to liquidate the Jewish Agency, as is suspected by every Jew in Palestine, but that we are determined only to wipe out the terrorists for the sake of the Jewish people and that we will not condone any anti-Semitism, whether it comes from a private soldier or from

a general. Anti-Semitism is bad not only for the Jews, but for us. Why I hate this war in Palestine is because of the bad effect it is having on our own troops. I have had letters which are openly anti-Semitic in sentiment—"Why can't we wipe out the Jews?" It is a terrible thing. We should not assist the prevention of it by condoning General Barker's unfortunate letter to his officers.

I will now say one or two words on the federal solution. When we were in Jerusalem I became convinced, rightly or wrongly, that there were only two possible alternatives for Palestine—a unitary solution or partition. I discussed this at great length with my colleagues on the Committee. They agreed with me, in view of what I said, that if the time came when it was suitable I should be allowed to tell this part of the story. I agreed with my colleagues that partition was a counsel of despair, but I was despairing in Jerusalem. I was pessimistic, foreseeing what has happened. I was, therefore, one of the people who advocated partition during our private conversations. But I was finally convinced that one could not come back and report to the British and American Governments the counsel of despair which was in my mind, and that we must have one more try at a unitary solution. We must try to go back to 1938, before the White Paper, and that is what we reported the Government should do. They should rescind the White Paper and go back to the old Mandate as it really was.

I still believe that if our Report had been acted on immediately a great chance might have come off. I still believe it was rightly calculated, though I know the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol suspects me on this point. I still believe it was calculated in such a way that it was just tolerable for the Arabs, and it was sufficient to prevent the rising tide of violence among the Jews. I believe a quick acceptance in principle would have prevented all the horror in the King David Hotel and all the horror of Tel-Aviv to-day. But it is no good crying over spilled milk, or rather spilled blood.

I must say that, two months later, that unitary solution is, to my mind, out of the question. I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol. The document we wrote is dead—dead because events have gone beyond it, because relations have got so bad not only between Jews and Arabs but, much more serious, between them and us. After all, a unitary solution depends upon good relations between the British Mandatory and the other two. I noticed much talk to-day about getting Jews and Arabs to love each other. Let us never forget the people they hate most of all are our troops and police. The confidence in us must be restored. I believe it can never be restored among the Jews after the events of the last six weeks and that the unitary solution must be finally abandoned. My instinct would have been to move from it with a jump to partition. But all that the Lord President said impressed me a great deal about the difficulty of jumping, with a sudden leap, from a unitary Mandate into partition. Anyway, the sudden leap would have to take two or three years. If, therefore, I can regard this federal scheme now propounded as the transitory stage between the present unitary Mandate and two separate States, I can accept it as a practical scheme. But—and here comes the but—I notice already that the police are to be retained by the Central Government. If the police are retained by the Central Government, in the present state of Palestine, the hate of the police will continue. There are 18,000 policemen in Palestine, and the police barracks are the fortresses which dominate the country. That dominance of the country symbolises the continuance of a police State. Under federal police what hope can Jew or Arab have that this plan is genuine?

I beg the Government to realise that if this federal scheme is to work, it will work because we give to the two Provinces something that we do not want to give them. If we give them what we do not care about, they do not value it. We have to take a risk with the Jews and the Arabs to make them believe we are going towards emancipation and not going to try and keep a domination of the British for ever in Palestine. Let them try to run the police for themselves. Why should the British people go as "Black and Tans" to Palestine and do this lamentable job? Let the Jews and Arabs do their own work. We shall have our troops there anyway. Let the Jews and Arabs have their own police to work out that part of the peace for themselves.

The test of the present scheme is the confidence we instil in the Jews and Arabs that we are being honest. There is, through the Middle East, a conviction that we are staying in Palestine, not to look after Jews and Arabs, not to conduct a Mandatory obligation, but because we have cleared our troops out of Egypt, and want to put them somewhere else. Every Jew and every Arab in Palestine will say, "If there were good reasons for the British troops going out of Egypt because the Egyptians did not want them, why on earth should we have the troops when we don't want them?" Everybody will suspect in Palestine that the federal scheme is designed to play off Jew against Arab, to ensure that we are there for ever, so that we can have the barracks at Gaza and the headquarters at Ramleh. If that is the conviction we are leaving in their minds, there is no hope of peace in Palestine. Every Arab will continue his struggle for Arab independence and every Jew will hate the police who have done to him the things which have been done in the last six weeks. There will be no peace. There will be a continuation of the situation in which four-and-a-half divisions have to be used to keep down a country smaller than Wales.

How are we going to give them something which is not in the Lord President's statement? How are we going to give them a proof that we mean to get out? I suggest to the Government, and I would like an answer, that there should be a time limit. We should say that we propose to run this federal system for a certain period, five, seven, or ten years, and after that it will be their federation or their partition, but we are not staying "for keeps." If that is promised, of course, we can go in under a treaty of alliance and our troops could stay there afterwards, but, unless we can get them to realise that we are not holding Palestine simply as a military base, and that all our moralising about Jews and Arabs is not merely the excuse for a military base, there will be no military base, because it is an untenable military base as long as both Jews and Arabs detest us. Imagine if war comes to-morrow and we have to call on the Hagana again to help us, as we did during the last war. How can Palestine be a military base when both Jews and Arabs detest the autocracy of British military rule?

Brigadier Low: Will the hon. Member make it quite clear whether he wants a military base or not?

Mr. Crossman: That is a perfectly fair question, and the answer is that I am not a strategist. If the Government want a military base, they should say openly to Jews and Arabs, when it comes to the question of independence, that we should like to negotiate a treaty and would like to have this concession in the treaty. The argument used by the Government about Egypt must also apply to Palestine.

That brings me to my last point. I believe that the same thing applies to the whole of the Middle East. Palestine is only part of the problem. We should be prepared to say to the world that, within a given number of years, we are going to give up our unilateral military responsibility for holding this vital line of communications, and put the matter before UNO. There a scheme should be worked out in which we would participate, for a joint sharing of that responsibility, not only with America and the adjacent Arab States, but also with Russia. If that happened, I believe it would be an essential step to the peace of the Middle East, and it is to that final end that we should go forward.

Mr. Manningham-Buller: I make no claim to speak on this subject as an expert. Many of us in this House have studied this problem for many years, and some hon. Members have a long acquaintanceship with conditions in that country. I have not been there for very long, nor have I studied the problem for very long, and I do not commit anyone by what I say, nor do I speak for any of my colleagues on the Committee, but I do maintain that a report written, as it was, in a very considerable hurry, after hearing masses of evidence in many parts of the world, and without the literary merits of the Peel Report whose authors were fortunate in having much more time at their disposal, none the less did point the way to the restoration of peace in Palestine. We signed that Report on 20th April, and the fact that we all signed it should not be lightly disregarded. As to whether events subsequent to that date have made all our recommendations capable of fulfilment or not, and, in particular, the recommendation as to the 100,000, I shall have something to say later on, but it is right to say that we carefully examined each proposal that was put before us—partition, federation, cantonisation, and the rest. The hon. Gentleman was not quite accurate when he said that our objection to the partition solution was because we felt that we could not come forward with the same recommendation as the Peel Report, which had been turned down. The hon. Gentleman implied that—

Mr. Crossman: I never said that was why it was rejected, but that it was a counsel of despair.

Mr. Manningham-Buller: I think the hon. Gentleman went a little further than that in indicating the reasons for our rejection. Looking back on it now, I regret that we did not set out more fully in that Report the good and sufficient reasons, as I think, for rejecting these solutions. I do not want to delve deeply into past history, but, if a solution is to be found, I think two things must be constantly remembered. The first is that, ever since the Balfour Declaration came out, there has been a steady and somewhat rapid growth of Jewish nationalist feeling. Since 1942, we have had the creation of a Jewish State adopted as part of the official Zionist programme, and Nazi oppression has increased the belief that only in a land ruled by Jews can they live without fear, in freedom and security. Now, such is the intensity of nationalist feeling and the effect of propaganda, that most of the Jews in Palestine, and, I think, most in America, and, certainly, a considerable number here, appear to hold the firm belief, that, if Palestine does not become a Jewish State, Great Britain will be guilty of a breach of faith, though a Jewish State has never, in fact, been promised. That, on the one side, is one factor of the situation which must always be remembered.

The other is that, from Easter Day of 1920 until the outbreak of the war, the history of Palestine has largely been that of outbreaks of Arab violence, due, from the first, to fear of political and economic subjection to the Jews. The Arabs want to go on living in that thickly populated land which their own forefathers have occupied and cultivated for hundreds of years, and theirs is the feeling which every Welshman, Scotsman, Englishman and American would have if he was told that hundreds of thousands of another nationality were going to settle in what he regarded as his own country and convert it into an alien State.

That was the problem which we on the Committee had to face, and it is the problem which this House has to face. How are these deeply held and conflicting views to be reconciled—the Jewish view that Palestine is Eretz Israel, their acknowledged and, according to them, their promised land; the Arabs regarding it as the land of their forefathers, of which they cannot, rightfully, be dispossessed, I believe that, if we consider these two angles, we arrive at the position by which any solution of the Palestine problem must be judged. There are really two tests. The first is—to what extent will the proposed solution bring about a reconciliation, and make it possible for Jew and Arab to live together, or side by side, in friendship, and so bring peace to Palestine. The other test is, is the solution a final one, or is it going to leave the door open for further pressure to be put upon the mandatory or trustee for further violence, in the hope of gaining some advantage? That, perhaps, is as important a test as the first I mentioned, and any solution that is put forward should be judged by those two tests.

The possible solutions are, of course, either to give way to the Jews or to the Arabs, or to find a compromise. For good reasons, into which I do not think I need now enter at length, we rejected both the Jewish and the Arab cases. But if it was right and just to accede to the Jewish claim for domination over Palestine, and if that would bring peace, we should not be deterred from the adoption of that course by the mere fact that, by so doing, we might appear to be giving way to Jewish violence. That wanton violence, the complicity of certain members of the Jewish Agency, as was clearly established and long suspected, in the commission of outrages which have involved the loss of British lives, solely to meet Jewish demands, and the carefully stimulated bitter anti-British propaganda in the United States to the same end, should make us think long and carefully, but should not prevent us from meeting their claims, if it is right to do so.

But it was my view, and, I think, the view of all who signed the Report, that that was not the right solution. Such are the respective birth rates that, in spite of what has been done in the way of facilitating immigration, there is always likely to be in Palestine a Jewish minority, unless the Arabs are driven out. I cannot contemplate the domination by a minority of the majority, of the Jews in that country

becoming a sort of *Herrenvolk*. I think that they might have been wiser in their treatment of the Arabs in the years gone by and, had they been, one might have had more confidence in their government in the future. It is impossible, on moral or legal grounds, to justify making the Arabs in Palestine, whose ancestors have lived there for so long, the subjects of the Jews. But it is equally impossible to turn the clock back to before 1917 and subject 600,000 Jews to Arab domination. Any such conclusion would immediately lead to an uprising of the entire Jewish community. Therefore, one is driven back to one of the three compromise solutions—partition, federation or cantonisation. At first sight, partition is the most attractive. It was recommended by the Peel Report, it has not been tried, and it has all the attraction of a new medicine when others have failed to cure the patient.

The argument used in support of it is that, if people are quarrelling in one room, they should be put into different rooms. That may, of course, be the solution provided it can be ensured that they remain in different rooms. But I believe that, to be effective, partition can only come about by agreement between Jews and Arabs. It is not a solution which can be imposed from above unless we are prepared to maintain the division of the land by force. If partition is adopted, Jewish control over immigration into the Jewish State would apparently be given, and many of the arguments against the creation of a Jewish State would apply to the State created by partition. I believe that the Arab reaction to it would be far worse than it was to the recommendation of the admission of 100,000 immigrants, for, after all, the Arabs would say that, by partition, the Jews were getting unlimited immigration and a portion of the land. I quite appreciate, so far as the Jews are concerned, that partition might secure peace for a few years, but I think it likely that it might lead to a more acute and more difficult problem hereafter, a cry for *lebensraum* and, possibly, stronger armed forces to deal with it. It would clearly lead to artificially unmanageable frontiers, and to some Arabs being ruled by Jews, and some Jews by Arabs.

One has got to face up to this issue. Either the time has come when we must say that Jew and Arab can no longer live together, or we must say that there is still hope of their getting on, together if the obstacles to their doing so can be removed. If we come to the conclusion that all hope of their living together has gone and that they must be kept separated, I say that, in spite of my criticisms of partition, it is a better solution than the one which the Government have put forward today. I myself am against partition, and all the members of that Committee signed the Report because we were against it and because we then believed that it was not impossible for Jews and Arabs to go on working together in the future.

If we divide this country on the basis that Jews and Arabs cannot live together, it seems to me that we are not likely to secure a reduction of their present nationalistic feeling. I believe that that solution would be welcomed by some Jews as a step towards their ultimate objective of making Palestine a Jewish State, particularly if it included more land than they now own. But if that basic premise, that they cannot live together and must be separated, is accepted, we are really sounding the death knell of the Jewish national home. If Palestine is to support the natural growth of Jew and Arab populations, it must have greatly increased industrialisation and intensified agriculture, and it is necessary, whether Palestine is unitary, bipartite or tripartite, for its economic survival, that it should be an integral whole economically and an integrated part of the Middle East. Are we going to secure that by dividing Jew from Arab in Palestine? Are we going to make it easier for the two nations to merge and become friends by forming divisions between them, which either side may not willingly accept?

Judging by the two tests which I have put forward, reconciliation and finality, I believe that partition is better than federation. But partition does not hold out very great promise of finality, and, in that connection, may I quote from a document which was handed to us in Palestine by the Jewish resistance movement and which is signed by the head of Command of that movement? It contained the following passage, which makes me doubtful whether these proposals for partition or federation will lead to the absence of violence:

"We shall not accept a symbolic independence in a dwarf-like token state which will not give us the chance of developing all the resources of the country and creating here a safe asylum for all Jews who are compelled or wish to come."

If I may turn to the proposals put forward by the Government today, I would like to start my comments by saying that I hope they will lead to more peace in that country. I have only had the chance of hearing what the Lord President has said.

It appears to me to be a variant of partition, to have most of the disadvantages of partition and some additional ones. I think that if the suggestion that the Jewish Province should control the police within that province were adopted the British would be held responsible for all that went wrong without having any opportunity of maintaining law and order in the country. Again, federation would mean unmanageable boundaries, the allocation of land by race, and I am sorry that the Lord President was not a little more definite in his explanation when he said that the Jewish Province would include Jewish land, an area between and around the Settlements. That may cover a great deal or very little, and we ought to know, because when we are considering either partition or federation, the first thing we want to know is what area is to be taken into which province, the populations and the resources of the various provinces. We had put before us early this year detailed proposals which bear a remarkable resemblance to the plan which the Government have now adopted. I think I can almost say that they were probably entirely the same. We considered them and the Committee rejected them.

I will say a few words about the scheme which is before us, because the details are very important. The scheme before us would have covered, I think, in the Jewish Province 301,000 Arabs and 451,000 Jews. It would have taken into the Jewish Province 68 per cent. of the Arab citrus plantations, and 70 per cent. of the plain lands which might be irrigated if water can be taken there. The Jewish Province would have had 63 per cent. of the revenue, 12 per cent. being left for the Arab Province and little for the Central Government. I doubt whether that can work. But if we accept the assumption that Jew and Arab cannot get on together, I would have preferred the Government to have gone straight for partition. Our solution was to put forward an incentive to collaboration and not to conflict, and to make Jew and

Arab realise that this intense and excessive nationalism is really harmful. I am sorry that our recommendation No. 3 did not receive an emphatic endorsement on both sides of the Atlantic at the time of the publication of our Report, and that so much emphasis should have been put upon the Recommendation with regard to the 100,000. I think the recommendation that there should be no Jewish or Arab domination was, perhaps, far more important for peace in Palestine. It would remove Arab fears and lessen the tension. I agree that it might involve a long trusteeship or continuance of the Mandate, but I do not see any alternative to that, and I do not think the Government's proposals will lead to a short cut solution. Indeed, I think what appears most difficult and most onerous will be a short cut in the end. If we can once remove from the Arab the fear of domination by the Jew, and remove from the Jew the aspiration of domination over all the Arabs, I think we will have gone a long way towards enabling those two peoples to live together. I think the Arabs would then be able to take an entirely different view of the question of immigration, and they would not then regard each Jew as a recruit for an illegal army.

In that connection, I would like to say a few words about our recommendation No. 6, which, of course, will go by the board, as I understand it, in view of the Government statement today. We recommended there that the governing consideration with regard to all immigration should be the wellbeing of all in Palestine, and we did not recommend in our comment, which has to be read with the recommendation, that in the new trusteeship agreement there should be any obligation to facilitate Jewish immigration. Indeed, if one takes our comment there with our comment on recommendation No. 7, where we point out that the country is thickly populated and unless there is a marked change in the method of cultivation it will not carry much of an increase in population, one may well wonder whether, after the implementation of our recommendation of 100,000, there would be room for many more inhabitants in that land. Whether there would or would not must depend to some extent on the practicability of the irrigation schemes, on which we were unable to express an opinion. We may be asked why we recommended 100,000 immigrants to go from Europe into Palestine.

That recommendation was largely due to what we saw of the conditions in Europe, the great desirability for emptying the Jewish displaced persons' camps and for giving them some hope, and to the Jewish Agency's promise to look after them. The immigration was to take place as rapidly as conditions would permit. I am sorry to say that I think recent actions by the Jews in Palestine have made it more difficult, and may have delayed, if not prevented, the immigration of that number within the time which otherwise might have been possible. I do not think that one can move victims of war in Europe into another arena where fighting and violence is as frequent as it is at present.

That recommendation of ours was linked with recommendation No. 1, and I am sorry, too, that no action on that recommendation has been taken from April 20 until now. We know that the United States were admitting 30,000 of all nationalities this year, and now we are told by the Lord President that the United States are resuming normal immigration and expect to receive 53,000 in each year from European countries. One does not know how many Jews will be included in that number, but we reported that there were 500,000 Jews who wanted to leave Europe, and that Palestine could not take them all. I wish the United States, who recognise the situation in Europe, would set an example—and it would be a very helpful example—by making a great and generous gesture in offering to admit to within her shores some of these victims of Nazi persecution. I remember being told in the course of the deliberations of this Committee that there was scarcely a Polish Jew surviving who had not got a relation in America. I feel certain that many of them would like to go to the United States if only the facilities were available, and I feel strongly that, if that attitude could be adopted in the United States, it would lead to a different attitude on the part of the Arabs to the admission of a large number of Jews into Palestine.

Finally, I want to say a few words with regard to the land transfer regulations and the Jewish Agency. In our report we did not recommend the removal of protection to the Arab land cultivator. We recommended that he should have protection wherever he should be in Palestine. I appreciate the difficulties of the Lord President, but I should have liked to know what were the powerful safeguards the Arabs would possess in the Jewish Province, and that the Jews would possess in the Arab Province, in view of the local legislative powers which would be conferred upon the Governments of those provinces. Nothing has been said—perhaps it cannot be said yet—as to the future of the Jewish Agency. I hope that that Agency will co-operate more in future than it has in the past. I hope, too, that it will become more representative of the Jews in Palestine, and, in particular, that it will include among its members representatives of the Agudas Israel, the orthodox religious Jews. Any solution which will bring peace to the Holy Land and, at the same time, lighten the intolerable burden on British shoulders and on the British Army will, I am sure, be welcomed by both sides of this House.

Lieut.-Colonel Harry Morris: I feel that no words of mine would adequately convey the horror I felt last week when I heard of the blowing up of the King David Hotel. I can do no more than say I regard it, as do most Jews in the world outside Palestine, as an act, not only of incredible wickedness but of incredible stupidity. The Government say now, as they said during the last Debate, what they were engaged in doing, and what they were entitled to do to preserve law and order. No one challenges the right of the Government as the Mandatory Power, but I hope it will be remembered that the Government are only the Mandatory Power in Palestine; Palestine is not a British colony; the Jews are not natives, and the Arabs are not natives who are being, or are likely to be, treated as are backward peoples in a British colony. The British Government have the right to maintain law and order, but there must be in the minds of those who speak for the British Government just what the Government mean by "law" and by "order." If it is the law of the tank and the tommygun, if it is the law of repression, the British Government must not be surprised that the order they are seeking to maintain is an unreal order, the sort of order that on some occasion may break out into the bitterest disorder.

For the Government to talk about terrorism and no more is to show a fundamental disregard of the basis of the whole policy. This Government have a part in connection with this matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council, who has spoken

about it, also has a past in connection with it, of which I will remind him in a moment. When talking about terrorism, it seems to me the Government might consider this: Why is it that those who have in the past been commended for their exemplary patience and forbearance suddenly embark on a career of terrorism? Why is it they begin to do things which apparently they did not do before? Why is it they manifest a spirit which they have not hitherto manifested? The Government cannot entirely rid themselves of some responsibility in this matter. It is true that when this Government came into power the Jews, in Palestine certainly, and Jews throughout the world, were entitled to assume that at last there had come into being a Government pledged, and fully pledged, to support the idea of the Jewish national home. When I say "pledged," that is exactly what I mean. It is idle for the Foreign Secretary to pretend that resolutions which had been passed in succeeding conferences—apart from observations made in announcements from the Government Front Bench in this House—were irresponsible outbursts in the enthusiasm of a Labour Party conference. They were serious and considered resolutions, which had been contained in a set declaration of policy.

I am reminding hon. Members opposite what the policy was. I understand that a very large part of the responsibility for the production of this particular handbook belongs to the Lord President of the Council, who opened this Debate.

Is it really surprising that when the Labour Party came into power last year the Jews of the world hailed their coming with delight? They relied on the Party pledge to support the idea of the Jewish national home. Other hon. Members have spoken of the intentions in regard to Palestine, and I have heard Jewish leaders against whom there is no charge of any sort of complicity in the recent outrage, and British leaders as well, who have said that the tension in Palestine was growing to incredible heights, and there was bound to be an eventual outburst. Is that surprising, when during these 12 months, nothing has happened—and when I say nothing, I mean nothing. In November of last year the Foreign Secretary announced to a very surprised House that he intended to set up a new Commission, and he was asked by me in February what he expected to get from it that he had not got from previous Commissions; he was also asked what he would do about it when he got the report of that Commission, whether he would implement its decisions or would there be delay, further temporising, and would the tension grow still further?

No one excuses or seeks to condone terrorism, but it seems to me that if we do not examine the background of terrorism we are manifesting a fundamental disregard of the whole question. Why all the delay about the present solution, which the Government have kept to themselves while the tension has been getting worse? The Lord President of the Council comes along like a conjuror producing a rabbit out of a hat—a rabbit which has, apparently, already escaped and created a certain amount of mischief.

One more word about that particular policy. It has been said that it has all the disadvantages of partition with none of the advantages. It is a policy which, though they themselves have rejected it in the past, this Government now bring here as a solution and fulfilment of all the pledges and promises they made. This policy, so far as we have been able to judge from the Press, and it is very difficult indeed to form any tangible views on the policy as expressed by the Lord President this afternoon, envisages something like this: 15 per cent. of the land of Palestine goes to the Jews; 40 per cent. or so to the Arabs, and the British Government have the remainder. Why do the British Government have the remainder? Perhaps the answer is this. During the last Debate we had on Palestine in which I had the opportunity of taking part I suggested to the Government that it would appear—I put it no higher than that—that they were playing the game of power politics in the Middle East while paying lip service to the ideals of C.E.O. If that is not true, perhaps the Government will tell us what this means: "Treaty of Alliance between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom and His Highness the Emir of Transjordan." It is a Treaty of military alliance between the British Government and the Emir of Transjordan, purely and simply a military alliance and nothing more. We wondered, as we were entitled to wonder, what it was in the political institutions of Transjordan which has so compelled the admiration of His Majesty's Government as to warrant the granting of such an alliance.

Mr. Raites: The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Central Sheffield (Lieut-Colonel Morris) has painted the picture more vividly than I could. False hopes were, undoubtedly, raised in the minds of many Jews by the Labour Party before that Party became the Government. It so often happens in this world, particularly in this country, I think, that men find, when they come to Government, and have responsibility, many things far more difficult to do than they appeared to be before. Nevertheless, hopes falsely aroused always have evil effects as time goes on. Beyond saying that, I do not propose to comment on the past. I want to look, as certain other hon. Members have, a little to the future.

I am certain of one thing beyond all else. So long as we assume that Palestine is simply and solely a solution to the problem of European Jewry, we are in for disappointment. We have these vast numbers of Jews in Europe today, many of whom have got to be found new homes. It is a little ironic that, after we have fought the greatest war in history for freedom and, presumably, amongst other things, to bring freedom to the Jews as well as to others, that there are still such vast numbers of Jews who, probably rightly, are longing to get away from Europe. Be that as it may, there are still several hundred thousand who cannot get away. They must have an outlet, and unless and until the United States of America, Great Britain and the British Empire, and the great civilised nations of the world are prepared to take their quotas of these men and women we shall never get a change of heart in the Arab world.

One of my main criticisms of the Anglo-American Committee's Report, on which I want to say a word or two, is that in it there are fine phrases about the Holy Land and the brotherhood of man. They are dotted about all through the Report. They express admirable sentiments, but, nevertheless, are not the sort of thing to appeal to those who are expected to take 100,000 extra Jews into a small country about half the size of Wales, while, behind these high moral platitudes, the Christian nations of the world are not really making even a gesture.

I take the view that, the Jewish problem being as it is, whatever amount of immigration of Jews there may have to be, the Empire and America should be prepared to take a quota, and a substantial quota, of these Jews. If we do that we can then turn to the Palestine problem with an easier conscience, because then, in time, we may succeed in arousing a feeling amongst the Arabs that does not exist today—the feeling that we are really prepared to play our part in shouldering the burden, and are not trying to force it on to those in other parts of the world who are weak.

Mr. Gallacher: This question has two facets. There is the simple direct solution—and there is no other. One can play about with cantonisation, federalisation and partition, but there is one solution only, and that is independence for Palestine. When I make that suggestion, I am told that if we give independence to Palestine, take away the British troops and, instead of letting them be killed there, bring them home—and why should they not be brought home to their mothers and families—that the Arabs and Jews will slaughter one another. But I am also told that if the troops are brought away from India the Muslims and Hindus will slaughter one another. The same in Ireland, if the partition is removed Catholics and Protestants will tear one another to pieces. Is it not a very significant and a very sinister thing that where British Imperialist influence is predominant, these murderous impulses exist? I say take away this unsavoury influence, and ordinary people will find ways and means of living together in harmony and co-operation. That is the solution.

The next question, and one which has to be dealt with, is that of anti-Semitism. It can only be dealt with when one understands and gets at the cause of anti-Semitism. I have heard many fine sentiments expressed in connection with it. This question of the solution of anti-Semitism is related to the question of independence for Palestine. There is a serious wave of anti-Semitism which is being encouraged by the higher-up in Palestine. The views expressed by General Barker are a disgrace, and this man should be immediately withdrawn and vigorously prosecuted by the War Office. We are told they are under a heavy strain. Of course the soldiers and officers there are under a heavy strain. But it does not matter how heavy the strain is if such sentiments are not inside they will not come out.

In principle, I have always been against terrorist acts. Many of these young men and women, a few years ago, had no thought that they would be in the position in which they are in today. They are Zionists. They believed in Palestine for the Zionists and in a Jewish State in Palestine. It was an illusion; it was a goal impossible of realisation.

Mr. Janner: Was not the Mandate actually given by 52 nations? Was it not confirmed by America? And was not that the Zionist principle as Lord Balfour declared it?

Mr. Gallacher: I do not care if there were a hundred thousand mandates. It is an illusion that Palestine could be in the sense that the Zionists put it forward, a Jewish State. At Zionist meetings, I have tried to persuade them that they were seeking after something impossible. They could tell me that they had the support of much more important and much more influential political leaders than I. It seemed to them that the goal was practically realised. So the call went forward. Another short march and they would be there. They made a short march and came up against a brick wall. In the Mandate, Palestine has two banks. On one side is Transjordan. It is a part of Palestine recognised as such in the Mandate although different treatment had to be given to it compared with the other part of Palestine. Transjordan has always been recognised as a part of Palestine; about that there is no question. What happened? A new regime under Emir Abdullah came into being in Transjordan. Is there any democracy under the Emir Abdullah in that country? Is there any Parliament, a democratic council or a democratic organisation of any kind? There is nothing.

Mr. Quinton Hoag: On a point of Order. I understand that the Ruler to whom the hon. Member is referring is a reigning sovereign, King Abdullah of Transjordan, and any reference which is derogatory to a ruling Sovereign who is a friendly Ally, is not in Order in this House.

Mr. Gallacher: I am sorry, but I do not think I made any reflection. All I said was that there was no Parliament, no democratic council, no democratic organisation of any kind. We have made a treaty with the Emir of Transjordan, which gives to this exalted personage a great tract of territory, and this exalted personage is agreeable that the British troops should remain there. No doubt he will need them. This happens when these Zionist young men and women are looking forward eagerly to the realisation of their hopes in regard to Palestine as a home for the Jews. Can we not appreciate the terrible blow that this is to their hopes? The goal was near and then this happened. A desperate and futile solution occurs to them. On the road to the goal which is so near there is erected a road block, and in a last desperate effort they believe they can blast that road block out of the way. We can understand their reason, though we cannot sympathise with their methods.

Mr. William Teeing: After hearing the very simple solution of the hon. Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher), that we should clear out of Palestine, I began to wonder whether there was any need for this Debate at all. I am quite certain that the Government feel that they have a far more difficult problem to deal with than that. I would like to add my protest about the way in which the solutions proposed by the Government have been put before us to-day, the way, in fact, in which the whole of this Palestine problem has been dealt with by the Government since the Foreign Secretary's statement last November. At that time we were asked not to speak about this matter, not to ask any questions for fear that we would arouse feeling in Palestine. Then came the Debate in February, and at that time it was also considered by many to be unwise that we should say what we thought because it might in some way affect delicate negotiations. The next Debate was forced on us by the arrests of members of the Jewish Agency.

To-night we find ourselves in a position of great difficulty in trying to bring forward concrete suggestions after having had only a very brief notice of the plans which the Lord President of the Council announced and which, no doubt, he knew about a long time ago, certainly several days ago. The nearest thing we have had to anything of detail has come from my hon. and learned Friend the Member

for Daventry (Mr. Manningham-Buller), who pointed out how similar were the Government's proposals to those which were put forward by an official to the Anglo-American Commission. All that was told us there is that the Jews will have control of certain parts of the country in which there are a large number of Arabs. I remember, after the last war, the refusal of the Danes to take any parts of Germany from the Germans, because they did not want to have a huge and unwilling minority in their area. Will the Jews be blamed if they do not like this new proposal? They are not even in the position of the Danes, living in their own country. They are—and many seem to forget it—from many parts of the world. They are not Jews from one nation, who have been all along in Palestine. They have come from many places. We have been treating them recently as if they were a Colony. When people talk about atrocities and fighting and resistance among them they are inclined to think of them as being British people who are doing these dreadful things, whereas vast numbers have never been to Britain in their lives, and know nothing of Great Britain, except the officials they see in Jerusalem and the troops we send to that country. People are apt to forget that.

The Jews are to be asked to take in Arabs without themselves being a proper nation as yet. I am certain it will not be possible, or feasible. Nor do I think that the Arabs will accept this suggestion. They are to be given a lot of money, I understand, and I would like the Minister who is to reply to the Debate to give us some idea as to whether the Arab States around Palestine are not themselves quite well off at the present time. The Jews, presumably, are not to be given money, because they can get it from Jewish relations and friends in Great Britain and America. The Arabs, it is suggested, are always poor. But are they so poor? I think they have done better, since the 1914 war, than people in many other countries, and certainly as well as the Jews in what has been given to them in Palestine. Furthermore, what have they done for us in return? Certainly less than the Jews. Be that as it may, I am certain that the solutions which have been presented to us to-day will not be acceptable to either side, and that we shall be faced with as difficult a position in a few months, or weeks, as we have been in the more recent past.

The Labour Party have promised, and made every Jew in Palestine believe, that when they get into power they would give everything to the Jews, but since coming into power they have procrastinated, and by their procrastination have made people very desperate.

I believe that the more one studies the Jewish Agency, and what it has done and tried to do in the past, the more one will come to the conclusion that the main reason it is now fast losing its hold is that the British Government have for too long promised something and not given it. To my mind, the Jewish Agency soon will have completely lost control, and everything will be in the hands of the terrorists; there will be the same situation as with the I.R.A. in Ireland after the 1914-18 war.

All this we have to think of in regard to Palestine. As has been mentioned already, there is always the possibility that, in the years to come, we shall need Palestine from the strategic point of view. The final thing to be remembered about the Irish situation is that, in the end, the solution of having partition was brought about really because of our need for friendship with the United States and because of the pressure that was brought to bear by the United States. To-day, there seems to be a somewhat similar situation. In the end we shall find ourselves in a much more difficult position because we have not had the courage to come to a decision and get on with the job before so many people were killed. Anti-Semitism is undoubtedly growing very fast in this country, and it ought to be stopped. I refuse to believe that all these atrocities, horrible and disturbing though they are, and though our troops are suffering them, are the responsibility of all Jewry in Palestine. I maintain that if the Jews had been properly backed by the British Government, and if the British Government's promises had been carried out, there would have been none of this whatever. Therefore, I am inclined to think that the Labour Government have a great deal of responsibility, and will have more responsibility, if they do not take care, for the troubles in that country at the present time.

There has been very little reference to the Christians in Palestine. Why should not the Christians be in control of the country? We went there and fought in the Crusades in the old days in order to take that country from the Arabs and keep it for Christianity. We have now got it. Many of us were proud when Allenby marched in early after the last war; to-day everybody is talking about giving the country to the Arabs and the Jews. I maintain that it is our Christian duty to keep that country, to look after it, and to make it possible for Jews to go there. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Bristol (Mr. Stanley) said that 30 years is long enough after the Balfour declaration to show that the Balfour dream will not work. How can 30 years be enough. For 1,000 years the Arabs have been there. For 2,000 years the Jews have been wandering. How can it be possible for them to settle down, to get to know each other and to agree in 30 years?

Mr. Thomas Reid: I did not intend to depart an inch from the statement made by the Lord President with regard to the solution before the House as "a basis of this discussion," but I could not let pass some of the statements made by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. G. Davies). After all he is the leader of the Liberals in this House and therefore holds a responsible position, and I am sorry to say that he has made statements which are not historically correct. He began by referring to the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and saying practically that it meant nothing if it did not mean a Jewish State. I have studied this thing very minutely, and it is a fact that before the Balfour Declaration was issued the political Zionists placed before the British Government various drafts in which they explicitly demanded a Jewish State or Commonwealth. Apart from the illegality and immorality of the thing, in my opinion the worst thing we can do to the Jews of the world is to set up a Jewish State in Palestine. It is the bone of contention in Palestine and the main cause of the trouble, and until the request of the political Zionists for a Jewish State is abandoned there will be no peace in Palestine. As a friend of the Jews I appeal to all Jews in this House, some of whom are prominent in Jewish public life and take part in Zionist meetings, to throw in their lot with the Arabs in Palestine and evolve a Palestinian State, in which they would have an immense power for good.

I appeal to the Arabs, who are far away, to try to settle this problem at long last. There are representatives of the Jews—strong Zionists—

in this House. I appeal to them—I am a friend of theirs—to try in their own interest to settle this problem by abandoning once and for all the demand for a Jewish State. I appeal to the hon. Member for West Leicester (Mr. Jenner). He and I have often discussed it. We do not always agree, but I have a profound respect for his sincerity.

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay: The only reason I dare speak on this subject, for I have no special knowledge, is that I have recently been in Palestine; though I have long taken a theoretical interest in it, and as a Junior Minister sitting on the Front Bench, I did something which is regarded as a serious thing—I abstained from voting on the 1939 White Paper. I did it because I had been to Europe and because I felt so horrified at the condition of the Jews and could see no finality to the Government policy. In February I was in Jerusalem and had the experience of living there for nearly two months during a period when the terrorism was partly in process and partly withdrawn during the stay of the Committee. I say that my only reason for speaking is to try to convey in a few sentences a little of the atmosphere I found there. Unless the Colonial Secretary or some other Minister can make a defence of the Government, which I am prepared to believe they have got, the story of this last year demands some criticism.

The condition in Palestine in January was quite impossible. It was suspended civil war. It is not only the Irgun or these terrorist organisations. It is almost every boy and girl. We are dealing with the whole population. I will recount two stories. A Jewish lady who had been to an American university herself wanted her daughter to go to the same college. In my presence her daughter said, "Mother, you may go to America, but I am not going. I am staying here. I am dying for my country." I have another story of a girl in one of the best settlements I visited, Ben Shimon. The Jew Dr. Lehmann, who ran that school, said: "That is my daughter passing by. You might think she was going to some college, but she is going to the rockiest place in Palestine to start a new settlement, and nothing I can do will stop her."

Transjordan has been given what is called independence, and I heard comments about that. People asked what it meant and made disparaging remarks about 300,000 Bedouins being looked after. They asked whether they could have some sort of consideration. Whatever the Committee reported, I believe it would have made little difference. I talked to Arab and Jewish leaders day after day. I visited about 15 settlements and many industries. During that time the Committee was partly in the country, and it was my experience that as the Committee receded there was a joke in Palestine, "Mercy for the Jews; Justice for the Arabs; Palestine for the British."

If the future of Palestine is to be settled by the votes of millions of American citizens, and if the future of Palestine is to be affected so largely by outside influences, both Arab and British, I do not think there is any future at all. Until the last few days, I was wholly against any form of partitioning. I do not believe we have ever tried to make the Mandate work. We have two entirely separate worlds in education, and a fiery nationalism which was condemned by the Peel Report, was condemned by the Anglo-American Report, and is now condemned by the McNair Report, which has come out within the last 24 hours. There is no common purpose. What is the good of talking about Canada or even of South Africa? There are two entirely different systems of education, two entirely different languages. No Arabic is taught in the Jewish schools and no Hebrew in the Arab schools. Do not let us fool ourselves.

Mr. S. Silverman: There are not many Arab schools at all.

Mr. Lindsay: There are about 400 Arab schools, and to our eternal discredit the Arabs themselves are paying for many of them. This is not a normal country, it is a police State. I thought they were Colleges at first, but wherever one goes he sees these vast Police Posts. It is an impossible situation, and I say to my right hon. and learned Friend the President of the Board of Trade that, if it was necessary for three Ministers to go to India, it is probably necessary for somebody to go to the Middle East before the situation gets hopeless. Hon. Members may think that is a rather foolish suggestion, but I would like to go further and lose the identity of party on this question. It would not be at all bad if somebody like the right hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington (Mr. Eden) went with members of the Government. I know hon. Members may say, "Precious little security for them if they did," or "What a hopeless thing to do at this late hour."

I have a letter from a friend of mine in Tel Aviv, and he writes trying to put a good face on it—this is only three weeks ago:

"The sea-shore is thick with happy families bathing: Normal life may yet kill both the Army and the Hagana."

This is a British official writing. There are thousands of people in Palestine who can co-operate, Jews and Arabs. They co-operated to do a whole series of things in the war, because there was a common purpose. But now there is nothing left to co-operate about. I do not believe we ever tried to give responsibility. Time and again, as Dr. Magnes says, we made a half-hearted attempt. I think partition is a mistake, and we are only pushing the problem a little further aside. I speak with feeling on this, because anyone who has had the privilege and chance of going through that beautiful country, with its great scientific agriculture, its research work at Rehovoth, knows that trachoma is not the disease, tuberculosis is not the disease, cholera is not the disease—the disease is politics and fanaticism. Unless enlightenment can come in through some door, there is no hope. These young Jews will fight to the death in Hagana or Irgun.

Mr. S. N. Evans: It is all very well for hon. Members on both sides of the House to seek to lay the blame for recent happenings in Palestine on the Labour Government, but the fact is that for 25 years the problem of Palestine has been bedevilled by high powered, heavily subsidised propaganda and emotion, with a paucity of logic. Emotion is a very good petrol but a shockingly bad driver.

We have to warn those who failed to co-operate in apprehending murderers that events in the King David Hotel have their repercussions at King's Cross. For the first time in my experience, ordinary decent working men are talking in their pubs and clubs, at the barber's and at work, about the lot to which our lads are being subjected in Palestine at this moment. Reference has been made to some words uttered by a gallant and distinguished British soldier in the course of his duty.

To get this matter in the right perspective it is necessary briefly to go over the background to this recent outbreak of violence. The background was that the British and American Governments, fully conscious of the difficulties surrounding a country in which 1,300,000 Arabs and

half as many Jews lived, set up a committee to investigate and report. In due course that committee reported unanimously, and made several recommendations. The technicians, the experts, were then set to work to examine the mechanics of these recommendations, including the assimilation, transportation, housing, feeding, clothing and employment of the 100,000 persons it was thought desirable to evacuate from Europe.

That was the background, and it might have been thought that tranquillity would reign, at any rate for the period in which these problems were being considered; but not so. An outbreak of violence unprecedented in ferocity was set in train, and in due course the British Government were compelled to take the steps which they have taken.

Brigadier Low: I want to say a word or two on the difficulty of restoring and maintaining law and order in that country today. We all know how the situation has deteriorated in the past six months. We know it has deteriorated so much that our troops there have now been given, we understand, full powers. I hope the Colonial Secretary will tell us whether or not they are full powers, or only modified powers, or whether they are restricted in any way. They have been given full powers to deal with the terrorists in the country. That task in peace time is a job which no soldier who has done it ever wishes to have to carry out again, and it is a job the difficulty of which cannot really be understood by those who have not done it.

Now I want to refer to the letter of General Barker, the full text of which I do not believe any hon. Member has seen, and which I doubt if the Government have fully considered. Yet it is the letter on which some hon. Members have seen fit to condemn, out of hand, a high officer of the Army. Whatever words that officer has found it necessary to use, I venture to suggest that the error which he made is certainly no greater than the error of the hon. Member who stands up in this House and accuses a general of "vulgar anti-Semitism." Surely, it is the duty of all of us in this House to uphold the confidence which our troops, in this difficult situation, have in their commanders? I venture to suggest that the Lord President has done little service to the country today, by announcing, before the Government have had time to look into this matter, that they dissociate themselves from the terms of that letter. Until we are told the terms which the General used in that letter, until we have seen the words which he actually used and until we know the contents of the letter, and the circumstances in which it was written how can we condemn the General or dissociate ourselves from the letter?

I hope that, as the result of the opinion which the Government seem to have formed upon General Barker's action, they are not going to make it more difficult for our troops in Palestine to carry out their job, by restricting their powers and by hamstringing their commanders. I do not know whether they have appointed any man with great political knowledge to assist our commanders in Palestine in the same way as our commanders-in-chief during the war had Ministers of State or political advisers to assist them. If they have not, it might be well worth their while to consider the wisdom of appointing someone with great political knowledge and understanding of the peoples with whom the generals in Palestine are dealing, so that the burden of any commander out there may be lightened, and so that, if the Government do find that mistakes have been made, such mistakes shall not be repeated. The proposals put to us today will need to be studied. They will be studied by hon. Members of this House and, as other proposals were studied in India, by the people to whom they refer. Just as in India, no proposals will be of any avail unless they are accepted by the parties concerned.

Therefore, these proposals will be of no avail unless Jew and Arab accept them. By "Jew and Arab," I believe we mean the opinion of world Jewry and of the Arab League and the Arab world. Much emphasis has been laid upon the consultations with world Jewry. I have heard far too little of consultations with Arab opinion. I am sorry that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is not here today. I regret his illness as much as others in this House. He has more than once reminded this House that Palestine is part of the Middle East. No decision can be reached unless we bear in mind that the Arabs in Palestine are culturally connected with the Arabs who live around them, that the economics in Palestine must be connected with the economics of the Middle East, and we can never exclude the fact that the strategic interests of Palestine, whether they be British, Arab or universal, are connected with the surrounding country. I hope that, in due course, the Jews and the Arabs will come to the council table with His Majesty's Government, and will discuss these and any other proposals which may be submitted, for I am convinced that only by discussion and by getting a conciliatory atmosphere, can we get down to the real problem of producing a scheme for the future of Palestine, which will meet with the general consent of Jews and Arabs in Palestine and of all peoples throughout the world.

Colonel Wigg: There are one or two aspects of the Palestine problem which have a significance beyond the problem itself. There are Members of this House who think that if we could remove all the Jews from Palestine the Arabs would then settle down and live a life of peace and harmony with themselves and with us, but I believe that the experiences during the period between the wars and, indeed, during the war itself do not bear out that suggestion. The Colonial Office was responsible for the administration of Iraq from the time when General Maude captured Baghdad onwards, and the history of what has happened in Iraq does not support the view that if there had not been a Jewish problem, the Arabs would welcome our administration. Indeed, during the war the Iraqi Arabs seized the opportunity to try to take their affairs into their own hands. [An Hon. Member: "Why not?"] I am not arguing that they should not have done so. I am trying to establish the point that the solution to the Arab problem does not depend upon the elimination of the Jews.

The point I want to make over and above that, is that the Colonial Office administration of Palestine is called in question by what the hon. and gallant Member for North Blackpool (Brigadier Low) called the breakdown of law and order. It is true that there is a breakdown of law and order, and that points to the fact that there has been a failure on the part of the civil administration. The soldier is not called in to carry out a policing function with the aid of tanks and similar weapons until the civil authority has failed to discharge its duty. I think the Government, as a whole, bear a responsibility which they cannot avoid merely by calling in Field-Marshal Montgomery or using his prestige, when a military commander, faced with an impossible

situation—to use an expression of my hon. Friend the Member for Wednesbury (Mr. S. N. Evans)—acts indiscreetly. The Commander there is called upon to deal with 70,000 or 80,000 men armed with mortars, and certainly other light weapons, with what is probably an inadequate force. He is forced to take action under instructions from the Government at home, and he is asked to handle it in such a way as not to cause a violent reaction of public opinion, not only to this country but also in the United States. It is a frightful thing to ask the soldier to do a job that the civil administration has failed to do without giving him adequate means for carrying it out.

I now turn for a moment to some of the events of the past few weeks, from which the Government cannot escape responsibility. The Foreign Secretary, speaking in Bournemouth, used these words:—

"If we put 100,000 Jews into Palestine to-morrow, I will have to put another division of British troops there. I am not prepared to do it."

It is true to say that, although he is not prepared to put the 100,000 Jews into Palestine, the extra division is there. It is there, I suggest, because the Government are not fully informed as to what is happening. I am as sure as a private individual can be of the kind of advice the Government are getting. I have no doubt they are being told that troops are straining at the leash; that positive action has got to be taken, and orders are given accordingly. I do not believe such advice is wholly true. I have a letter from a private soldier, a constituent of mine, who expresses admiration for what he calls "the guts of the Jews." He goes on to make the point—and this is one of his worries, and one of the worries of other private soldiers serving in Palestine—that if, as a result of American opinion, we have to put 100,000 Jews into Palestine, then let American troops come and help to enforce law and order. His Majesty's Government ought not to be so tender to American opinion.

I hope His Majesty's Government will not seek to hide behind the kind of solution which the Lord President of the Council put across this afternoon. It is not new, and it leaves the Government open to the charge that what has been put forward to-day could have been put forward a year ago. I quite agree with the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Blackpool, that the first job is to enforce law and order. The parallel is what happened in Ireland. In short, we have to secure an armistice before any solution is possible. It is quite improper to ask the military commander on the spot, or, indeed, the High Commissioner, to tackle what is, after all, a political problem. May I remind the House of what happened during the war? In the Mediterranean theatre we had Field-Marshal Alexander, a soldier of very great experience and a man of affairs. Yet attached to his staff—perhaps I am putting it a little crudely—there was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bromley (Mr. H. Macmillan) to advise on political affairs. I suggest very earnestly that a member of the Government of Cabinet rank should go out and seek a solution in Jerusalem. That is where this problem will have to be solved. It cannot be solved by asking British troops to pay the price for the political mistakes which are the consequence of the mistakes of policy in the past.

Major Tufon Beamish: First of all, I want to appeal to hon. Members on both sides of the House, and particularly on the opposite side, to cast aside what I might call woolly thinking and sentimentality. There has been too much of that altogether in connection with this problem. [An Hon. Member: "Why exclusively this side?"] I did not say exclusively that side. I believe the terms of reference of the Committee were wrong, in that they confused the plight of the Jews in Europe—for which we all feel very much—with the actual future of Palestine under British mandate. The two problems cannot be entirely separated, but they should not be confused to that extent.

In Poland, for example, out of some four million Jews before the war, only 80,000 are supposed to be alive to-day, apart from some 200,000 or 300,000, according to official Polish figures, who have had an enforced stay at the invitation of Marshal Stalin in Siberia since 1939. I have been to Auschwitz, and I know of the appalling and incredible suffering of the Jews there, and of the Poles themselves, and we are all desperately sorry for the plight of the Jews in Europe. As another example, many hon. Members in the past, and I think even to-day, have stressed the fact that some 25,000 Palestinian Jews, most of whom were members of Hagana, volunteered for the British Forces during the war, and there have been people who have been only too quick to compare that with the number of Arabs who volunteered. To my way of thinking, that is an extraneous issue. I know, too, of the rising in the Warsaw Ghetto, about which very little is known. I have actually seen the space in Warsaw where thousands upon thousands of Jews lost their lives before General Bor's rising, a space, which now has not one brick standing upon another, about two miles wide by one mile. About 400,000 out of the 600,000 Jews in Palestine are supposed to have close relations now in Europe among 1,500,000 survivors, and I imagine it would be also true to say that almost every one of the 1,500,000 survivors could claim to have a relation in Palestine. We all admire the Jewish contribution to the war effort, and we have great sympathy with their sufferings, but neither our admiration nor our sympathy should be allowed to fog the issue of the problem of Palestine. That is the first point I want to make.

Next, I want to draw a contrast between the behaviour of the Arabs from 1936-1939 and the behaviour of the Jews since VJ-Day. It was reliably estimated that in 1938 some two-thirds of the Arab population were supporters of Haj Amin Hussein, the Grand Mufti, and perhaps the other third were supporters of Fakri Bey Nashashibi. The number of armed Arabs was never large, several hundreds perhaps, a thousand at the most, and most of them came from Syria under the command of Aref Abdul Razek and under the direct orders, of course, of the Grand Mufti.

The population as a whole, however, were not behind the Arab rising. I know this very well, and I can tell hon. Members from my own experience that the greatest difficulty one had, as an officer, in those days was to maintain discipline, which was excellent in itself, amongst one's men, because so soon as they were left alone they would be making friends with the Arabs which, at that moment, was incompatible with their duty. One would find them playing with the kids at the very time when there were armed gangsters in the vicinity. We never lacked Arab helpers in those days, and there were very few villages, indeed, to which one went—and other hon. Members who were there

will bear me out—where one was not offered a cup of coffee or a glass of arrack, which was better still.

On the Jewish side of the picture, we all know that from 1936 to 1939 Hagana openly collaborated with the Palestine Police and, indeed, we actually formed a Jewish Settlement police, and organised armed and trained men. They took full advantage of that fact. In 1940, we saw the secession of the two terrorist movements. Recent events have shown, as all hon. Members know, close collaboration between the two terrorist groups and Hagana, and, worst of all, between them and the Jewish Agency, the latter fact not coming as a surprise, I may say, to any of those of us who kept closely in touch with the situation. But this is the point I wish to draw from this: the activities of the Jewish terrorists in Palestine would now be absolutely impossible had they not got the backing of the very large majority of the Jewish population. I do not think that we should lose sight of that fact in considering the whole matter. Let us, therefore, give our wholehearted support to the actions of the General Officer Commanding in Palestine, and ignore such irresponsible outbursts as that of the hon. Gentleman Mr. S. Silverman—whom I see in the House but not in his place—in questioning the Prime Minister last week.

Mr. Lever: I have never myself been a Jewish nationalist. I have never supported extreme nationalism in Palestine or in Great Britain. I hold no brief for the Jewish Agency leaders in much of their propaganda, particularly that adopted in the United States and in this country. Still less have I any sympathy with the villainies of the terrorists of the extreme nationalist movement in Palestine. I am somewhat sickened at the mealy-mouthed hypocrisy which permeates the atmosphere whenever the terrorists are discussed in this House. These terrorists are villainous, stupid and unbalanced people. If anyone is responsible for the deaths of Jews, Arabs and Englishmen in Palestine, it is those who have fomented the desperation of these terrorists, and encouraged their extreme nationalist ambitions, without any hope of their being fulfilled. When we have played on the hopes of a tortured people and encouraged desperate young men in their ambitions, it will not do to come into this House and satisfy ourselves in a smug way by merely rebuking them with some pious generalisations about law and order.

I claim the right to concern myself about the safety of the British Tommy. I take the view that anyone who really cares about the interests of the British soldier in Palestine is not content with cheering on the kind of stupidity which will lead to further bloodshed and deaths. I hold the view that it is sometimes contemptible for hon. Members of this House to attack generals or civil servants for carrying out a general policy. But General Barker was not carrying out the Government's policy when he issued the stupid, inflammatory and insulting message to his commanders which he did. I hold the view that perhaps now that the Government have disassociated themselves from his remarks and indicated that appropriate action is being considered, the best thing than hon. Members can do is to suggest alternative poets for this general.

Normally, when a general is carrying out a policy which he is ordered to carry out by the Government, only a fool or a knave would venture to hurl abuse at his head. This general has gone far beyond that. Without thought of the consequences, he has been guilty of an act of grave irresponsibility which will inflame the situation there, and cause loss of life and embittered feelings which cannot be in the interests of our soldiers.

We ought to be a little more candid in this House and outside as to what is our object in Palestine. It is no good deploring the fact that outside this House, relations between Jew and Gentile are being made worse because of terrorist action in Palestine. It is no good deploring it unless you explain to the British people where the responsibility lies for the events in Palestine, why you are there, and what you propose to do about it. Why are we in Palestine? Let us be clear about our purpose. Are we in Palestine as trustees for the local population? I am as much concerned for the welfare of the Arab population as for the Jewish. Are we there because we need a strategic base? Do not say that we are there as trustees if we are there mainly for strategic reasons, or to secure our oil supplies, or even to improve the value of oil company shares. Do not be mealy-mouthed. Do not give windy lectures to exasperated Jews who have temporarily lost their reason. Be honest about it, and tell them within what limits they can have votes, or no votes at all. I feel a little sorry that the hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn) did not have a chance to speak to-day, because he would probably have made a realist approach to this subject, from the Tory point of view. I think that is often to be preferred to the more dishonest moralising that one so often hears on this subject. If we are in Palestine as trustees for the Jewish and Arab populations, let us be quite clear that our actions are solely conditioned by their welfare. It is rather a novel interpretation of trusteeship action for one trustee to lock up another and to assault the beneficiaries. This is something that is novel to me, speaking as a lawyer, in the interpretation of trusts. That applies whether one is dealing with the Jews or the Arabs.

Second Day of the Debate.

August 1st, 1946.

The President of the Board of Trade (Sir Stafford Cripps): I think everybody who was present in the House yesterday must have been struck by the constructive spirit in which the Debate was carried forward, and also by the excellently objective temper in which this very difficult problem was approached. Perhaps the Debate illustrated, by its content, the extreme difficulties of the situation; for, while there was plenty of healthy criticism as regards the solution of this problem in the future, little was advanced by way of proposed alternative courses, other than those which have been thoroughly explored, either by the Committee of Inquiry or by the expert committee mentioned by my right hon. Friend. This afternoon I propose to deal with the future of Palestine, and to leave to my right hon. Friend the Colonial Secretary, who will be speaking later in the Debate, all those many questions that have been raised with regard to the administration of Palestine and past action under the Mandate. Of course, he is far more familiar with all the details of those matters than I could possibly be.

However, before dealing with the future, I must make one matter quite clear as regards the present and the recent past. The British Government, as the responsible authority under the Mandate, are determined—and I think this determination was supported from all sides of the House yesterday—that the future of Palestine shall not be decided by terrorism and by violence. We have fought the greatest war in history to establish that there are better ways of solving political and economic problems than the use of violence and brute force. It would be a betrayal of all that we and the democratic peoples of the world have suffered to achieve what we have achieved, if we were now to give way before the murderous assaults of terrorists in Palestine or any other country. It is encouraging to know that so many Jews throughout the world have disowned these gangs of terrorists, by whom, indeed, so much discredit has been brought to the Jewish case. Law and order must be preserved, at whatever cost. We ask the many non-terrorist Jews, who form the vast majority of the population of Palestine, not merely to condemn these excesses but to give their support in rooting out the perpetrators of them. As has been repeatedly said in the course of the Debate, there can, of course, be no solution of the Palestinian problem by mere suppression, however essential at any given moment that may be in order to preserve law and order. Our ultimate object is, and must be, the attainment of self-government by the two peoples of Palestine. For solving this intractable difficulty, made intractable by the history of events ever since the first world war—events for which this Government, anyway, are in no way responsible—we need a great constructive effort, not only on the part of the British Parliament and Government, but on the part of all those who realise the gravity to the world of the issues with which we are dealing.

This is not a matter in which partisanship can be of any help, difficult though it may be for those whose sympathies have been strongly entrained upon one side or the other. It is essential, if a solution is to be found, that we should look objectively at the problem. One of the most gratifying aspects of the Debate yesterday, as I have mentioned, was the great degree of objectivity shown by practically all those who spoke. That does not, of course, mean we should disregard the very real and deep sentiments of either the Arabs or the Jews. This is no mechanical problem, but one which arises out of those very sentiments. Therefore, we must both understand and appreciate the feelings, the hopes and the desires of both parties, encouraged, indeed, as many of them have been, by sympathisers of all kinds from outside Palestine itself. The high court of Parliament is, in this case, in the position of a high court of equity, and not to be bound by rigid and legalistic rules or the meticulous interpretation of documents, but rather, trying to exercise with impartiality a wise and equitable judgment. There are two claimants to Palestine, both of whom have a good case to put forward, and we might indeed wish that we could reach a decision by a judgment of Solomon, but in this case there is equal objection on both sides to a solution by partition, and so by that means we cannot achieve a quick decision.

The facts of the case can be simply stated. The Jews, persecuted and maltreated throughout the Continent of Europe, seek a homeland in Palestine, which they consider was promised to them after the last war. Hundreds of thousands of them have already gone to Palestine, purchased land and initiated activities of every kind, as indeed under the Mandate it was contemplated that they would. Over large tracts of country they have established themselves as citizens of Palestine, and there are still hundreds of thousands who seek admission from the devastated countries of Europe, where so many of their co-religionists have been tortured and murdered. There would indeed be no one who could resist the claim of the Jews were it not for the claims put forward with equal strength by the Arabs. Our sympathies, of course, must be strongly engaged by the long persecuted race of Jews, who under Nazism have suffered more than any other people in the history of the world, but those sympathies do not entitle us to act unjustly to others. To the Arabs in Palestine, it is, of course, a part of their homeland, too. They have inhabited it for generations, and they see themselves liable to be driven out, or to be subject to the rule of alien immigrants introduced against their wishes, and despite their protests. It is small comfort to the possessor of property, that someone else can make better use of it than he can himself. It is the basis of his livelihood, and he regards it as his home, in which he has a right of occupation.

History has been hard upon Palestine, attempting as it has done to satisfy those two directly opposed and inconsistent claims. It is too late now, even if it were ever desirable, to go back upon that history of the last 25 years. The Jews have been brought to Palestine in great numbers, and the Arabs still remain there, and no future can be worked out, except upon the basis of these inescapable facts. Neither of the peoples can be removed; they must either be kept perpetually apart by force in separated territories, or be allowed to fight out to a violent and bitter end their differences, or some arrangement must be sought which may eventually allow them to dwell together in peace and in harmony. No one, of course, disputes that this latter is the best way, provided that it proves possible, and it is up to all those who feel deeply the dangers and tragedy of the situation to exercise their statesmanship to achieve such an arrangement. It is undoubtedly true that in the present temper of the two peoples, recently still further exacerbated by the terrorist outrages, a compromise is excessively difficult. We may have to envisage the need for laying down conditions which we hope will lead ultimately to that compromise, and to go forward with a plan so constructed.

The basis of the plan that has been proposed is a scheme of provincial autonomy upon a cantonal basis. Its object is to obviate an immediate partition with all the inevitable difficulties of international boundaries, the cutting of communications which have been established, the setting up of tariff barriers and all the rest which goes with two independent territories, and also with the abandonment of the hope of any ultimate coming together of the two races in a single territory. The terms of that plan were so fully given by my right hon. Friend yesterday that I do not propose to repeat them, but I would attempt to deal with those points of criticism that arose during yesterday's Debate, bearing in mind that no solution that

human ingenuity can suggest will be perfect in the sense of meeting fully the demands of both sides. That is impossible. The most that we can do, in fairness to Jews and Arabs alike, is to try to provide as large a measure of self-government within a limited territory, as the size of that territory will allow. So far as we ourselves are concerned, it is equally important for us to retain the good will of both races. There is nothing to be gained for our country by antagonising either side, and we are equally anxious to maintain our friendship both with the Jews throughout the world and with the great Arab populations of the Middle East.

First, I would like to deal with the very natural criticism that this matter has been delayed, and that it has been finally thrust upon the House of Commons with inadequate notice of the proposals. The key to the understanding of that position lies in our most earnest desire to bring our friends of the United States of America into consultation and agreement. That is not only because of our general desire to work side by side with them upon these world problems, but also because of the special interest which they have taken in the Palestinian problem owing to their own large Jewish population. It was as far back as August of last year that President Truman addressed to the Prime Minister his request for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine. It was quite obvious that the introduction of such large numbers of Jewish immigrants was impossible without a great deal of planning and finance, and also except as part of a general scheme which would reassure the Arab population as to the situation. Moreover, it was essential, as several speakers have pointed out in the Debate, that this problem of the rescue of the Jews from Europe should not be regarded exclusively as a Palestinian problem. We, therefore, set about immediate negotiations to achieve a joint Anglo-American consideration of the whole problem, the problem of the disposition of those Jews who desired to escape from the conditions under which many of them were still suffering in Europe.

Unfortunately, this was by no means the only urgent international matter which had to be tackled at that time. Other matters also claimed immediate attention. On 13th November we were able to announce that a joint committee would be appointed. We had achieved our objective of joint consideration of the problem with the United States of America. On 10th December we were able to give the names of the Committee, which entered forthwith upon its duties, and, ultimately, produced a most valuable Report, which was published on 1st May of this year. We were committed, as I have said, to a joint inquiry, and we hoped that combined action would follow joint inquiry, for we believed, as we believe now, that such combined action would be far more potent, and more likely to succeed, than action by ourselves alone.

The Report of the joint Committee of Inquiry was, as the House will have seen from perusing it, in a very general form in its recommendations. The form, for instance, of Recommendation 3, which has often been referred to in this Debate, is a good illustration of that fact. It was necessary, therefore, to work out from these general recommendations a precise plan, for it is to be observed—and this must always be borne in mind—that the recommendations formed one complete series and could not be dealt with separately, in isolation. The Report was carefully balanced so as to give preference neither to the Arab nor to the Jew, but to be fair to both. We, therefore, sought immediate agreement by the United States of America to a joint examination of the Committee's Report by a team of British and American officials, with a view to working out an agreed plan of action.

The United States of America wished, first, to consult only about Recommendation 2, the introduction of 100,000 immigrants, and sent a team for that purpose alone in June of this year, though we pointed out that the scheme must be considered as a whole; and it was not until the beginning of July that the consultation on the rest of the scheme could be started. The report of this latter examination, which was referred to yesterday by my right hon. Friend as the experts' report, and which was carried through with very great expedition and thoroughness, was not finally received by the Government till Friday last, and was then simultaneously submitted to Washington; but till yesterday morning we did not receive the response of the United States Government, so that it was not possible to give the House any information until my right hon. Friend the Lord President opened the Debate yesterday. The need for agreement is certainly a delaying factor in many difficult international matters, but I am certain that the House will agree with me that the Government were right in seeking that agreement, even though it may have meant a certain amount of delay in the process.

Now let me come to the merits of the scheme. It has been, I think, generally agreed in this Debate that there are three possible alternatives for Palestine in the future—partition, which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol (Mr. Stanley) preferred; the present scheme, or something of that character; and, thirdly, the return to the *status quo*. It is to be observed that the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry make no specific recommendations on how the government of Palestine should be carried on under continuing Mandate or the trusteeship agreement that will supersede it. All they do is to lay down certain general principles in their Recommendation 3, and it was in the elaboration of those principles that the present scheme was adopted—adopted by the unanimous agreement of our own and the United States' representatives. That unanimous agreement would, perhaps, alone be a sufficient justification for acceptance, but I will, nevertheless, deal with the criticisms that have been advanced, bearing always in mind that the scheme is based upon the principles of Recommendation 3 of the joint Committee of Inquiry.

These criticisms fall under three heads. First, the lack of finality; secondly, that one more attempt should have been made to achieve the unitary system; thirdly, that law and order should not be a central but a provincial subject. Let me deal with these three criticisms. There never can be finality in such arrangements as these, especially when a decision is being sought in an atmosphere of very high tension. What is required is a temporary state of affairs which is capable of being a transition to some ultimate desired conclusion. Partition is, in a sense, no more final than federation. Who

can say, for instance, that Ireland has reached finality in her constitution? All these arrangements are stages in a constantly developing world situation. Some, it is true, will last for a longer, and some for a shorter time; but none of them can be regarded as final. We believe that partition would be too violent and sudden a solution; it would, moreover, lead to a great many practical difficulties, many of which the right hon. Gentleman mentioned yesterday, and to a most dangerous state of friction, even if it could be achieved at all without the application of force, which is extremely doubtful. Moreover, it greatly diminishes any future hope of an unitary Palestine, the possibility of which we should certainly not wish to exclude. At least, we wish to preserve a chance of such a thing happening. On the other hand, our proposals may be a transition either to partition or to some form of federal union, whichever proves to be the better or more practical in the light of the experience gained during that transitional period.

The second point is that we could have given the unitary scheme one more trial. I do not think that that was urged with any very great degree of conviction. We certainly believe that such a trial is not now possible, whatever may have been the case, even a few months ago.

Mr. Austin: When the right hon. and learned Gentleman speaks about the unitary scheme, would he not agree that it would be practicable under the mantle of Socialism in Palestine, under which Arab and Jew could live together in a democracy?

Sir S. Cripps: No. I am afraid that in the state of exacerbation of feeling in Palestine at the present time it would not be possible to bring Arab and Jew together into an effective unitary Government, whatever principles that Government were going to apply. I do not think, indeed, there are many people in this House who would have any faith in the success of such a further experiment, even if we could get the two parties together to make the attempt.

As regards the centralisation of law and order, it is to be noted—and I do not blame anyone for not noting this yesterday, in view of the way in which the scheme had to be disclosed to the House—that this is a temporary device only, to regulate the initial stages of this new set-up. It is not proposed that it should constitute a permanent feature; but, at the present time, it will provide that relief from fear, which has been stressed, I think, by many speakers, and which is, after all, an essential factor to success, if we are to achieve it.

Mr. Pickthorn: Does "this" mean the whole business of cantonisation, or is there some feature that I have missed?

Sir S. Cripps: I was dealing with the centralisation of law and order. The hon. Member will appreciate that under the scheme, it is proposed, in the initial stage, that law and order should be under the Central Government and not the provincial Governments. That is intended to be a purely temporary feature while present difficulties exist.

Mr. Henderson Stewart: How long will this interim period last?

Sir S. Cripps: As soon as it is felt that the provinces are ready and willing to take over this obligation, and the minorities in those provinces accept the taking over, that would obviously be a suitable time to pass over this duty to the provincial governments. Where there is such a difficult state of feeling, it is impossible to promise any date in regard to these various happenings. It is not proposed to constitute this as a permanent feature of this scheme, but it will provide this relief during the initial stages. There can be little doubt that if this scheme works successfully it has very great merits from the practical point of view. It substantially makes each race master in its own area, and it will allow the provinces, in practice, to regulate their own immigration, while at the same time not interfering with the common services, such as railways, roads and other matters of that kind, and not encouraging the setting up of rival armed forces.

Mr. Pickthorn: Will electric power become a common service, or will that remain a monopoly?

Sir S. Cripps: I could not say. I do not know whether that has been decided. Electric power would, presumably, not be under the heading of communications.

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay: Does not electric power determine the future absorptive capacity, which in turn affects the future immigration: at the same time immigration rests with the provinces?

Sir S. Cripps: I said that in practice the regulation of immigration will be with the provinces. Technically it will remain at the centre, but the centre will act only on the advice of the provinces as to the number to be permitted for immigration. It will be for the provinces to act and not the centre. I also said that this would not encourage the setting up of rival armed forces, which is a matter of very great importance as regards the future of Palestine. These are substantial matters of advantage, as is also the possibility—and this to some extent covers the point which was raised about electric power—of combined planning of those types of new developments which are capable of serving both areas equally well.

The difficulty was raised yesterday of the definition of the boundaries between the provinces. I would merely make the observation upon that point, that these difficulties will be far less than would be the difficulties of settling the final boundaries under a partition scheme. These boundaries will certainly have some degree of finality, in that it is laid down that they cannot be altered without the consent of both provinces. That should satisfy the Arabs that it will protect them from what, I think, has sometimes been referred to as the "silent invasion." We believe, that with the acquiescence of the two races this scheme will prove workable. It should be regarded not as a rigid final decision, but as an important stage in the effort to achieve collaboration and co-operation of the peoples in the government of their own country.

I would here once again stress that this plan must be considered as a carefully balanced whole. In some parts it may be said to favour the Jews—as regards immigration—and in other parts it may benefit the Arabs—as regards the increase in social services and so on, in the Arab areas. It must be considered as one complete plan, to the success of which both the help which we are prepared to give, and that proposed from the United States are equally essential contributions. It was for that reason that my right hon. Friend the Lord President of the Council stressed yesterday the fact that the full

implementation of this plan depends upon the co-operation of the United States. We certainly hope most earnestly that such co-operation will be forthcoming. Without it, we shall not be able to burden the people of this country with the whole of the finances which would be necessary to carry through this new scheme. One or two hon. Members yesterday made the suggestion that the whole matter ought now to be referred to U.N.O. for fresh decisions and suggestions. It will, of course, be necessary for the terms of the trusteeship agreement which is to supersede the Mandate to be settled by U.N.O., but to delay all action still further, until we get the agreement of U.N.O. would mean a quite unacceptable delay; indeed, many hon. Members have already stressed the need for a speedy decision, and have noted quite rightly the deterioration in atmosphere that has gone on while we have been awaiting the present agreement. In the existing circumstances we believe a quick decision to be absolutely essential. As my right hon. Friend the Lord President has stated, it is our intention to discuss this matter with both the Arabs and the Jews, both inside and outside Palestine. We hope to get representative Jews from various countries, as well as in Palestine, and Arabs in Palestine, as well as the Arab States, to come together and discuss this plan and give their views on it.

Hon. Members: When will that be?

Sir S. Cripps: As soon as possible. We realise the need for both races to be fully represented, and we hope, whatever their antagonisms, that they will find it possible to come together on these vital discussions of the future of Palestine.

Mr. Crossman: Will outside representatives be invited?

Sir S. Cripps: We do not know what representatives they will want to select. The intention is to give them a very wide power of selection.

Mr. Keeling: Have the invitations yet been issued, and what date has been suggested?

Sir S. Cripps: Some of the invitations have already been issued. Discussions are going on with the parties concerned as to the issue of other invitations. The actual date has not been fixed.

Mr. Sydney Silverman: When the right hon. Gentleman says that it is intended to give the widest possible choice of representation, he is not intending to infer, I hope, that there is any intention of side-tracking the Jewish Agency?

Sir S. Cripps: There is no such intention at all. We hope to have discussions tomorrow with the Jewish representatives.

Vice-Admiral Taylor: Can the right hon. and learned Gentleman say whether the representatives of the United States will be taking part in these discussions?

Sir S. Cripps: They do not wish to take any part in the discussion, although they may be there in the capacity of observers.

Mr. Mikardo: Is it proposed to invite the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem to this Conference?

Sir S. Cripps: There will be no invitation issued to the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem. What will happen if the Arabs wish him to come, we shall decide when we get the request.

Mr. Henderson Stewart: Is there any assurance that America will send observers there at all, since they have not signified their approval?

Sir S. Cripps: We have no assurance, but we know that, in any event, they will probably not wish to partake in it, but they will be very welcome as observers, if they wish to come.

Mr. Keenan: To what extent will the United States be involved? Is their obligation purely a financial one?

Sir S. Cripps: If the hon. Member will be good enough to read again in *Hansard* the statement made yesterday, I think that he will see the answer to his question, subject to the fact that the United States Government have not yet accepted the scheme. It is only their representatives on the expert body who have agreed to it. I was stressing, when these questions were put to me, that this problem is, of course, not merely an Arab and Jewish problem, though they are the parties most vitally concerned. The repercussions of this problem will be felt throughout the Middle East, and, indeed, wherever Arab and Jewish communities may be found all over the world. That is why we wish to have representatives from outside Palestine as well as those from inside. I would like, therefore, to emphasise again that the Palestinian problem is not the same problem as that of the allocation of the persecuted Jews of Europe. Palestine may help in the solution of this latter problem, but it certainly can never cope with the whole of it, and it is for that reason that we welcome the first recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry, and will do all that we can to see that it is carried into effect. Other countries must be persuaded to open their coors to these people, who have suffered so much and so long from the brutalities of Nazi persecution. No one must imagine that the extension of immigration into Palestine, if it takes place, is alone going to provide the solution to the whole of this question.

I was asked yesterday by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol about the new prospects of settlement with South America. These are not yet definite, but, as he is probably aware, an inter-Governmental committee on this matter is at the present moment sitting at Rio, and a number of the South American States have already expressed their willingness to accept refugees from Europe.

Karl Winterton: May I point out that when I was chairman of the inter-Governmental Committee for Refugees they expressed their willingness to do so, and that is some six years ago. It is not a question of their expressing willingness; it is a question of taking it up.

Sir S. Cripps: I quite appreciate the difficulty. We have had a war since then, which has made some little difference to the situation. The first question of this reconsideration is to get the willingness, and then work out the plan. That is the scheme which is under way. I have recently had some experience of the difficulties which arise from an attempt to settle problems of self-government for two large communities, in a vast territory, in which they have both lived for centuries, and where they have long shared a common life. That is proving hard enough, but, in this case, we are dealing with a comparatively small territory providing little room for expansion, inhabited on the one hand by a race who have been long and comparatively sparsely settled, and on the other by a small section of a large, widely scattered race with no other homeland of their own, continually pressing to introduce more and more of their people who have been forced brutally out of their established homes and occupations in other countries. It is not to be wondered at that the solution

of that problem is one of immense difficulty, and that the sentiments and emotions of both sides are running crest-high today. Both sides have in the past, from time to time, resorted to violence because of the intensity of their racial and national feelings. Today they stand facing one another in bitter antagonism. We have the unenviable lot of attempting to maintain impartially law and order in this tense situation, and no praise is too high for those many fellow-citizens of ours who have given and are giving unstintingly of their service, and, indeed, in all too many cases, of their lives, to carry out this most difficult task.

In those circumstances, I would ask every responsible person to have regard to the basic facts, and to do their utmost to assuage these bitter feelings and not exacerbate them still more by arguments of partisanship. In the long run, however it comes about, whether by violence, agreement or compromise, Arabs and Jews will have to live together in Palestine. Surely, both races must realise that war and bloodshed cannot produce for them any fair and satisfactory solution of their difficulty. Neither side can drive the other out of the country, and the world has, I hope, decided that it will not in future allow such differences to be settled by the violence of war. It is in our interest to maintain our friendship and good relations with both races. We are impartial in our desire to help them to the wisest and fairest solution of their difficulties. We have asked our American friends to consult with us, and the experts of both countries have unanimously agreed upon this plan in the interest of world peace and the future of Palestine as a whole.

I would beg the two peoples to pause a moment and consider, not putting aside, of course, their strongly held opinions, but realising how much both may gain by the avoidance of war, and by agreement on a way of sharing the prosperity which co-operation alone can bring to their country. We have put forward this plan because it seems to us to hold within it the seeds of a hopeful future. It is not perfect, but it provides a method by which the two races can live side by side, enjoying a large measure of immediate self-government without sacrificing the benefit of a united Palestine. The future alone can determine how such a scheme will develop, but it holds within it the possibility of future co-operation of Arabs and Jews for their mutual benefit.

We put it forward, and we invite discussion on it by the interested parties, but whatever comes from those discussions it is essential, if we are to avoid the horrors of a civil war, that some decision as to Palestine's future should be quickly made. Though all of us largely condemn terrorism we fully realise how unkind history has been to the inhabitants of Palestine over the last 25 years. We certainly do not claim that all successive British Governments during that time have acted with perfect wisdom, or that Arabs and Jews are alone to blame for the difficulties that have arisen. All, no doubt, have made mistakes, but no examination of past errors will get us out of the present difficulties. That can be achieved and only achieved by the concentrated and constructive efforts of all parties affected. We accept our duty, and we offer our services in a great co-operative attempt to solve, once and for all, these stubborn difficulties which have so long bedevilled that land, which saw the birth of the Founder of our religion, and which should contain for all of us an inspiration for justice and for peace.

Mr. Churchill's Comments.

Mr. Churchill: The House is, naturally, obliged to the President of the Board of Trade for the painstaking speech which he has delivered to us, and which supplements, in many points, the interesting and detailed statement delivered by the Lord President of the Council yesterday. We are also much obliged to Mr. Stanley, whose speech, I think, furnished the House with a wealth of careful thought, judiciously selected and rightly produced facts, and represents a very large body of our opinion at the present time upon this most difficult question. In the short time which I will venture to occupy the House, I am going to touch a little on some of the grave realities which lie outside the peaceful tones of the oration of the President of the Board of Trade, and the quiet circumstances of this House, because the situation in which we are placed is a very grievous one, and one which is not improving at all. I must also go back a little into the past, because on this question we have got to look to the past.

The position which I, personally, have adopted and maintained, dates from 1919 and 1921, when as Dominions and Colonial Secretary, it fell to me to define, with the approval of the then Cabinet and Parliament, the interpretation that was placed upon our obligations to the Zionists under the Mandate for Palestine entrusted to us by the League of Nations. This was the declaration of 1922, which I, personally, drafted for the approval of the authorities of the day. Palestine was not to be a Jewish National Home, but there was to be set up a Jewish National Home in Palestine, Jewish immigration would be allowed up to the limit of the economic absorptive capacity—that was the phrase which I coined in those days and which seems to remain convenient—the Mandatory Power being, it was presumed, the final judge of what that capacity was. During the greater part of a quarter of a century which has passed, this policy was carefully carried out by us. The Jewish population multiplied from about 80,000 to nearly 600,000. Tel-Aviv expanded into the great city it is, a city which, I may say, during this war and before it, welcomed and nourished waifs and orphans flying from Nazi persecution. Many refugees found a shelter and a sanctuary there, so that this land, not largely productive of the means of life, became a fountain of charity and hospitality to people in great distress. Land reclamation and cultivation and great electrical enterprises progressed. Trade made notable progress, and not only did the Jewish population increase but the Arab population, dwelling in the areas colonised and enriched by the Jews, also increased in almost equal numbers. The Jews multiplied six-fold and the Arabs developed 500,000, thus showing that both races gained a marked advantage from the Zionist policy which we pursued and which we were developing over this period.

The President of the Board of Trade spoke of the past 25 years as being the most unkind or unhappy Palestine has known. I imagine that it would hardly be possible to state the opposite of the truth more compendiously. The years during which we have accepted the Mandate have been the brightest that Palestine has known and were full of hope. Of course, there was always friction, because the Jew was, in many cases, allowed to go far beyond the strict limits of the inter-

pretation which was placed upon the Mandate. Disturbances occurred in 1937 and in 1938; in 1939 Mr. Chamberlain's Government produced the White Paper, which limited immigration other than on the grounds of the economic absorptive capacity of the country. That after a five-year interval, would have brought immigration to an end except by agreement with the Arab majority, which certainly would not have been obtained. This was in my view a failure to fulfil the obligations we had accepted, and I immediately protested against this departure. I found myself in full agreement with the Labour and Liberal Parties of those days.

I have never altered my opinion that the White Paper constituted a negation of Zionist policy which the House must remember, was an integral and indispensable condition of the Mandate. That is the view which I hold today. It was violently resented by the Jews in Palestine, and by world Jewry, a large majority of whom—although there are notable exceptions—regard Zionism as a great ideal, and as the cherished hope of their race, scattered throughout the world. Then came the war. After the fall of France, and the attack upon us by Italy, when we stood utterly alone, we had great need to concentrate our troops against the enemy, and economise in our outlying garrisons and commitments. At my desire, the Jewish community and Palestine was armed, encouraged to organise and, in fact, to play a part in the defence of the Holy Land, to liberate British units there. The horrible persecutions by the Nazis left no doubt as to which side they were on, or could be on. The possibility of a German invasion, striking through Turkey, Syria and Palestine to the Suez Canal, as well as through Persia, towards the Persian Gulf, and at what were then deemed to be our vital communications, at what was then considered to be an important element in our affairs—our Eastern Empire and possessions, as well as Australia and New Zealand—was a very real anxiety in 1941-42. At a most critical time in 1941 it was aggravated by the revolt of the pro-German Arab elements in Iraq. No doubt our Zionist policy may have led, in part, to that divergence of Arab sentiment. But the revolt was quelled, Syria was liberated, and Persia was occupied. Immense preparations and fortifications were made against German penetration of the Caucasus, and this danger complicated the whole defence of Europe from the West. But this menace was removed, at once and for ever, by the victories of Stalingrad and El Alamein.

Meanwhile, the Jewish community had developed strong, well-armed forces, and the highest military authorities reported to the Cabinet during 1941-42 that if the continued bickerings between Jews and Arabs grew into serious conflict, the Jews could not only defend themselves, but would beat the Arabs in Palestine, though that was, of course, the very opposite position from that which existed at the time of the Mandate, in 1919. At that time the Jews were a defenceless minority, and it was a great part of our duty to protect them from the hostility of the very much stronger Arab forces who emerged with so much distinction and credit from the struggle against the Turks. Thus, there are two facts to be borne in mind. First, that Zionists and the Palestine Jews were vehemently and undividedly on our side in the struggle, and, secondly, that they no longer need our assistance to maintain themselves in their national home against local Arab hostility. A general attack upon them by all surrounding Arab States would be a different matter, and that would clearly be one which would have to be settled by the United Nations' Organisation. But the position is different from what it was when the Mandate was granted.

Meanwhile, how did we treat the Arabs? We treated them very well. The House of Hussein reigns in Iraq. Feisal was placed on the throne, his grandson is there to-day. The Emir Abdullah, whom I remember appointing at Jerusalem, in 1921, to be in charge of Transjordan, is there to-day. He has survived the shocks, strains and stresses which have altered almost every institution in the world. He has never broken his faith and loyalty to this country. Syria and the Lebanon owe their independence to the great exertions made by the British Government to make sure that the pledges made by them, at the time when we were weak, but, nevertheless, were forced to take action by entering the country to drive out the Vichy French, were honoured. We have insisted on those pledges being made good. I cannot touch on the Arabs without paying my tribute to this splendid king, Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, who in the darkest hours never failed to send messages and encouragement of his unshakable faith that we should win and gain through. I cannot admit that we have not done our utmost to treat the Arabs in a way which so great a race deserves and requires. There was no greater champion of Arab rights than the late Colonel Lawrence. He was a valued friend of mine. With him I always kept in very close touch. There was great anxiety and dispute about this matter of the last war, when I was in the responsible position, at the Colonial Office, of dealing with it. When Colonel Lawrence gave me his book "The Seven Pillars of Wisdom," he wrote in it that I had made a happy end to this show. I will not have it that the way we treated this matter was inconsiderate to the Arabs. On the contrary, I think that they have had a very fair deal from Great Britain. With all those countries which are given to their power and control, in every way they have had a very fair deal. It was little enough, indeed, that we had asked for the Jews—a national home in their historic Holy Land, on which they have the power and virtue to confer many blessings for enjoyment, both of Jew and Arab.

It is quite true that the claims and desires of the Zionists latterly went beyond anything which were agreed to by the Mandatory Power. This caused alarm and unrest among the Arabs, but the limits of the policy which I explained to the House have never been exceeded by any British Government, and if they are discharged they constitute the faithful fulfilment of our pledges, on which the Mandate hangs. At the General Election which followed the victorious ending of the German war, the Labour Party, which was believed to champion the Zionist cause in the terms I have defined, and not only in those terms, but going, in many cases, far beyond—to set up a Jewish State in Palestine, and so forth: quotations have been used, and one reads them, but there is no dispute on the matter—this Labour Party, some of whom we see here to-day, gained a large majority in the House of Commons. During the Election they made most strenuous pro-Zionist speeches and declarations. Many of their most important leaders were

known to be ardent supporters of the Zionist cause, and their success was, naturally, regarded by the Jewish community in Palestine as a prelude to the fulfilment of the pledges which had been made to them, and indeed opening the way to further ambitions. This was certainly the least which everybody expected.

In fact, all sorts of hopes were raised among the Jews of Palestine, just as other hopes were raised elsewhere. However, when the months slipped by and no decided policy or declaration was made by the present Government, a deep and bitter resentment spread throughout the Palestine Jewish community, and violent protests were made by the Zionist supporters in the United States. The disappointment and disillusionment of the Jews at the procrastination and indecision of the British Labour Government are no excuse, as we have repeatedly affirmed here, for the dark and deadly crimes which have been committed by the fanatical extremists, and these miscreants and murderers should be rooted out, and punished with the full severity of the law. We are all agreed about that, and I was glad to hear the right hon. and learned Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade affirm the intention of the Government not to be coerced by terrorism. But the expectations which had been aroused by the Party opposite, and the resultant revulsion of feeling, are facts, none the less, to be constantly before our minds. They cannot say all these things, and then let a whole year pass away and do nothing about it, and then be surprised if these pledges come home to roost in a most unpleasant manner.

Had I had the opportunity of guiding the course of events after the war was won a year ago, I should have faithfully pursued the Zionist cause as I have defined it; and I have not abandoned it to-day, although this is not a very popular moment to espouse it; but there are two things to say about it. First, I agree entirely with what the President of the Board of Trade said on this point—no one can imagine that there is room in Palestine for the great masses of Jews who wish to leave Europe, or that they could be absorbed in any period which it is now useful to contemplate. The idea that the Jewish problem could be solved or even helped by a vast dumping of the Jews of Europe into Palestine is really too silly to consume our time in the House this afternoon. I am not absolutely sure that we should be in too great a hurry to give up the idea that European Jews may live in the countries where they belong. I must say that I had no idea, when the war came to an end, of the horrible massacres which had occurred; the millions and millions that have been slaughtered. That dawned on us gradually after the struggle was over. But if all these immense millions have been killed and slaughtered, there must be a certain amount of living room for the survivors, and there must be inheritances and properties to which they can lay claim. Are we not to hope that some tolerance will be established in racial matters in Europe, and that there will be some law reigning by which, at any rate, a portion of the property of these great numbers will not be taken away from them? It is quite clear, however, that this crude idea of letting all the Jews of Europe go into Palestine has no relation either to the problem of Europe or to the problem which arises in Palestine.

Mr. S. Silverman: The right hon. Gentleman is not suggesting, is he, that any Jew who regarded a country in Europe as nothing but the graveyard and cemetery of all his relatives, friends and hopes should be compelled to stay there if he did not want to do so?

Mr. Churchill: I am against preventing Jews from doing anything which other people are allowed to do. I am against that, and I have the strongest abhorrence of the idea of anti-Semitic lines of prejudice. Secondly, I have for some years past—this is really the crux of the argument I am venturing to submit to the House—felt that an unfair burden was being thrown upon Great Britain by our having to bear the whole weight of the Zionist policy, while Arabs and Moslems—or Muslims, as they are called by a certain school of political thought—then so important to our Empire, were alienated and estranged, and while the United States, for the Government and people of which I have the greatest regard and friendship, and other countries, sat on the sidelines and criticised our shortcomings with all the freedom of perfect detachment and irresponsibility. Therefore, I had always intended to put it to our friends in America, from the very beginning of the post-war discussions, that either they should come in and help us in this Zionist problem, about which they feel so strongly, and as I think rightly, on even terms, share and share alike, or that we should resign our Mandate, as we have, of course, a perfect right to do.

Indeed, I am convinced that from the moment when we feel ourselves unable to carry out properly and honestly the Zionist policy as we have all these years defined it and accepted it, and which is the condition on which we received the Mandate for Palestine, it is our duty at any rate to offer to lay down the Mandate. We should, therefore, as soon as the war stopped, have made it clear to the United States that, unless they came in and bore their share, we would lay the whole care and burden at the feet of the United Nations organisation; and we should have fixed a date by which all our troops and forces would be withdrawn from the country. At that time we had no interest in Palestine. We have never sought or got anything out of Palestine. We have discharged a thankless, painful, costly, laborious, inconvenient task for more than a quarter of a century with a very great measure of success. Many people have made fine speeches about the Zionist question. Many have subscribed generously in money, but it is Great Britain, and Great Britain alone, which has steadfastly carried that cause forward across a whole generation to its present actual position, and the Jews all over the world ought not to be in a hurry to forget that. If in the Jewish movement or in the Jewish Agency there are elements of murder and outrage which they cannot control, and if these strike not only at their west but at their only effective friend, they and the Zionist cause must inevitably suffer from the grave and lasting reproach of the atrocious crimes which have been committed. It is perfectly clear that Jewish warfare directed against the British in Palestine will, if protracted, automatically release us from all obligations to persevere, as well as destroy the inclination to make further efforts in British hearts. Indeed, there are many people who are very near that now. We must not be in a hurry to turn aside from large causes we have carried far.

There is the figure of Dr. Weizmann, that dynamic Jew whom I have known so long, the ablest and wisest leader of the cause of Zionism, his whole life devoted to the cause, his son killed in the battle for our common freedom. I ardently hope his authority will be respected by Zionists in this dark hour, and that the Government will keep in touch with him, and make every one of his compatriots feel how much he is respected here. It is perfectly clear that in that case we shall have the best opportunities of carrying this matter further forward.

I am sorry to weary the House with these reminiscences and "might have beens," but it was my intention when the war was over to place this position before our American friends in the plainest words—the plainest words, which, spoken in good will and good faith are the words to which Americans are most likely to respond. I am in full accord with every effort the Government have made to obtain American support in sharing the burden of the Zionist policy. The Anglo-American Commission was a step in the right direction, the negotiations which have taken place since are another favourable step, as was this scheme which has been read out as agreed to by the expert bodies joined on this Commission. It is far more important that there should be agreement than that there should be this or that variant of the scheme. I fully agree that the Government were right to labour with the United States; I will not try to examine the various schemes of partition or cantonisation which have been put forward, nor would I dwell on that idea, which I always championed, of a wider union—an Arab-Jew federal system of four or five States in the Middle East, which would have been one of the great Powers, with Jew and Arab combined together to share the glory and mutually protect and help each other. As I say, almost any solution in which the United States will join us could be made to work.

All these processes of inquiry, negotiation and discussion have been the occasion, so frequently referred to in this Debate, of prolonged and very dangerous delays, and if at the end of all these delays success is not attained, namely, Anglo-American co-operation on equal terms to carry out a Zionist policy within the limits defined or as we may agree—if that is not attained then we are confronted with a deplorable failure in the conduct of our affairs in Palestine since the end of the second great war. It was with very great regret that I read this morning of the non-agreement of the United States, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down quite bluntly and bleakly told us that there was no agreement at the present time. I hope it is not the final word. This agreement was the one great goal to which we were invited to aspire; here was the one excuse the Government could put forward for the long delays and indecisions which have involved us in so much cost and serious bloodshed. If this Anglo-American co-operation fails, as it seems so far to have failed, then I must say that the record of administration during this year—and a Government must be judged by results—in the handling of Palestinian affairs will stand forth as a monument of incapacity.

It may be that they have had difficulties, but Governments are judged by results. I turned up with a number of defeats during the war, and I was very much criticised about it. I had several times to come down with reports of defeats, but when afterwards there were successes we were entitled to be praised. Up to this particular minute, this has been a complete failure; it has gone from bad to worse, and one does not feel that there is any grip of the matter which is going to succeed. The one rightful, reasonable, simple and compulsive lever which we held and, if you will, still hold, was and is a sincere readiness to resign the mission, to lay our Mandate at the feet of the United Nations organisation and thereafter to evacuate the country with which we have no connection or tradition and where we have no sovereignty as in India and no treaty as in Egypt. Such was the position we could have adapted until a few months ago, and I am sure it would have procured a good result. The cogency of such a statement once it was believed would, I am sure, make the solution much more possible, and if no solution was obtained, then our responsibilities would have been honourably discharged. Once make it clear that the British have no interests in remaining in Palestine and no wish to do so, and that they decline to carry forward single-handed this harsh, invidious burden, then you will get attention paid to what you say and what you ask and all kinds of good solutions for the Jew and Arab alike, based on the co-operation and resources of the English-speaking world, will immediately come into the field of possibility.

However, His Majesty's Government by their precipitate abandonment of their treaty rights in Egypt, and, in particular, the Suez Canal zone, are now forced to look for a strong place of arms, for a jumping-off ground in Palestine in order to protect the Canal from outside Egypt. By this unwisdom they have vitiated disinterestedness and we can now be accused of having a national strategic motive for retaining our hold on Palestine. I must regard this as a very grave disaster and an immense weakening of our position. What the Government have done in Egypt—though, no doubt, from very good motives—has greatly weakened our moral position in Palestine by stripping us of our disinterestedness in that country. I pointed out in the Debate on Egyptian policy a few weeks ago, that the moment we were dependent upon Palestine for a base from which to defend the Suez Canal, we should greatly hamper all possibility of obtaining American co-operation. Well, look at the position to which we have now been brought.

Take stock round the world at the present moment; after all we are entitled to survey the whole field. We declare ourselves ready to abandon the mighty Empire and Continent of India with all the work we have done in the last 200 years, territory over which we possess unimpeachable sovereignty. The Government are, apparently, ready to leave the 400 million Indians to fall into all the horrors of sanguinary civil war—civil war compared to which anything that could happen in Palestine would be microscopic; wars of elephants compared with wars of mice. Indeed we place the independence of India in hostile and feeble hands, heedless of the dark carnage and confusion which will follow. We scuttle from Egypt which we twice successfully defended from foreign massacre and pillage. We scuttle from it, we abandon the Canal zone about which our treaty rights were and still are indefeasible, but now, apparently, the one place

where we are at all costs and at all inconveniences to hold on and fight it out to the death is Palestine, and we are to be at war with the Jews of Palestine, and, if necessary, with the Arabs of Palestine. For what reason? Not, all the world will say, for the faithful discharge of our long mission but because we have need, having been driven out of Egypt, to secure a satisfactory strategic base from which to pursue our Imperial aims.

I thank the House for listening. I have trespassed on their time at some length, but I wish to look forward before I conclude and not to look back. I will not go so far in criticising and in censuring without proposing positive action, with all the responsibility and the exposure to counter attack which one incurs when one proposes definite and serious action. Here is the action—action this day. I think the Government should say that if the United States will not come and share the burden of the Zionist cause, as defined or as agreed, we should now give notice that we will return our Mandate to U.N.O. and that we will evacuate Palestine within a specified period. At the same time, we should inform Egypt that we stand by our Treaty rights and will, by all means, maintain our position in the Canal zone. Those are the two positive proposals which I submit, most respectfully, to the House. In so far as the Government may have hampered themselves in any way from adopting these simple policies, they are culpable in the last degree, and the whole Empire and the Commonwealth will be the sufferers from their mismanagement.

Mr. Sydney Silverman: I would like to make a reference to what was said yesterday by Mr. Stanley who declared that the House of Commons had been cavalierly treated in this matter. We are having a most useful, constructive Debate, and I hope that it will prove in the end to be very helpful; but I cannot see why we should not have had it six months or eight months or nine months ago. There is nothing that has been said on either side of the House which could not have been said long ago, and indeed to have said it at the beginning instead of at the end might have had two very important results. One is that the basis of discussion on which we are inviting the United States to co-operate would have been made known and made clear from the beginning. Why need there be any secrecy about it? The other is that we should not have left, as we did leave, not merely Jews in Palestine, but Jews in the displaced persons camps in Germany, in hopeless and helpless silence.

It was inevitable that the Debate should have been overshadowed at its commencement by the outrage in Jerusalem last week. Everyone can appreciate the feelings that such an outrage engendered. I do not want to say another word about it. I do not even want to say a word about General Barker, in connection with whom so much misunderstanding was expressed in various parts of the House yesterday. I can understand it too. I wonder how many Members who were Members of the last Parliament remember the occasion in 1942, early in December, when, at long last, the great Powers, the Allies, became reluctantly convinced that Hitler really did mean to annihilate the whole of the Jewish population of Europe. What will be recalled is the moment that will compare with any other moment in the history of this House, when the whole crowded House—an unprecedented thing to do and not provided for by any Standing Order—rose to its feet and stood in silent homage to those who were about to die.

We could not do much to help them. No one desired that our war activity should be moderated in any sort of way or that our war effort should be in any way weakened in order to bring succour to those threatened people. Surely, at that moment we undertook some obligation to any who, in spite of all, might survive. Not many did. I know that the House gets tired, as I get tired myself, of recounting the numbers of people who went through the gas chambers, but I beg hon. Members whose sympathy was so deeply roused about General Barker and who understand so well how the deaths of people known to us and dear to us can make us say unbalanced things, and do things that otherwise we should not have done, to show some kind of understanding for the people in Palestine and elsewhere, who have not lost 100 people but who have lost 6,000,000 people. If they, too, get overstrained and do things that they ought not to do, say things that they ought not to say, and get, as a result, more disaster and more bitterness, however much we may condemn it and however much we may condemn General Barker's words, let us show some understanding. That is all I want to say about that, except that it leads me to this: on both sides of the House people still talk about not allowing Jews to be expelled from Europe. I agree. It would be a poor result of the past six years of war unless we could create conditions everywhere in the world in which men could live in free and equal citizenship without regard to race, creed or colour. If there are Jews who are prepared to remain and contribute again of their best to the reconstruction of European civilisation, at least conditions ought to be created that will enable them to do so; but I repeat that no one ought to be compelled to remain who wishes to go.

I knew a German Jew who was born in Berlin, aged now perhaps a year or two under 40; his father was born in Germany and his grandfather and great-grandfathers go back for 1,000 years. He married a German Jewish girl in Berlin. They had a little house and a little business and a little boy, and lived there until Christmas of 1941, when a large black Nazi car arrived at their little house and took away his wife and his little boy. The next morning another car arrived and took him away, and he spent the next four or five years in various concentration camps, miraculously surviving, until I found him in Belsen last August as vice-chairman of the Central Committee of Displaced Persons. He has never heard of his wife or his boy since. He will never hear of his wife or his boy again.

What do hon. Members think ought to be done with Mr. Wohlheim? Send him back to Berlin? No, I do not believe there is anybody who would do it. Send him as a refugee or exile or alien to some other country that might be induced to receive him as an act of charity? No, if there is any other fate open to him. If he wants to go to a land in respect of which we are pledged to create a national home, where he will be no stranger and no exile but a returning son back to his own land and people to live his own life in his own surroundings, is he not entitled to go?

It is said, why only Palestine? I have given some reasons why Palestine is the only possible place for some of these people, but suppose one agrees that the whole problem cannot be so solved and that other nations must take their share of responsibility and discharge their obligations, which is, after all, an obligation upon the conscience

of all the world. Statements are made in Debate about international refugee associations and agreements. The Colonial Secretary probably knows—if he does not know, I recommend him to consult the Foreign Secretary—that the International Refugee Organisation under U.N.O. is not concerned with the Palestine problem at all, but is concerned with displaced persons as a whole. They made careful inquiry among all the nations of the world to see what proportion, if any, would be taken by each. I have the documents—the detailed answers. I beg the House to accept it from me that it amounted to just nothing whatever. I heard an hon. Member asking about South America. But they have selected the refugees, imposed conditions as to time and place of residence, as to not living together, as to language, as to race and as to religion; and the result is that those States are not available to any of the persons for whom this question is the real question—none at all. I should not like to accuse the Lord President of the Council of being deliberately cynical. I am sure he had no intention of being deliberately cynical, but to say that we have done our share and that we have given a lead in discharging our obligation to the Jewish survivors of this holocaust because we have taken in 170,000 Poles—was he really intending to laugh at us? Is it some sort of bad joke? That is how it would be regarded everywhere in the world in a situation which has been exacerbated time after time by slipshod statements of that kind bearing no relation whatever to the facts and inflaming passions everywhere where the matter is of vital importance.

For weeks and months we have pressed the Home Secretary not to take in vast numbers, but only this—that if we find in a displaced persons' camp in Germany some surviving man or woman or child whose only relatives left in the world are living in comfort in this country and are willing to take them here, let just those come in. That has nothing to do with Palestine, that has nothing to do with the National Home, and it has nothing to do with any wide political problem of any kind. Just that handful of people who have anybody else left in the world and have been luckier than their comrades and associates in that they have some relatives surviving here—let them come in. After weeks and months we got an announcement of a narrowly limited series of categories designed to let these people in. That was in January. What the position is now I do not know, but but up to three weeks ago not one person had come into the country under that scheme. And we talk about discharging our obligation and taking our share of the responsibility. America is going to take 53,000. That is their normal quota. That is nothing to do with Jews or displaced persons. That is the exact quota that they would have taken if no war had occurred, if no Jew had been killed, and if there had been no displaced persons in the world. It is the quota resumed after six or seven years. It is laughable to talk as though this was a practical suggestion for dealing with an immediate difficulty. We know, they know, everybody knows that it is only words to say that the responsibility must be shared by all other nations. There is a community ready to receive these people. The 600,000 Jews who live in Palestine, who won Palestine back from the desert, form the one solid haven of refugees that is open, the only place in the world where they want to go, and the only place in the world ready to receive them. Yet for twelve solid months a Socialist Government in this country has kept them out, preaching patience and restraint, preaching non-violence. It is so easy, is it not? There they sit in your concentration camp yes, still waiting for any word of hope from this country.

Your enemies can take your life; your enemies can take your property; they can take your house; they can take your livelihood; they can take everything from you—breath itself—but only your friends can inflict upon you the last refinement of cruelty, of raising hopes every morning which they disappoint every night. But for their restrictions on immigration at that time, hundreds of thousands of people might have escaped from Europe in time before ever the war occurred. They did not look to them for help, they looked to us for help, they looked to you for help, and you promised them help. You make people desperate in that way. If you drive them to despair, it is not really enough, after that, merely to rub your hands in sanctimonious horror and indignation at the insane, desperate things that they then do.

I agree with the President of the Board of Trade in his own approach to it today. Certainly, let us try to be constructive now; let us deal with the difficulties as they are, and see what is our way out.

We hear now that this scheme, or something very like it, was prepared long ago, before the Government came into office at all. We hear from Mr. Manningham-Buller that this scheme was presented to the Anglo-American Committee and rejected by them. You have the situation now when one joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry unanimously rejects what the next Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry unanimously accepts. That is the situation.

There are three fatal defects in it. The first fatal defect is that it does not deal with the 100,000 who, everybody knows, must go into Palestine. It is quite true that the scheme says that they shall go in within twelve months; but within twelve months from what? Does it mean twelve months from the day on which this scheme comes into operation, and what day is that? Nobody knows. So it is twelve months from an unspecified date—indeed, within twelve months that may never occur at all, because what does the Government say about it? The Government says that this scheme can work with the acquiescence of both parties, and we are to have a conference to see if we can get the acquiescence of both parties. Yet the Government have already been told that one party will not come. I hope I am wrong about that, but I thought the Arab Higher Committee in Palestine had said that they would not come and would not discuss with the Jews the future of Palestine. If they have not said that, so much the better and they will come.

However, suppose they do come. Their view has always been that Palestine cannot take more Jewish immigrants. That was their case in 1938; that was the case to which Mr. Neville Chamberlain's Government yielded. I say yielded not because of its merit, not because of its right, but yielded to force, yielded to violence. Suppose they still say so. What will the Government do then about this 100,000—not about the scheme, but about the 100,000? Are you not still saying—and if you are not, please make it clear, because it is most important—at the moment it looks as if you are still saying that the 100,000 will come in within 12 months of the day when the

Arabs agree to let them in. The Lord President said within 12 months from the day on which the scheme comes into operation. It is only the White Paper with one remove. I doubt very much whether that was the Government's intention, but certainly that is what the scheme says, and I appeal to the Government to remove that one, at any rate, of the three fatal defects—that it does not deal with the fate of the 100,000 whose ultimate fate can only be the one agreed unanimously by everybody. If they are to go in, if you know they are to go in, say that they are to go in and give a time limit when the thing is to begin. Do not make it part of the lesser of your transitional measures. It cannot be part, because it does not depend on them.

What is the second fatal decision? I heard the Lord President say that virtually this leaves the control of immigration in the hands of the separate provinces; that although it is actually exercised by the central government in the sense that it is the central government which issues the certificates, the central government will act only on the advice of the provinces. The province is to determine the economic absorptive capacity, and the central government have only to see that the economic absorptive capacity is not exceeded.

That sounds very plausible, and if there were no history in this matter it might be accepted. But, as the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition said, until 1938 the economic absorptive capacity was the test, and the Agency determined how many they could economically absorb. Having decided how many they could economically absorb, they went to the High Commissioner, precisely as they will have to do under this scheme, and he said, "No." I think there was one occasion on which he said that 60 per cent. of certificates could be absorbed. That was in the days when, as I say, the economic absorptive capacity was the test, and that was exceptional—in most years they got 10, 15 or 20 per cent. When the High Commissioner, to whom this power is reserved, under this scheme, considers whether he will agree with the Jewish province when it says, "We can take so many, give us so many certificates," will he be advised by his Council, on which the Arabs will have equal representation with the Jews, or will he act in this matter without anybody's advice? If he is going to act on the advice of the Council on which the Arabs are present, look what opportunities for friction and delay are introduced. It may very well be that as a result of a long inquiry and, perhaps, an appeal to the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, the province may ultimately get its way. But, by that time, two or three years will have been wasted, and they will always be behind the economic absorptive capacity. Why in the world, if the President of the Board of Trade was right, if the issue of certificates by the Central Government is a mere formality, if they will be issued whenever the province says it can do with them—if that is the position, what is the point of reserving it to the Central Government at all? Why not say, plainly, and put the matter beyond doubt, that the provinces will be able to control their own immigration, without anybody's fear or check?

The third thing which I think is a fatal defect in this transitional measure is this. Economic absorptive capacity, yes, but for what? For the creation of a National Home, and the admission of some hundreds of thousands of people for whom there is no other place? That cannot be done in a too limited area, and we cannot take anybody else's land with which to do that. It is always asked, "Why do the Jews want to take something where somebody else lives? Why cannot they go where there is nobody, and build it up themselves?" That is precisely what they have been doing since 1917. Nearly all the land on which they live is land which they reclaimed from malarial swamp and desert. When it is said that they have great capital behind them with which to do that, it should be remembered that it is the pennies and shillings of the poor from all over the world, and most of the money went into the pockets of Arab landlords, from whom the malarial swamps were obtained in the first place. They did nothing with their money, but spend it in Cairo and Haifa.

To reclaim waste land is precisely what we are prepared to do now. There is no need to take any Arab land at all. There is the Negeb, in the south, which is only a desert, but what does the scheme say about that? Nobody knows whether it will ever be cultivable or not. That is what they said of Palestine in 1917. The Jews might be wrong, the Agency might be wrong. They say they can cultivate it. Mr. Stokes asked a question the other day. He wanted to know whether any British technical experts had examined the scheme. He was told, "No." I do not know what deduction he draws from that, but the deduction I draw is that the administration have not been interested in it for 25 years. Otherwise, they would have had technical experts examining it long ago. I suppose British experts will always be right, and the others will always be wrong. But, suppose the technical experts are all wrong, then nothing would be given away. All we say is, "Give us this desert, and we shall try to make it blossom, as we made the Vale of Jezreel blossom. We will take our despised and rejected, we will take our survivors, we will take the victims that no one else wants, and put them in the desert and make it their flower of civilisation, as we have made Palestine in the last 25 years." Why keep cavilling? What is the object of keeping that in abeyance? What is it hoped to gain? Is it to be another apple of discord to throw between Arab and Jew? Give it to us now, and let us make it flourish.

We are asked to take the Jews to some other place which is not cultivated, and which is not someone else's land, and there are 2,000 miles of desert which we think we could make live and flourish. Why keep it out of the scheme? If these three things were put right we would not have a final solution—but who can deal with final solutions in this matter, or indeed, in any other matter?

Mr. Silverman then read quotations from Mr. Herbert Morrison's speeches describing the wonderful things he saw in the Jewish settlements in Palestine, of the Jewish idealists, many of whom, he said, were now in concentration camps.

Mr. Pickthorn: I have always been anti-Zionist and have never disguised it. I was an almost pre-natal anti-political Zionist. I was concerned with the matter in 1918, after the Balfour Declaration had been issued, but before the thing had been generally accepted and interpreted and become a permanent establishment. I have no authority to speak for Palestinian Arabs, but I cannot but believe that these are the three things which in the whole of the proposals

now set up seem to them to be what really matters. If only there were to be a 100,000 more Zionist immigrants at once, said the hon. Gentleman. Secondly, if only the Zionists were to decide what is the economic absorptive capacity for the future. Thirdly, if only they are to control the Negev. I quite see that from this point of view if these "if onlys" were adjusted, then everything would be highly tolerable. The Mandate did not come into existence until 1923. So it is very easy to remember the way the thing happened wrongly, very easy to think that this or that is the result of something else when really the events came in reverse order. In view of that, and in view of the relationship between the Mandate and the League of Nations, which has now long gone, and the relationship between the Mandate now and the United Nations, which has hardly yet come—I do not know which one of us who uses the words "United Nations" with any consciousness of what those words used to mean really can attach very much meaning to the relationship between the "United Nations" and the Mandate—in view of these things I do not think too much stress should be laid upon the Mandate. I thought my right hon. Friend was a little unfair when he talked about the pro-German party in Iraq.

I now come, in the main, to the remarks made by the Lord President of the Council, and especially to the White Paper which was issued on acts of violence. Look at page 2 and see about the Hagana being a whole-time military organisation, and so on. What I want to ask is this. If you look at the Mandate to see what is the constitution and function of the Agency, you will see that the constitution and function of the Agency are to act in co-operation with the Mandatory Power in certain connections, and I would like to ask the Government whether this Government has considered, not this minute, but in the course of the last twelve months, whether the Jewish Agency, really having this sort of relationship to an Army which has become this sort of Army, could really continue to go on being the appropriate body for the functions for which it was intended. There was a time when the Arab Higher Committee was clearly not appropriate, from our point of view, for its functions, and it was removed to the Seychelles.

Mr. Janner: Would the hon. Gentleman tell the House exactly where in the Mandate the Arab Higher Committee were mentioned for the purpose of co-operation?

Mr. Pickthorn: I never said that the Arab Higher Committee was mentioned for the purposes of co-operation. The Jewish Agency is in the Mandate, and it is made quite clear what sort of a body it is intended to be, and, therefore, the argument is all the stronger that when it becomes, as it seems to me quite clear it did become some time ago, inappropriate and had fallen out of step with the prescribed functions, and, therefore, His Majesty's Government ought to have considered the question of its continued validity.

I should like to ask some questions about the telegrams, especially the ones beginning on page 4. I should have hesitated to ask questions about the telegrams had it not been for the speech yesterday of Mr. Grossman. That speech, and the glosses he put on the telegrams and on the relationship between the Hagana and British Military Intelligence, did seem to me to make it necessary that certain specific questions should be asked. When we read, in these telegrams, "To London," who is London? Presumably it was not just addressed to London and left to some clerk in the telegraph office to find out whom it most concerned. Who is Hayyim? If His Majesty's Government knew, I am sure they should tell us. I turn to the new official plan. I am quite certain that neither that plan nor any other will do, unless you persuade the Arabs very early on that you are consulting them about it.

Mr. Wilkes: We have heard to-day a great deal of the wide, general problem, and I wish to ask certain questions—I think they are pertinent questions—about the operations which are now proceeding and, also, to deal with the general background in the concluding portion of my speech.

I happened to be in Greece during the operations which were carried out there. I watched the British troops enter the country and, from the hills, I saw the first Commandos approaching the southern Peloponnese. I saw there the immense burden which a complicated political situation imposes upon military commanders who are, usually, quite unfitted to bear this burden for, in all conscience, they have enough to worry about. In dealing with the present movements of troops and the operations now proceeding I would reinforce the plea made yesterday in this House that we should send a Cabinet Minister, or some political adviser of real Cabinet calibre, to advise the generals and the brigadiers in Palestine who are bearing such a heavy burden. Political mistakes were made in Greece by the military which cost us very dear. During the next few days when, possibly, the psychological atmosphere of Palestine and the psychological relations between the Jewish population and the British military will be fixed, perhaps, for months to come, I am most anxious that no further mistakes shall be made.

What is the object of the present military operations? Are they to track down the Irgun terrorists, or are they to disarm the Jewish population? As to which or both, we ought to be able to have a frank, full and open answer because, if the object is to disarm the Irgun and to capture the terrorists, we are not doing this in the way in which it can be achieved. But, if it is to disarm the Jewish population, then let me say at once, bearing in mind the fact that between 1936 and 1939 1,000 Jews were killed by Arab terrorists and that His Majesty's Government, quite properly, are committed by reasons of a British military mission in Cairo to re-equipping and rearming the Egyptian Army, and committed also, again quite properly, to arming, training and officering the 16,000 of the Arab Legion in Transjordan, that, if it is the disarmament of the Jewish population which is the object of this operation, it ought to be made clear that this disarmament in Palestine is going to be a mutual and reciprocal operation and that the Arabs there will also be disarmed. But if it is to disarm and to capture the Irgun terrorists, I should like to put the following questions to the Government and to have an answer to them tonight. The Irgun represents a right-wing, Fascist, terrorist, brutal, murdering organisation controlled by a terrorist and Fascist Right Wing party.

Mr. Oliver Stanley: I always understood that the difference between the ordinary Jewish party in Palestine and the Revisionists had nothing to do with the economic position, but with the speed with which they wished to establish a Jewish State in Palestine—the one by violent methods and the other by gradual methods.

Mr. Wilkes: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman does not expect me to go into details of the philosophies and doctrines held by the different political parties. I do not wish to pursue that matter, and if "Right Wing" is unpleasant to hon. Members opposite, I shall withdraw the phrase and substitute "the Fascist terrorist organisation of the Irgun."

If the intention is to capture these people why, when the Jewish Agency was closed down, were the offices and headquarters of the Revisionist Party who control the Irgun left open? Why is the Revisionist Press, certainly up to 24 hours ago, allowed to go on with its aggressive, militant, racial propaganda? When in June and July these outrages were committed, certainly in the large majority of cases by the Irgun, why were the Socialist settlements searched? Was it expected to find the Irgun in settlements organised and run by the Histadruth? Why is the only paper in Palestine now closed down, so far as my information goes, a paper called "Haaretz," which is a Liberal paper and which, indeed, has often attacked the Jewish Agency for being too militant? I believe there are important and vital political mistakes which are now being committed in Palestine. We are giving the maximum of provocation to the most moderate elements in Palestine, and it is for this most important reason that I must ask the Government to send out political advisers, and, more especially, a Cabinet Minister, to advise the military in Palestine on the difference between a Socialist and a Fascist because, believe me, it was not often apparent to our generals and brigadiers in Greece.

With regard to the present situation in its broader aspects, the plan that has been put forward by the Government has, at least, this immense advantage. It does break the terrible circle of counter-terrorism and killing. I wish it had been put forward months ago. I think that even now with certain modifications it offers a real hope of going forward, because now at long last, 12 months after the election of a Labour Government, the phrase "restoration of law and order in Palestine" is no longer the restoration of the White Paper or the state of affairs which was condemned as illegal, so far as the Mandate was concerned, by the majority on the Permanent Mandates Commission in 1939. The phrase "restoring law and order" has, indeed, a hollow ring if it means the restoration of a state of affairs condemned by the only authority competent to judge, and when one remembers that the White Paper meant that the Mandate was being infringed and was not being carried out. At least, we now have a break in this sombre history. At last "restoration of law and order" means a state of affairs in which this new plan can be discussed—but, I would add, discussed, I think, by responsible Jewish leaders only if three things are done. Public acceptance or discussion of this plan means a great sacrifice for the Jewish people in Palestine and it means the sacrifice of many pledges made. It means the sacrifice, very largely, of the terms of the Mandate. Whether the pledges made and the Mandate were good or bad, hardly comes into the argument, but acceptance of this plan means a real sacrifice, and I am one of those who believe that this problem in Palestine will not be settled without sacrifice by Arabs and Jews.

The second point concerns the Negev. I would remind hon. Members that the Woodhead Commission in 1938 showed the way, because this Commission, which was by no means deemed a friendly one to the Jewish point of view, stated:—

"There are large parts of the Beer Sheva sub-district now almost entirely unoccupied which the Jews ought to be given an opportunity to develop forthwith, and that even as regards the occupied portion of the sub-district, it would be wrong to take such action as would exclude that prospect."

The third point concerns this question of the economic absorptive capacity. The economic absorptive capacity of the Negev today is nil. The economic absorptive capacity of any desert is nil. Those words mean very little. They have bedevilled the whole discussion of Palestine economics. What matters is the economic creative potential of any district. One cannot judge that until one has, at least, seen what has been done in other parts of Palestine, where the economic absorptive capacity was deemed to be almost nil. We can only let the people go there and gradually increase as the area and scope of the agricultural operations increase. After all, what could be more sacred than the contract between the Labour Party and the Jewish people of Palestine, and the whole Zionist cause, which was passed at conferences for the last 20 years? What could be more sacred than that contract? Yet, although there are changed circumstances, it has not been possible to carry out that contract. I am afraid that legally guaranteed rights are not sufficient in the present crisis.

Mr. Hopkin Morris: Mr. Churchill in his speech this afternoon reminded us of the White Paper of 1922, and reminded us of the definition there of the "Jewish National Home." The right hon. Gentleman is playing a great part on this stage, as he has played on the other stages of the world, but I think he ought to have gone on to remind the House of another thing. Why was it necessary to put a definition to the White Paper of 1922? Why was it necessary for the White Paper to say, not that Palestine was to be a Jewish National Home but that there should be a Jewish National Home in Palestine; and that the admission of Jews into Palestine should be in accordance with the absorptive capacity of the country to absorb them? Why should that be necessary? That was necessary because the Balfour Declaration had already been in force for five years. There had been rioting in 1920; there had been rioting in 1925. The Balfour Declaration was not accepted by Arab opinion in the Near East.

Another interesting coincidence is that the right hon. Gentleman, in making that observation today, was making it in criticism—mild criticism, it is true—of the proposals of the Government which had the agreement of the United States prior to his own definition. While the Peace Conference was going on in Paris, the United States had sent their own Commission to the Near East. President Wilson had sent his own Commission to inquire into the whole arrangement of the land that had been subject to Turkish rule. A Report was made by the two Commissioners, both distinguished Americans, Dr. King, the President of one of their colleges, and Mr. Crane, who subsequently became American Ambassador to China. Those two men went out to inquire into the position in Palestine prior to the definition in the right hon. Gentleman's White Paper. President Wilson was in favour of the Declaration made by Mr. Balfour, as he then was. The two Commissioners appointed by President Wilson, who went out there, were in favour of the Zionist interpretation of the Balfour Declaration. That

interpretation was, without qualification, the establishment of a Jewish State; there was no talk about "Jewish National Home" in the interpretation. The interpretation was: "A Jewish State." They went out there, and in their Report they were prepared to find that a Jewish State should be established. They inquired throughout the length and breadth of the land—through Syria, the Lebanon and Iraq—and they recommended serious modification of the extreme Zionist programme for Palestine of unlimited immigration of Jews, looking finally to making Palestine a distinctly Jewish State. They made a series of recommendations, the recommendations being that the claim for the National Home should be modified and defined; that, if an attempt was made to establish a Jewish National Home, not a Jewish State, in Palestine, there should be placed in Palestine an adequate military force to see that it could be done. The observation in their recommendation was that it would be embarrassing, in the opinions of the two United States Commissioners, for the United States to accept the Mandate, owing to the powerful Zionist opinion among their own subjects; and they recommended to President Wilson that he should reject the acceptance of the Mandate.

Today, in 1946, after the experience we have had in the meantime, comes another offer to the United States to come in. I am delighted to see that the present Government are inducing the United States to accept this, or any other scheme. As was pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol (Mr. Stanley), it would be easy at this stage to criticise any scheme that was put forward; cogent reasons could be brought forward against any one of them. To my mind there are two things that are important in the present circumstances. Whatever scheme is brought forward—we hope with the agreement of the United States—and accepted should be adhered to. One of the weaknesses of the last 25 years, and one of the weaknesses attaching to the right hon. Gentleman's own definition, has been the variation in the administration.

In 1930 Lord Passfield, on behalf of the Government, issued a White Paper in which a restriction was placed upon immigration and upon land transfers. I am not interested for the moment in saying whether this was right or wrong; what I am saying is that the Government, and this applies to any government, cannot vary its policy from year to year. In 1930 the Government of the day restricted immigration and land transfers, and the following year, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, as Prime Minister, wrote a letter to the Jewish Agency in which he said that the White Paper meant nothing of the sort and that the restrictions on land transfer and immigration should be removed. That was a variation from one to the other. Then comes the Peel Report. You can criticise the Peel Report, you can criticise partition or any scheme that can be put forward, and without agreement between the two sides no scheme can be carried out, and I therefore hope the invitations which have been sent out will be accepted both by Arabs and by Jews. But once agreement or something near to agreement has been reached, the Government should then pursue that policy without any later variations.

Great men at all times have been interested in building up their conception of the ideal State. From Plato to Augustine, from Augustine to Dante, from Dante to Machiavelli, from Machiavelli to Bacon, Bacon to Hobbes, Hobbes to Rousseau, one after another, at different times and in different countries, all have been interested in describing and building up, if they could, a conception of the ideal State. The best description I know, however, was written in two sentences by an old Hebrew prophet:

"A city where old men and old women can walk the streets with their hands leaning upon their sticks, and where the children can play in the streets thereof."

Look at the streets of Jerusalem today, or indeed of Europe. They are not safe for children to play in. I hope that as a result of this effort by the Government, and as a result of a serious attempt by both Arabs and Jews to come to an agreement, the streets of Jerusalem and of Europe shall become such that children can play in them in safety. No more important word was spoken from the Front Bench today by the right hon. Gentleman than when he said that he agreed that no Jew should be subjected to a prohibition or compulsion to which no other man was subjected. It is the one test of liberty that Jews and other races alike can live in the same conditions in every city of Europe. That is the condition. If Europe is not safe, neither will Jerusalem be safe. If it is not safe for the Jew, neither will it be safe long for anybody else. Conditions of safety are the same for all.

Mr. Janner: I think it would not be proper if I did not repeat again what has already been said, that the horror and indignation of the whole of the Jewish world has gone out against the atrocious crimes which were committed recently in Jerusalem. On the other hand, I ought to say also that the expression of opinion given by the general who is supposed to be dealing with the situation in Palestine must fill with horror all those who have read the words he used. Obviously, to describe all of those who have built what has been built in Palestine in such terms as "loathsome," and similar words, is going to such an extreme that no reasonable person could possibly tolerate the use of them.

Mr. Stokes: In raising the question of General Barker, may I ask him if he has studied the second telegram on page 4 of the White Paper, and does he realise that the gentleman referred to by the name of "Hayyim" is Dr. Weizmann?

Mr. Janner: I neither realise that nor am I prepared to accept the suggestions that have been made that these telegrams are connected officially with the Jewish Agency. I do not know what those telegrams are supposed to be, and I have heard very little to indicate exactly what they are, but I think my hon. Friend will agree, if he knows what has been performed in Palestine by the Jewish settlers in the period during which the Mandate has been in operation, he will agree that the very last word that can be used about those who built that great social enterprise, and who have been praised on all sides for its success, is the word used in the general's letter.

I think we ought to go back for a moment or two and examine what really has happened in the period during which the Mandate has been in operation. We have heard that political Zionists are to be distinguished from so-called cultural Zionists. What nonsense. The Declaration was sent to the Zionist Federation by Balfour. Balfour declared himself a Zionist. My right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition has declared himself such, and nearly everybody who

has spoken in favour of the Jewish National Home, on all sides of the House, has declared himself a Zionist; quite rightly.

The purpose of Zionism was not only to deal with the question of settling persecuted Jews. There is a misunderstanding on this point. The idea of the Zionist movement, which was inaugurated by Herzl, was to deal, once for all, with the homelessness of the Jewish people; an entirely different matter. The homelessness of the people is its tragedy, and Herzl conceived the idea that there should be a Zionist movement which should have as its object the re-creation of the Jewish National Home; and the only land in which that could be done, obviously, was that to which the Jewish people had been turning their eyes for so many generations. It was mainly desert then, it is true. It was practically useless. The Arabs inhabiting Palestine at that time were under Turkish rule. Some people talk glibly about the Arabs giving something away. It is not a question at all of what the Arabs were giving. It was a question of somebody buying land in a country which was practically unused, in which some hundreds of thousands of people were living, it is true, but in which the number of the population was never increasing, in which disease was rife. It was a question of their taking over a land which was practically devoid of any cultivation.

Mr. Stokes: It is not possible for nobody to be there and for disease to be rife at the same time.

Mr. Janner: When the Balfour Declaration was given it was given in order that the Jewish people might create a National Home of Palestine. They proceeded to do it, and they did it well. They recovered from the desert land which enables the 600,000 who are there now to live in comparative comfort. They provided conditions which enabled the Arab population in the land to increase. They swept disease from the areas which they were cultivating, and this benefited Jew and Arab alike. I cannot understand why a distinction is not made, when this matter is under discussion, between the Arab politicians who are mainly outside Palestine—and some who are within the boundaries of Palestine—and the Palestinian Arabs as a whole themselves.

Let me give the House a quotation from a statement made when a new Jewish colony was being created to commemorate the name of a great man who had fallen in the course of this war, Brigadier Kisch. A striking feature of the inaugural ceremony, only a few days ago, was the appearance of a delegation of Arab elders from the adjoining village of Mader, headed by the Mukhtar, Ibrahim Altayb, who welcomed the Jewish ex-soldier settlers, saying:—

"I have searched history and have failed to find any cause of enmity between the sons of Ishmael and Isaac, both of whom are sons of Abraham."

It was only intriguers, he added, who sought to sow discord between the peoples, and he expressed the hope that the present clouds would disperse, and that a peaceful time for all would soon begin. This took place almost at the present time. It takes place at a meeting between Jew and Arab who are living together in amity in Palestine. In that country there was a strike recently. Jew and Arab together entered into that strike, without any difference between themselves. I should like to ask the Government, my right hon. Friends, to take into consideration the fact that, in the main, the Arab working population, in Palestine itself, have been quite agreeable to the development of the Jewish National Home there; and that it is a question of preventing those who are outside from fomenting agitations, and, by such prevention, bringing peace and harmony within the boundaries of that country.

The terms of the Balfour Declaration were clear. I am not prepared to accept the suggestions, which legalistic quibbles introduce into this matter, at all. I am sure, as the Peel Committee said, that it was understood at the time under the Mandate accepted by 52 nations, that, ultimately, there would be a Jewish State in Palestine. It was stated in the Peel Report. Subsequently there were quibbles about that. It is perfectly clear that the question of the number of people who should be accommodated in that Jewish Palestine Home must be decided by the people of the Home itself. Why, today there is actually a shipload of people just outside Palestine who have escaped from the horrors of Europe and who have not been allowed to land in Palestine. I should like to bring the attention of the House back to 1939, when that pernicious White Paper was introduced, and when Members on all sides of this House strongly and stoutly condemned the suggestion that the proposal that Palestine, in so far as the immigration of Jews was concerned, was to have a closed door after a certain time.

The Jewish settlers in Palestine took their proper share in the war effort, and had it not been for the Jewish settlement the situation in the Middle East would have been much more critical. They played their full part in helping the Allies. I would ask my hon. Friend whether the Government will not reconsider the admission of the 100,000 people into Palestine who are waiting anxiously to get out of the desperate position in which they are. What reason can there be for not allowing them to enter Palestine? They are not asking for work or food from anyone other than their own kith and kin. I would ask the Government to allow them to enter without delay. When the Balfour Declaration originally came out it referred to some 45,000 square miles of land. That figure was reduced later by the White Paper of 1939 to 10,000 square miles. What is the figure being reduced to now? As has been stated, the Negev can be made fruitful. It can be made fruitful not only by the expenditure of labour and capital, but through the exercise of that good will and the ideals which inspired the building up of other parts of Palestine. It was not only a question of labour and capital, but a desire of these people to create something which made the desert bloom. In view of the fact that the Mandate is still in existence, and the declared policy of the Government is to abide by it, we should not turn aside at this stage and cut down the extent of the Jewish National Home. I ask the Government to reconsider the position, so that a full Mandatory National Home may once more be envisaged, which will be to the benefit of Palestine, to the benefit of this country and to the benefit of the whole world.

Mr. Henderson Stewart: It must be quite evident that the question at issue is not merely one which concerns political and economic development of a small country for whose administration we are responsible. It is a matter raising moral and spiritual issues of the highest importance. It is no wonder, therefore, that opinions upon it cut across all political parties. To me, this is a matter of conscience, where conscience alone must direct. We have all been declaring where we

stand, and for my part, speaking entirely for myself, I confess that I stand on the side of the Zionists. I have not a drop of Jewish blood in me, and I have no particular love for the Jewish people, although like others, I have many Jewish friends, whose friendships I cherish. But Zionism to me is something which is irrevocably linked with the Christian faith, with the Church of Scotland in which I was brought up. Perhaps it was that early association of ideas which caused me as a young officer at the end of the last war to be so thrilled by the Balfour Declaration when it was made public.

That action by the British Government seemed to me to be a fine and noble thing, in conformity with the faith and character of the British people. It was a declaration which committed the honour of this country; it undoubtedly enjoyed the almost unanimous support of the people at that time—it certainly won approval of every Party in the House of Commons. I have never been able to escape from that debt of honour, and when between the wars efforts were made to whittle down the Mandate, I did everything I could in my humble way to oppose them. In the great Debate on the White Paper in 1939, which was made a matter of confidence, as a supporter of the Government, I voted against the White Paper, and had I caught the eye of Mr. Speaker I would have spoken against it in the strongest terms.

I found myself in the Lobby on that occasion with some remarkable men. There were Mr. Amery, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Churchill, Mr. H. Macmillan, Sir A. Herbert and the whole array of the Labour Party, including the present leaders of this Labour Government. It is a tragedy that with the exception of those whom I have named, those right hon. Gentlemen who voted then for the honour and observance of the pledged word of England should now, as England's masters, trail that honour in the dust and savage yet again their own solemn promises. I scarcely would have thought it possible that in a single year of office and power right hon. Gentlemen opposite could have left such a dark trail of broken pledges.

Holding these views on our obligations, I confess that I was shocked to read of the first violent measures taken by the Government against the Jewish people in Palestine. I do not for one moment challenge the right and duty of the Government to maintain order in that stricken land, and suppress by all necessary measures the violence and inexcusable outrages recently committed. I abhor these outrages, and agree that they must be stamped out and order restored. But I ask, with the greatest earnestness, whether this method is the right and only way to restore order in Palestine. Can it possibly be the right way to provide tranquillity in this Holy Land, for which the whole world is responsible, and for which our country has a very special and high degree of responsibility? The present crisis in Palestine is not something which has newly happened. It is not a sudden mutiny which hard measures will quickly obliterate.

Palestine, especially since the end of the last war, has been a place of ever-increasing tension. Even the most uneducated person must have seen that crisis—outrage and calamity were bound to be the end of it all, unless broad, swift and statesmanlike measures were taken. It is not a new problem, and the Government must have known the problem and have recognised that only drastic alterations of conditions in Palestine would prevent that tension from exploding. What the House demanded, and what the country demanded, was a clear plan, firm decision and swift action by the British Government. Instead of that, we have had a succession of delays, subterfuges and crass and unforgivable blunders, such, for example, as the most unfortunate speech of the Foreign Secretary at the Bournemouth Conference. Even tonight the tale of delay, procrastination and misunderstanding is not finished. The proposals of the Lord President, so far as I have studied them, involve still further long delays. For example, we can do nothing until a meeting of the two sides has been called. I asked the President of the Board of Trade when he thought that would take place? He could not tell me. I ask would it be before the end of September?

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. George Hall): I am hopeful that it will take place in the middle of August.

Mr. Stewart: That is the first indication which we have been given, but I cannot see when these meetings will end. The delegates must consult their friends before reaching decisions. I cannot see His Majesty's Government taking decisions upon those decisions until Christmas. Yet time, surely, is the vital factor in this business. Before the Labour Government took office they had a plan. They said so. When they took office they could have carried out that plan, or the plan of the White Paper which the Coalition Government had been endeavouring to carry through, or the Anglo-American Committee's plan. They did none of those things.

Mr. Scollan: There was a complete change of circumstances in the interval.

Mr. H. Macmillan: The only change was that Labour came into office.

Mr. Stewart: Nothing is to be done to relieve the tension of which I have spoken until these two parties have met, discussed, gone home, decided, and then the Government have to decide what to do. Is this another example of lack of co-operation between this Government and America? It was not very long ago that the Lord President of the Council had to go to America because there was a misunderstanding. It is an incredible situation that a statement should have been made yesterday, based, as the Lord President himself said, fundamentally on acceptance and agreement by America, and that within 24 hours we should be informed that America, apparently, does not agree. The point which I am making is that Palestine, at the moment, is a place of enormous tension, and that if this matter is delayed without special emergency measures being taken immediately—and I am going to suggest one—that tension will not be lowered, but increased. Meanwhile—and I talk with some knowledge of this matter—young Jewish men and women in Palestine know that their friends, fathers, mothers and brothers are over here in camps of one kind or another, and cannot go to their National Home. A brother of mine sailed a week or two ago from Marseilles to Haifa. He joined a ship on which there was a considerable number of Jewish refugees going to Palestine. He has told me about it. He said that when they came out into the sunshine their bare backs were covered with weals and cuts imposed upon them by the Nazi persecutors. He said that it was a sickening sight and a demoralising thing to feel that the British Government—his Government—were the Government which were preventing these wretched people from getting to Palestine.

Mr. Stokes: Does it not demoralise the hon. Member still more that the Government do not accept them into this country? A proportion of twenty-five thousand.

Mr. Stewart: Is that going to help very much? Is that going to help at all in relieving tension in Palestine? The speaker then quoted a statement made by Dr. Dalton:

"It is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of any Jews who desire to go." That was the Chancellor of the Exchequer only a year ago. Is it to be wondered at that these wretched people in Palestine, as well as their more wretched friends and relatives over here in Europe, are utterly disappointed and desperate? That is the fact that is causing the trouble to-day. I do not condone it; I deplore it, but it is a fact we must face.

Therefore, the Government must now face up to this problem of the 100,000. I had said that it would take months before agreement is reached on this new plan. I say now that action must be taken on the problem of the 100,000. I say the settlement of this Palestine problem is intimately linked up with our future relations with America. Having regard to the sombre, grim scene that we have seen developing in Europe in these recent months, I say we cannot risk losing the sympathy and co-operation of that great democratic people. At all costs I would endeavour to hold their sympathy and friendship. If we act now in the way that I have suggested and grant these certificates as an act of faith we may succeed.

Mr. M. Phillips Price: The Government have made a most important statement on the Palestine situation, and I do not complain that they have waited some time before they have made that statement. I think that they were right to try to bring with them, as far as they could, public opinion in the United States. The process of self-education in foreign affairs amongst our Transatlantic cousins is a slow one. We must not forget that the elections for Congress are not very far off, and, unfortunately, politics are being played at the moment. That is a cause of much of the difficulty with which we are faced. On the other hand, I hope the Government will show initiative in this matter, and not trail along behind the coat-tails of Uncle Sam. I admit that Uncle Sam is important in regard to financing much of what is in the plan, but, at the same time, having regard to the situation that exists, I hope that they will take a lead in this matter.

I have always been an opponent of partition, largely on the ground that in a country the size of Wales—and that is what Palestine is—it is difficult to create two or still three States. But the gravity of the situation is such, the impasse so great and the outlook so menacing, that I would be ready to consider any plan which might be a solution. I have always thought that Palestine should be a Jewish-Arab State with the Arabs in a majority, because they are the original inhabitants. Just as I have opposed the extreme Zionists' view, so always have I opposed the extreme Arab view that Palestine should only be an Arab State, because we cannot have a country like Palestine, where the three great religions of the world have their roots, so populated that one race completely dominates it. There must be a multi-racial State in Palestine, but the Arabs are entitled to the majority, because they are the original inhabitants.

The time is coming too, when there will be an Arab League; in fact there is one now. I hope that the Arab League will incorporate all the Arab States of the Middle East, and I would like to see Palestine part of that League as a multi-racial State like Lebanon or Syria. If this aim is to be achieved the Jews must abandon once and for all any attempt to dominate the Arabs in Palestine and be content with a minority and a cultural home. British Governments in the past should never have allowed the Zionists to put the interpretation on "national home for the Jews" that they have, and they are much to blame for allowing them the liberty of putting their meaning on the term. We have also allowed too long a deliberate confusing by the Zionists of the condition of the displaced Jews in Central Europe with immigration into Palestine. It is the duty of the Western Powers to do their part in these matters and then I think I know what the Arab reaction is going to be.

Colonel Pensonby: This Debate has ranged over all the issues which affect Palestine—moral, spiritual, sentimental, and historic. I myself feel that it is time we left ancient history behind, and looked to the future. Here is a crisis of great magnitude, and here are the Government trying hard to find a solution. For a short time I would like to say a few words about the basis on which the Government's proposed settlement of the problem is founded. It is purely economic, and is linked up with what has been mentioned several times in the Debate, namely, the limit of the economic capacity of the country to absorb a certain number of people. I will give the House only one or two figures, which are set out to some extent in the Report of the Anglo-American Committee. The country has an area of 10,000 square miles, and if one deducts the 4,000 square miles of the Negeb, which can be used, possibly as a cushion in the future, there is a balance left of 6,000 square miles. As the Report of the Committee says, there is now a population of 1,765,000, of which 554,000 are Jews, and 1,061,000 are Moslems.

If one thinks of the future—and it is to the future that we must direct our attention—one finds that in 1959, even if there is no emigration or immigration of Moslems, they will be up to about 1,700,000, and if there is no immigration of Jews, a supposition which is impossible, they will be up to 664,000. At the present time there is a population of 179 to the square mile, and if one leaves out the Negeb, a population of 336 to the square mile. Let us compare those figures with the figures for two countries with which we are familiar, Wales with 8,000 square miles, and a population of 2,500,000, and Belgium with an area of 11,750 square miles, and a population of 8,250,000. Hon. Members will realise however, that Wales derives its prosperity from its coalmining, steel, ship repairing, and so on, and that Belgium is a prosperous manufacturing country with coal, iron, zinc, lead, copper, all its prosperity deriving from mineral wealth. There is no comparison with Palestine, because, except for the Dead Sea potash, there are practically no minerals in Palestine, and no raw materials.

Therefore, we come to the problem that we find in many of the countries which we administer of having an almost wholly agricultural country. Even then, a great deal of the country either cannot be taken into cultivation or is already cultivated. Any hon. Member who has walked, as I have done, over the Plains of Sharon and the Vale of Esdraelon will remember the crops of barley, wheat, maize, grape-

fruit, and so on. Practically all of that land is under cultivation. If one climbs the Hills of Ephraim and Galilee and the Mountains of Judæa, one sees how bare and rocky they are; the vineyard, olive groves and fig groves are made on terraces to hold the scanty water supply. Thus the country is almost entirely agricultural, and very much of it is either cultivated or incapable of being cultivated. Yet we are planning, or thinking of planning, to put more people into that country. When I saw the figures in the Report of the Anglo-American Committee, I wondered how it was possible for them to recommend 100,000 immigrants now, having regard to the fact that in a very few years, with the natural increase, there will be far too many people in the country. I do not wish to put a spanner into the machinery, but it is very important that we should all realise what will happen in the future if we try to force an increased population into what is already an over-populated agricultural country.

Mr. Lipson: I speak as one who is deeply grieved at recent happenings in Palestine. To me it is heartbreaking that so-called Jews should have been guilty of such murderous outrages as took place in Jerusalem. I use the phrase "so-called Jews" because there is nothing in the teachings of Judaism which could possibly justify an action of that kind. Judaism is a way of life. Its ways are ways of pleasantness and all its paths are peace; there is no place in Judaism for murder and outrage. I say that these terrorists have done an injury to the Jew which Hitler was not able to do; he destroyed their bodies but their glory and their honour remained. These terrorists have inflicted an indelible stain on the name of the Jew and if they persist they will destroy the Jewish soul. He is no friend to the Jew who tries to justify or to condone in the slightest degree the action of these terrorists. The fact that 6,000,000 Jews have been killed by the Nazis is not the slightest justification for the murderous and treacherous attacks on British soldiers who saved the remaining Jews from a similar fate. If it had not been for Britain and the stand she took in 1940 what would there be today of the Jewish National Home in Palestine? How many of those who vilify this country would be free to do so today if Britain had not stood firm in 1940?

It is necessary to say these things, and I should like the House to know that there are many Jews in this country and in other lands who are and will ever remain grateful to Great Britain for what she has done. May I say that I heartily welcome the plan which His Majesty's Government have brought forward and I think that it is to their credit that they have not been so provoked by recent happenings in Palestine as not to bring forward a plan for dealing with the problem there. I doubt if there is any other country in the world which, if exposed to similar provocation, would have continued with its policy and have produced a plan to try and settle the Jewish problem in Palestine. I believe that this plan which has been put forward by the Government is one which is practicable and which can work, provided there is a will to work it, and I hope that both Arabs and Jews will be willing to co-operate with His Majesty's Government in an attempt to make it work. Personally, I prefer the proposals put forward in the plan to partition because these proposals do not close the door; they leave open the possibility of realising what I think most people most appreciate is the best solution in Palestine—a Palestinian state in which Jews and Arabs would co-operate.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. George Hall): It is remarkable that we should have a two days' Debate on the question of Palestine with so little political feeling displayed, so many constructive speeches made and so much agreement as to the policy before the House. The Debate will encourage His Majesty's Government to go forward, we trust with the full cooperation of the Government of the United States, to get the conference going as quickly as possible, to reach a settlement of a matter which has baffled Governments over the last quarter of a century.

The right hon. Gentleman Mr. Churchill dealt in his speech with the Mandate and the growth of the Jewish National Home, not only in respect of population, but also in respect of the development of that part of Palestine which has been occupied by the Jews. I do not think that it is yet fully realised by a number of people what has been done during the last 24 or 25 years, notwithstanding the great difficulty with which Palestine and the Palestinian Administration have been confronted. The right hon. Gentleman rightly said that the Jewish population in Palestine had increased six-fold or seven-fold whereas, as he also rightly says, the Arab population has increased by some 100 per cent. It is not only a question of population. It is a question of what has been done. I regret very much that I have not yet had an opportunity of visiting Palestine to see the result of that work but I would remind many people who criticise His Majesty's Government of the terms used by the hon. Member for Cheltenham (Mr. Lipson) who addressed the House in the most moving manner, as he usually does. He pointed out, as he always does point out, what the National Home owes to the British people. Others refused the Mandate when it was offered, and it was the British who accepted it. Who is there in this House who will say that as far as it has been possible, taking into consideration the conflicting interests of both races, that Mandate has not been faithfully carried out? I think it has.

The right hon. Gentleman stressed the point of Anglo-American co-operation in this matter. It has been surprising to hear some of the speeches which have been made during the past two days blaming the Government for delay and vacillation. The whole of the time that was taken up from August of last year until last Friday was spent in seeking Anglo-American unity or co-operation in dealing with this very grave problem. I am hopeful, as I have already said, that we shall obtain that co-operation until the scheme has been put through. The right hon. Gentleman also talked of giving up the Mandate. He said that unless we obtained that co-operation we should name a date and put the Palestinian problem at the feet of the United Nations. The Lord President said yesterday that it is our intention, if the scheme is found acceptable, that it should be embodied in a trusteeship agreement for Palestine. In that event we shall prepare the draft of a trusteeship agreement for submission to the United Nations as soon as it is practicable, but His Majesty's Government have already made it clear that while they are anxious to place mandated territories under trusteeship government, their agreement to do so must naturally depend upon their being able to negotiate terms which, in their view, are generally satisfactory, and achieve the objectives of the Charter and arrein the best interests of the inhabitants of the territories concerned.

We hope that the forthcoming Conference with the Arabs and the Jews will assist us in achieving the fulfilment of those conditions. It is not easy to obtain a trusteeship agreement under the trusteeship organisation which exists at the present time. There is a lot of preparatory work to be done. There has to be a designation of the States strictly concerned, and one can imagine that in negotiating a trusteeship agreement for Palestine, surrounded as Palestine is by Arab States, it will not be very easy for the trustee, whether it is a single trustee or an Anglo-American trustee, or, indeed, a United Nations trusteeship, unless we can get the Arabs and the Jews to come into conference, as we propose getting them to come, with a prospect of obtaining an agreement. If that agreement is obtained, there is no reason why we could not go on, as has been suggested by so many hon. and right hon. Members in the course of this discussion, and obtain a trusteeship agreement.

It is not easy to lay the Mandate at the feet of U.N.O. unless there is an organisation to take its place, and that is what we are hoping to do. I thought the right hon. Gentleman towards the end of his speech brought in a good deal of politically controversial matter, not helpful at all in obtaining American co-operation with the scheme. I thought it was, as my hon. Friend said, very mischievous, and sitting here and hearing what he said, I thought that notwithstanding his desire to obtain Anglo-American co-operation, he did his best to destroy it. Why did he bring Egypt into this discussion? He knows that at the present time negotiations are proceeding for a new agreement with Egypt. In this connection we have undertaken to withdraw British troops from Egyptian territory. We still maintain our belief that the policy we have adopted is the right policy, and the policy best calculated to secure British interests. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of strategic interests. Why, our greatest strategic safeguard in the Middle East is the friendship of its Governments and its peoples. We do not intend to lose sight of this principle in Palestine, any more than in Egypt. If a solution is found that is just and right and acceptable to both peoples, we shall not allow military considerations to prevent us from adopting that principle.

We listened, as we always listen, to a very moving speech from my hon. Friend Mr. S. Silverman. Naturally, as we expected of him, he devoted a good deal of his speech to pressing for the immediate admission of the 100,000 Jews into Palestine. His Majesty's Government have made the position quite clear. They wanted the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee accepted as a whole. It was felt, and, indeed, rightly so, that, with all that is involved in the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine, it was a burden greater than His Majesty's Government could carry. The cost involved is a very heavy cost, and, indeed, as is laid down in the plan and was mentioned by my right hon. Friend the Lord President, as soon as this plan comes into operation, a plan already exists for the intake of the 100,000 Jews into Palestine. If not, then it will be for His Majesty's Government to consider the whole position. That is the agreement with America—

Mr. Pickthorn: I am sorry to interrupt, but I really do not understand him. He said: "That is the agreement between His Majesty's Government and, we hope, somebody else." Is it an agreement or not?

Mr. Hall: That is the agreement we hope for between ourselves and the United States of America.

Mr. Pickthorn: I see, it would be an agreement if there were one, or will be if there is one?

Mr. Hall: I wish the hon. Member would not try to be funny.

Mr. Pickthorn: I am not trying to be funny.

Mr. Hall: Perhaps not. The hon. Member might show a little bit of the breeding of the university.

Mr. Pickthorn: I am a very modest member.

Mr. Hall: I would put it to him, as to everyone who has talked of the plan, that this is a provisional plan, both in regard to the suggested central legislature and in regard to the Negeb. It is quite open for discussion between the two parties when they meet, although it is not easy to deal with the Negeb scheme in view of the conditions which exist in the Negeb at the present time. The recommendation is that there should be a survey taken as soon as possible, because, from information we have received from the Negeb, it appears that there is very little prospect of more than a very few people obtaining a livelihood unless there is a considerable amount of preparatory work done in the first instance. His Majesty's Government are prepared, we hope in conjunction with America, to undertake that preparatory work.

Sir William Darling: If America does not agree, I take it that His Majesty's Government will still proceed with the plan.

Mr. Hall: I have already pointed out that His Majesty's Government will have to consider the position. They just cannot tie themselves to the very huge cost which is incurred in putting a plan such as this into operation. I think that ought to be made clear.

Mr. Scollan: Do not tell us that if they cannot afford it, they cannot carry out the plan.

Mr. Hall: It is a matter, of course, which His Majesty's Government will have to take into full consideration. Questions were asked whether the Jewish Agency can go on in view of its relation to the illegal army. It was made quite clear by the High Commissioner when the action was taken originally, that it was not taken against the Jewish Agency as such. It was taken against members of the Jewish Agency, those members who, in accordance with the telegrams which are published in the White Paper, were involved in acts for which the High Commissioner thought he was justified in detaining them. There were others not in any way involved, and others whom he did not deem it necessary to detain. The hon. Member for Cambridge University put a straight question to me as to who is "Hayyim." We are of the opinion that "Hayyim" is Dr. Weizmann. But, at the same time, I would like to say that Dr. Weizmann, in accordance with the information given in the telegrams, was not in any way, and has not in any way been, involved in anything which is illegal or, indeed, in adopting anything which would lead us to think that he was anything other than a great Zionist, and a very great friend of this country.

Mr. Pickthorn: This makes it a little difficult:

"If Hayyim meant us only avoid a general conflict not isolated cases"—

cases of at least violent sabotage—

"send greetings to Chill for the birth of his daughter."

Mr. Hall: That has been very carefully considered and, as far as we are concerned, as far as I am concerned, it would not involve Dr. Weizmann.

Mr. Stokes: May I ask why did he send "greetings to Chill"?

Mr. Hall: He did not.

Mr. Stokes: Well, he did.

Mr. Hall: No, he did not; we have no knowledge that he accepted the telegram.

My hon. Friend Mr. Wilkes asked what was the object of the present operations in Tel-Aviv, and the number of persons who have been detained. Up to 10 a.m. today, 664 suspects have been arrested, of whom some are already identified as dangerous terrorists. We had a very interesting speech from the hon. Member for the English Universities (Mr. K. Lindsay) yesterday. He dealt with the educational work which was being done by the Jewish Agency, and pointed out the disparity between the educational work of the Arabs and the Jews. It is true, and in the Report of the Anglo-American Committee the reasons as to the disparity are fully given. I am sure that the hon. Member has seen in the Report of that Committee the amount of money which has been spent upon the maintenance of law and order and the amount which has been spent on education. Had it not been for that fact, not only would there have been a much greater increase in the amount spent upon education, but in that spent upon health services as well. I hope that the time will soon come when the educational standard of the Arabs will be greatly raised from what it is at the present time.

Other speakers have referred, in sympathetic terms, to the hard task which our Armed Forces, including that fine body of men, British and Palestinian, the Palestinian Police, are carrying out, and the grievous losses they have suffered from time to time at the hands of political extremists on both sides. May I stress also, perhaps with greater emphasis than we have yet heard, the part played by the civil servants in Palestine throughout all these years of strife, and the catastrophic losses sustained by them in the King David Hotel outrage last week. These non-combatant civilians, Arabs, British, Jews, Greeks and Armenians, men and women of all ranks, from the higher civil servants to humble cleaners, have been wantonly sacrificed for no offence and no cause. In the face of discouragement, hostile propaganda and violence, they have done their duty, impartially and steadfastly, for the good of the country and of the people they serve, irrespective of politics and communities. They have been an excellent body of people, and it has been my pleasure to examine their work at a distance, and to have seen all the fine work they have done. I know that the House regrets very much that such a number of fine public servants have been sacrificed in the way in which they have been sacrificed.

My hon. Friend Mr. Crossman raised the question of co-operation between the Government and the Jewish Agency. For a time, the Jewish Agency co-operated with the Government, as the Mandate required, and in certain spheres it has continued to do so, but in other directions it has abused its privileged position, and become the instrument of an extreme nationalism. I well remember receiving a Zionist deputation, led by the Chairman of the Agency, a week or two after I had entered upon my present office.

With no recognition of the rights of the existing non-Jews in Palestine or the mandatory obligations of His Majesty's Government towards them, he not only demanded the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine, but demanded fundamental changes in the constitution, and also asked that there should be an immediate declaration by His Majesty's Government in favour of a Jewish state. Even in all the important spheres of public order, the Agency has in recent months failed in its duty of co-operation with His Majesty's Government. The outrages in Palestine on the night of 31st October last, which are described in the recently published White Paper, evoked an equivocal condemnation from the Agency, who published a statement containing the following words:

"The Agency repudiate recourse to violence but find its capacity to impose restraint severely tried by a policy which Jews regard as fatal to their future."

Some newspaper reports of speeches made by members of the Jewish Agency, which I feel sure my hon. Friend has seen, are an indication of their attitude towards the work of the administration. My hon. Friend also raised some matters in which he alleged that there had been co-operation between the Palestine administration and the Hagana. I have made inquiries concerning this matter. There was some truth in the fact that the Jewish Agency, after the death of Lord Moyne, made available to the police a number of suspects, of whom about 300 have been traced and arrested, and some small stores of arms were uncovered. Prominent members of the Hagana were included, and a few of them were detained. He also referred to the alleged assistance given by the Hagana to the police authorities in Jerusalem concerning the discovery of sites connected with the new rocket weapon for shooting up the King David Hotel. I am informed that no assistance was at that time or any other time rendered by the Hagana to the Palestine police and that the police discovered that these weapons were mortars without any assistance either from the Agency or from the Hagana. Even assuming that everything the hon. Gentleman said is correct, I am sure he will agree that it cannot in any way justify the various acts of terrorism, particularly the blowing up of the King David Hotel.

The hon. Member also raised a question with regard to the Palestine police force, and said he hoped that it would not become a "Black and Tan" organisation. I feel sure the House, while they will not expect me to deal with the past history of the Palestine police force, will agree when I say there is no danger at all of this police force, which is made up mainly of British men, becoming anything like a "Black and Tan" force.

Dr. Morgan: The "Black and Tans" were British, too.

Mr. Hall: Reference was made to the conditions under which the Palestine Police are working. He hoped that all the "plum jobs" would not go to the regular soldiers. The number of appointments to commissioned rank in the police and mobile forces from among officers serving in the Army is about 20. About 30 men serving in the Palestine Police have been promoted to commissioned rank. Promotion to the regular police force is almost wholly from the ranks and, apart from the Inspector-General, the great majority of the senior officers have been promoted from the ranks.

We have come to the conclusion that it will be best, at the outset of the scheme which is before the House, to make no arrangements for the immediate constitutional development at the centre. There is, at present, no common ground between the two communities, and any

representative Central Government would consequently be a house divided against itself. The strife, which we trust will soon disappear, would almost inevitably endanger the scheme right from the start, and we are of the opinion that it is very much better that the plan should continue, as it exists, as a basis for discussion. The plan recognises this obligation both to the Arabs and to the Jews in Palestine, and, while admitting the difficulties of reconciling that obligation, it is hoped that, with the growth of common interests and good understanding, and a determination to face these complex issues from the standpoint of the wider interests of the United Nations, it will make a consequent contribution to the foundations of international security, both from the point of view of the Jews and that of the Arabs alike. It holds out the promise of a new and better era, and it is hoped that the influence of world opinion will strengthen those elements, hitherto too little regarded amidst the partisan clamours, which are working in co-operation between all who dwell in Palestine. If that co-operation can be achieved, Palestine will stand as an example of a country, which has overcome those divisions of creed and race which have so often constituted fatal obstacles to successful endeavour.

Mr. Stokes: Will my right hon. Friend answer the question as to what is meant by "to London" in the four telegrams? They cannot just have arrived at the General Post Office. To whom were they addressed?

Mr. Hall: No, I cannot answer that.

Mr. Stokes: Will he answer it next Session?

Mr. Hall: There can be no doubt at all that the telegrams were sent, and the telegrams were received by certain persons. We cannot say who has received them. That is the difficulty.

Mr. S. Silverman: Will he make it perfectly clear that the Jewish Agency have declared publicly that none of these telegrams ever reached them?

Mr. Hall: It is not suggested here that the Jewish Agency has received them.

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay: Several Members asked whether the suggestion had ever been put forward that the British Government or the United States Government should themselves offer to take some immigrants from Europe. Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether that suggestion has ever been made?

Mr. Hall: It has been made through the International Refugee Committee which has been set up and is examining the position at the present time, not only in respect of the United States and this country, but also in relation to the Dominions and other countries?

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

PALESTINE: QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT HOUSE OF COMMONS

June 26th, 1946.

PROPERTY REQUISITIONING.

Mrs. MINTHROP asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what powers exist in Palestine for the requisitioning of buildings; whether these have also been kept in force for a further period of five years as in the case of land; and, as the retention of powers to requisition land for five years ahead in peacetime are likely to lead to hardships for the ordinary citizens of the country, if he will reconsider the position.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: The powers for requisitioning buildings in Palestine are the same as those for requisitioning land to which I referred in my reply to my hon. Friend on 5th June, as the term "land" in that legislation includes any building or other fixture on that land. These powers will be retained in force only so long as circumstances require and the situation is continually kept under review.

BRIGADIER GLUBB (INTERVIEW).

Mr. CHARLES SMITH asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the interview given to the "Daily Mail" on or about 27th May, by Brigadier Gubb, Commandant of the Transjordan Frontier Force, in which he attacked the report of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine and stated that if its recommendations were implemented there would be an immediate Arab uprising throughout the Middle East, was authorised by His Majesty's Government; whether he will take steps to prevent British officers giving unauthorised newspaper interviews; and what action has been taken in this case.

Mr. McNEIL: Brigadier Glubb, I am assumed, gave no interview. A statement by Brigadier Glubb that the opinions attributed to him were totally unauthorised has since been published in the Middle Eastern Press. Brigadier Glubb is not commandant of the Transjordan Frontier Force. He is not a serving officer of the British Army. He is employed by the Transjordan Government as Commandant of the Arab Legion. In the circumstances, the second half of the Question does not appear to arise.

Mr. KEELING: Assuming that some such report had been correct, would this officer's action have been any worse than that of the hon. Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman) who, although a member of the Commission, publicly criticised —

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise from this Question.

July 2nd, 1946.

MUFTI OF JERUSALEM.

Mr. OLIVER STANLEY asked the Prime Minister in the House of Commons whether he has any further statement to make concerning the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem.

THE PRIME MINISTER (Mr. ATTLEE): His Majesty's Government are negotiating with the Egyptian Government on this matter, but no agreement has yet been reached, and I do not consider it advisable to give any further details at this moment.

Mr. STANLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman let the House know as soon as he is in a position to give any further information?

THE PRIME MINISTER: Yes, as soon as I know I will let the right hon. Gentleman know, and I will ask him to put down a further question.

July 3rd, 1946.

ARMS CONVICTIONS.

Brigadier MACKESON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons to-day how many Arabs and Jews have been convicted of offences in connection with arms and explosives during the last six years; the number of each community sentenced to imprisonment on such charges; and the numbers of each community sentenced to imprisonment with special treatment.

Brigadier MACKESON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will give an estimate of the number of small-arms weapons at present in possession of, respectively, the Jewish and Arab communities in Palestine.

Mr. GEORGE HALL, replying to both questions, said it became a capital offence to carry arms on November 18th, 1937. The death penalty for this offence was revoked on June 15th, 1940, and reinstated on March 23rd, 1944, and was still in force. Since November 11th, 1937, 188 Arabs and six Jews had been sentenced to death for those offences. Of those, 142 Arabs and one Jew had been executed; in addition, two Jews had been sentenced to death, but the sentences had not yet been confirmed. The High Commissioner has been asked to furnish the information asked for by the hon. Member, but its collection would involve some delay.

Mr. JANNER asked Mr. Hall if he had included in those figures of people charged with carrying arms those who were under the Mufti in Germany carrying arms against this country during the war.

Mr. HALL said that that was another question.

Brigadier MACKESON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement regarding instructions sent during the last six months to the High Commissioner for Palestine and the military authorities regarding internal security and the collection of arms; if any definite instructions have been sent to ensure that the most active steps possible should be taken to disarm the civilian inhabitants of Palestine; and if he will now publish such instructions or correspondence.

Mr. HALL: It would not be in the interests of public security to make any statement additional to the information already given to the House by the Prime Minister last Monday.

Mr. S. S. SILVERMAN asked whether he could draw Mr. Hall's attention to the last part of the question. While no one would ask him to publish all the correspondence, was it not very much to the public interest that he should publish the instructions, if any, which he did send to the High Commissioner on that matter?

Mr. HALL: No, I still think it is not in the public interest to disclose those instructions.

Mr. SILVERMAN asked Mr. Hall if he could say that he sent instructions on matters of that kind with their world-wide repercussions, without the House ever knowing what those instructions were?

Viscount HITCHINGBROOKE asked Mr. Hall if he were prepared to add anything to the Prime Minister's statement.

Mr. HALL: I have already said—No.

July 4th, 1946.

DEBATE ON PALESTINE.

Mr. CHURCHILL, Leader of the Opposition, asked what were the Government's intentions with regard to debates on India and Palestine, "which are looming on us." Two days would be required for India. The same was true of Palestine, in which Members of all Parties were interested.

Mr. MORRISON: As to the number of days, I cannot say. We can discuss that through the usual channels. With regard to Palestine, it is the intention of the Government that facilities for a debate should be provided. If the Leader of the Opposition will agree, conversations can take place for the amicable arrangement of business.

Mr. CHURCHILL: We will exhaust every possibility through these channels.

July 8th, 1946.

ACTION AGAINST JEWISH AGENCY.

Mr. J. FOSTER asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons today whether it was with his authority that an official of his Department announced to the Press that the President of the U.S.A. had been informed beforehand that His Majesty's Government proposed to take action against the Jewish Agency in Palestine.

Mr. HECRON MCNEIL (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs): The Press were not told by an official of the Foreign Office that President Truman had been informed in advance that His Majesty's Government proposed to take action against the Jewish Agency in Palestine. Speaking with full authority, the News Department of the Foreign Office told the Press that the United States Government had been informed of the action taken in Palestine, but had not been consulted. They added that, some ten days in advance, a warning had been conveyed to the United States Government that His Majesty's Government took a very grave view of the renewal of terrorism in Palestine.

July 9th, 1946.

TREATMENT OF DETAINEES.

Mr. JANNER asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons today whether he is aware that complaints have been made regarding the treatment of detainees in Atlit detention camp; that in consequence of a protest and hunger-strike organised by them, the G.O.C., Palestine, has promised to introduce a new order into the camp; and if, as independent persons were allowed to visit the Latrun detention camps, he will cause an immediate investigation to be made by similar persons in respect of the Atlit camp.

Mr. GEORGE HALL, Secretary of State for the Colonies: I am aware of the complaints to which my hon. Friend refers. As regards the second part of the question, there has been no organised hunger-strike, but on 30th June, the day following the operations, some detainees refused their lunch, though they took it later, as a protest against their finger-prints being taken. No promise has been given that new arrangements will be introduced in the camp, nor is this necessary.

As regards the last part of the question, facilities were given to Press correspondents to visit Atlit on 5th July, and some 10 journalists availed themselves of the opportunity. Facilities have also been given to two Rabbis to visit all detention camps. They have done so,

and have reported that the administration of all camps on the whole is excellent and that the detainees have asked them to express their thanks for the sympathetic attitude of the camp authorities. Specific complaints made by individuals concerning alleged ill-treatment are being investigated.

THE PROMISED PALESTINE DEBATE.

In the course of his speech on Colonial Affairs in the House of Commons, Mr. GEORGE HALL, Colonial Secretary, said that in view of the Debate on Palestine last week, and the further Debate which is to take place shortly, the Committee will not expect me to make any statement on Palestine in the course of this general Debate on Colonial affairs.

Mr. OLIVER STANLEY, in the course of speech, said: "We have been promised an opportunity to debate Palestine by itself, and, frankly, I think it would be quite wrong, when we have an opportunity to-day for general discussion of Colonial policy, to introduce a subject which, of itself, is of sufficient importance to warrant a separate discussion. On the subject of Palestine, I will only reinforce the plea which I made last week, and that is to ask the Government to do everything that they can to speed up their decision in this matter, and, having come to a decision, to allow the House to debate it, and, finally, to settle it one way or the other."

July 10th, 1946.

DAMAGE CAUSED BY SEARCHES.

Dr. SEGAL asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons what mechanical aids were used in the searches for illegal arms carried out at Yagur, near Haifa, how many trees were uprooted; what other damage to property was caused; and what estimate can be given of the total damage inflicted on this settlement by the searches for illegal arms.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: Various mechanical implements were used to uncover caches of arms, the presence of which had been indicated by mine detectors. Some 20 vines were damaged by tracked vehicles passing through a section of the vineyard near the settlement buildings, where it was necessary to uncover concealed arms caches. This settlement was literally honeycombed with them. In all 33 such caches were found, some in bogus culverts and dummy sewers, others beneath floors and above ceilings or in secret cupboards behind false panels. Some were in the children's dormitory and school.

The arms discovered included 92 two-inch mortars, 5,267 mortar bombs, 5,017 grenades, 10 machine-guns, 321 rifles, 78 pistols, 1,404 magazines, 425,000 rounds of ammunition, in addition to quantities of demolition explosives and other military stores and equipment.

The damage necessitated by the operation of unearthing these munitions of war was in the circumstances not only significant but entirely justified. I am convinced that no other Army in the world would have been capable of carrying out such a difficult task with so much consideration and forbearance.

ARRESTS ON SABBATH.

Dr. SEGAL asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies for what reasons the Palestine Government compelled orthodox Jews to desecrate their Sabbath when carrying out their arrest; whether he is aware of the affront to religious feelings caused by this action; and what steps he now proposes to take to remove the painful impressions aroused in Palestine by this action of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply given by the Prime Minister to a supplementary question by the hon. Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher) on 1st of July, namely that this matter was left entirely to the local authorities to decide.

Dr. SEGAL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this debasing of religious and administrative standards could only be justified in time of war; and does he realise that no action on the part of His Majesty's Government could have done more to persuade the Jewish population that it is now engaged in a holy war in defence of its religious liberties?

Mr. HALL: It was necessary to carry out this action with the least possible inconvenience, and it was necessary to leave the matter, as stated, in the hands of those who were best competent to judge.

Mr. WILSON HARRIS: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman who it was who began the acts of war?

Mr. S. SILVERMAN: While one understands that the decision on time and place and method in such a matter would have to be left to the local authorities, in view of the fact that the local authorities chose an entirely unsuitable time, has my right hon. Friend asked them for any explanation of why they chose the early hours of Saturday morning?

Mr. HALL: No, Sir, they have not been asked for any explanation; indeed the results of the action itself have justified the action taken.

ARRESTED TRADE UNION LEADERS.

Mr. JANNER asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies the number of leaders and officers of Jewish trade unions, Socialist parties and co-operative societies who have been arrested in recent operations in Palestine.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: The information requested by my hon. Friend is not in my possession, but I am asking the High Commissioner for Palestine for a report, and will communicate with my hon. Friend when this is received.

Mr. MICHAEL FOOT: In view of the fact that the right hon. Gentleman has such detailed evidence about arms secured in various places, is it not extraordinary that he has not detailed evidence of the number of men taken into custody by the British administration in Palestine?

Mr. HALL: We have the numbers, but it is difficult to classify them, because a very substantial number have already been released.

ARREST OF JEWISH AGENCY MEMBERS.

Mr. BENN LEVY asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is yet in a position to publish the evidence of complicity in terrorism which prompted His Majesty's Government to incarcerate the leaders of the Jewish Agency in Palestine.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: No, Sir. The matter is being handled with all possible speed, but I am not yet in a position to say when publication will be made.

July 11th, 1946.

UNITED STATES AND ARRESTED LEADERS.

Major LEON-BOURNE asked the Prime Minister in the House of

Commons what procedure was adopted in notifying the U.S. authorities of the action to be taken in Palestine.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Within a few minutes of the hour at which the measures taken in Palestine on June 29th were begun, President Truman was given full information on these measures by His Majesty's Ambassador in Washington.

Major LEON BOURKE: Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that on July 1st, in Washington, two statements were made, the first implying that information had been given, and the second contradicting it? Will he give some assurance that the State Department at least is fully aware of what happened?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I have given full information, but I cannot be answerable for what statements are made elsewhere.

ANGLO-AMERICAN CONVERSATIONS.

Mr. GAMMANS asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the terms of reference of the discussion between British and U.S. representatives on Palestine are confined to technical questions or include the resettlement of displaced Jews in any part of the world.

Mr. McNIL: The conversations now about to begin between British and American officials will cover the whole range of subjects dealt with in the ten recommendations made by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. The first of these recommendations deals with the general problem of finding homes for all displaced persons.

DAMAGE AT W.L.Z.O. HEADQUARTERS.

Mr. ORBACH asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware of the complaints that the headquarters of the Women's International Zionist Organisation in Palestine was entered on June 29th by British troops by means of dynamiting the entrance; that the interior of the premises was badly damaged and that money and goods were removed; whether these actions were carried out under the orders of the commanding officer; and if he will hold an inquiry into these complaints.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: The main door of the headquarters of the Women's International Zionist Organisation in Palestine was found locked and barricaded when troops sought an entry on June 29th. No watchman was on duty. It was necessary to blow open the door, and a certain amount of damage resulted, but no more than was absolutely necessary to effect entry. The High Commissioner has reported that in the course of the searches at Tel Aviv, of which this was one, it was necessary to remove the contents of certain safes, but that in every case an inventory was made under the supervision of an officer. Precautions were taken to ensure that there was no unauthorised removal of valuables. I do not consider that a special inquiry into this incident is required.

LONDON DEMONSTRATION.

Mr. McADAM asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has considered a resolution from a mass demonstration of Jewish citizens, held in London on July 7th, a copy of which has been sent to him; and if he has made any reply thereto.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: The Prime Minister has received and considered the resolution to which my hon. Friend refers, and an acknowledgment has been sent.

WHITE PAPER ON PALESTINE.

During the discussion of the business of the House, **Major LEON BOURKE** asked the Leader of the House whether there is any likelihood of a White Paper on Palestine being published in the near future?

Mr. MORRISON: I am afraid I cannot hold out any promises about that, I am bound to say that my own recollection of a promise of a White Paper is a bit hazy. I am not at all clear about it. If no promise was given, perhaps I had better say nothing about it; if a promise was given, I will inquire into it.

Mr. SYDNEY SILVERMAN: Whether or not a promise was given about the publication of a White Paper, my right hon. Friend will remember that we have continually been promised, for many weeks, a statement by the Government on its constructive policy in Palestine, and we have not had it yet. The Prime Minister's statement last week was only concerned with administrative action and contained no information about policy. When may we expect a statement on policy?

Mr. MORRISON: It is intended that there shall be a discussion before the House rises for the Summer Recess.

July 12th, 1946.

POSITION OF ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE.

During the discussion in the Committee stage of the Diplomatic Privileges Bill in the House of Commons, **Mr. Commander BRAITHWAITE** said: There was recently appointed an Anglo-American Committee in reference to Palestine. The Committee spent some time in that country, and has reported, and its report is still under consideration by His Majesty's Government, who seem to have even more difficulty in making up their mind in this matter than in others. What would be the position of the Anglo-American Committee in Palestine? Surely, it was an international function that they fulfilled. I am making no criticism of the Danubian Commission or of the Coal Organisation, or of anything of that sort. The right hon. Gentleman paid tribute to those organisations. I am sure he would also pay tribute to the members of the Committee on Palestine. They, surely, come within the same definition of a body engaged in a task of international importance, one which, it is hoped, will help to solve an extremely thorny problem in the Middle East. Will the members of the Anglo-American Committee be regarded as envoys within the meaning of this Bill?

Mr. PAGET: I think that what the hon. and gallant Gentleman has overlooked is the word "organisation." "Organisation" means a corporate existence. The Palestine Committee was composed of individuals appointed by countries to do a job. It did not have a corporate existence. This provision will apply to an organisation having a corporate existence. It is a legal point.

Mr. NOEL-BAKER, in reply, stated that as to the Anglo-American Palestine Commission, the answer was given by my hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Paget). It is not an organisation; it is a purely temporary body. While I think it should have independence, it is obviously not the kind of body which ought to come under this Bill.

July 15th, 1946.

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION.

Mr. MIRANDO asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the

House of Commons why permission has been refused for a Parliamentary delegation to visit Palestine.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: It is not considered that such a visit would be opportune or helpful at the present moment.

DESTRUCTION AT W.L.Z.O. HEADQUARTERS.

Mr. McADAM asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has considered the letter from the Higher Broughton and Crumpsall Women's Zionist Society, with the copy of the telegram sent out by the Palestine W.L.Z.O. executive, forwarded to him by the hon. Member for North Salford; and what steps does he propose to take to investigate the grave charges of deliberate and wanton destruction contained in the telegram.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: I have seen the letter to which my hon. Friend refers. I am unable to add to the reply given to a question by my hon. Friend the Member for East Wiltshire (Mr. Orbach) on July 11th.

JEWISH SETTLEMENT IN BRITISH GUIANA.

Mr. GAMMANS asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if, in order to assist the problem of displaced Jews in Europe, he is prepared to renew the offer made by His Majesty's Government in 1939 to provide land and the necessary facilities for Jewish group settlement in British Guiana.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: The proposal presents difficulties and has been the subject of much inquiry in the past, but His Majesty's Government will give the matter further consideration if it is clear that this is desired by responsible Jewish authorities.

July 16th, 1946.

COST OF MAINTAINING ORDER.

Mr. KEELING asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons what is the estimated cost to his Department of maintaining order in Palestine during the current financial year.

Mr. DALTON: No useful estimate can be framed since the course of events in Palestine cannot be foreseen.

Mr. KEELING: Could the Chancellor say how much expenditure in the last three months has been due to the rash promises made to the Jews by his party before they took office?

Mr. GALLAGHER: What about the hon. Member's own party?

EVIDENCE AGAINST JEWISH AGENCY.

Major LEON BOURKE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he expects to be able to publish the evidence against the Jewish Agency, as he promised on 1st July, before the Debate on Palestine.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: Yes, Sir.

July 17th, 1946.

DEATH PENALTY FOR CARRYING ARMS.

Dr. SEGAL asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons if he can now see his way to ease the existing tension in Palestine by revoking the death penalty for the carrying of arms and confining it only to the illegal use of arms.

Mr. CRECH JONES: Consideration has been given to this suggestion but my right hon. Friend is unable to agree.

NUMBER OF JEWS ARRESTED.

Sir H. LUCAS-TOOTH asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many of the Jews who were arrested in Palestine on or after June 29th last have since been released and how many are still being detained.

Mr. CRECH JONES: 2,675 were arrested, and releases up to July 16th were 677. On that date 1,998 were still in detention.

SEARCH OF JEWISH AGENCY BUILDING.

Mr. G. THOMAS asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any member or official of the Jewish Agency was present during the search of the premises of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem.

Mr. CRECH JONES: The answer is in the negative.

Mr. G. THOMAS asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Arab officials were present during the search of the premises of the Jewish Agency, and for what purpose.

Mr. CRECH JONES: No Arab officials or other Arabs were brought to the Jewish Agency building for the purpose of taking part in the search of the premises or for the examination of papers belonging to the Agency. The search and selection of papers was carried out entirely by experienced British officers.

DISARMING OF ILLEGAL ORGANISATIONS.

Mr. KEELING asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies for what reason the disarming of the illegal military organisations in Palestine, condemned by the Anglo-American Committee, has been discontinued.

Mr. CRECH JONES: The plans for the search of settlements put into effect on 29th June have been completed, and the High Commissioner has expressed the hope that there will be no further need for widespread military action. There is no question of discontinuing action against the illegal organisations and any further outbreaks of violence will be dealt with with the utmost vigour.

July 18th, 1946.

THE INQUIRY REPORT.

Mr. JANNER asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons whether he will now make a statement as to the steps it is intended to take to implement the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry that 100,000 certificates be authorised immediately for the admission into Palestine of Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution.

Mr. McNIL: Discussions on all the recommendations made by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry are now proceeding between British officials and representatives of President Truman's Cabinet Committee on Palestine and related problems. I cannot make any further statement while these discussions are in progress.

PALESTINE DEBATE.

Mr. JANNER asked whether the Leader of the House would give an indication when they were to have a Debate on Palestine.

Mr. MORRISON: We anticipate that there will be a Debate on Palestine the week after next.

Major LEON BOURKE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is proposed to have a two days' or a one day's Debate on Palestine?

Mr. MORRISON: That will be discussed through the usual channels. I cannot say at the moment.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it wise to

postpone the Debate over next week and have it the week after? If there is a Debate, it must be a full Debate, because a great many hon. Members, on both sides of the House, have views on this matter; and the views are by no means united on either side of the House.

Mr. MORRISON: That is very true, I appreciate that. We shall be willing to discuss this matter through the usual channels, but we must be careful not to get into the habit, on any subject of substance, of a two days' Debate becoming the standard. We will discuss it through the usual channels, in a quite friendly way.

July 23rd, 1946.

TERRORIST OUTRAGE, JERUSALEM.

Mr. EDEN (by Private Notice) asked the Prime Minister whether he has any statement to make on the bomb outrage at the British Headquarters in Jerusalem.

THE PRIME MINISTER (Mr. ATTLEE): Hon. Members will have learned with horror of the brutal and murderous crime committed yesterday in Jerusalem. Of all the outrages which have occurred in Palestine, and they have been many and horrible in the last few months, this is the worst. By this insane act of terrorism 93 innocent people have been killed or are missing in the ruins. The latest figures of casualties are 41 dead, 52 missing and 53 injured. I have no further information at present beyond what is contained in the following official report received from Jerusalem:

"It appears that, after exploding a small bomb in the street, presumably as a diversionary measure—this did virtually no damage—a lorry drove up to the tradesmen's entrance of the King David Hotel, and the occupants, after holding up the staff at pistol point, entered the kitchen premises carrying a number of milk cans. At some stage of the proceedings, they shot and seriously wounded a British soldier who attempted to interfere with them. All available information so far is to the effect that they were Jews. Somewhere in the basement of the hotel they planted bombs which went off shortly afterwards. They appear to have made good their escape."

Every effort is being made to identify and arrest the perpetrators of this outrage. The work of rescue in the debris, which was immediately organised, still continues. The next-of-kin of casualties are being notified by telegram as soon as accurate information is available. The House will wish to express their profound sympathy with the relatives of the killed and with those injured in this dastardly outrage.

The High Commissioner, Sir Alan Cunningham, has returned to Palestine by air.

As the House knows, His Majesty's Government are at this moment in consultation with the Government of the United States with a view to arriving at proposals for a just settlement of the Palestine problem, which will be placed before representatives of both Arabs and Jews. His Majesty's Government have stated, and state again, that they will not be diverted by acts of violence from their search for a just and final solution of this problem.

Mr. EDEN: While associating myself and my hon. Friends on this side of the House with the Prime Minister's expressions of horror at this dastardly and inexcusable outrage, and also with the words of sympathy he has expressed towards the relatives of those who lost their lives, I would like to put one question to him. I quite understand that the right hon. Gentleman may not be able to give details, but we would like to be assured that the Government intend to take every step in their power here, and to provide local authorities with any sanction they may need to take any steps in their power, to prevent, if possible, a recurrence of any such incident as this.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Certainly. The right hon. Gentleman will realise that I am awaiting a full report from the High Commissioner and the military authorities as to the steps that are required by them.

Mr. LIPSON: While associating myself with everything that the Prime Minister said, will he consider whether there is anything which the Jews in Great Britain, who are shocked by this murderous and senseless outrage, which brings dishonour and shame to the name of Jew, can do to help to put an end to such outrages, and in particular, will he call upon the religious and lay leaders of the Jews in this country, including the leaders of the Zionist Organisation, publicly and unreservedly to condemn these cowardly outrages, and to pledge their full and loyal support to the Government in any action they may take to suppress them?

THE PRIME MINISTER: Certainly, I will consider the suggestion of my hon. Friend.

Mr. SILVERMAN: May I, first, associate myself with every word that my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has said about the criminal insanity of this outrage? May I, next, ask him whether there is any credible evidence or any direct evidence so far that the perpetrators of it were Jews? Thirdly, may I ask him whether he appreciates that the continued detention in Palestine without trial of almost every moderate and responsible leader inevitably leaves the field free to the terrorists?

THE PRIME MINISTER: With regard to the first question, I have already stated that I have no information beyond what is given by the official report. It would be quite improper for me to try to make any conjecture beyond what I have got from the official report. As to the second part of the hon. Gentleman's question, it is quite incorrect to suggest that every responsible leader has been held in prison or anywhere else. I would say that the hon. Member does an injustice to the members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency by suggesting that arrests made of a certain number of persons included the whole of the responsible leadership of Jewry. It is quite untrue.

Colonel J. R. H. HUTCHINSON: Will the Prime Minister take note that there are in this country hundreds of ex-officers and men trained with the resistance movements during the war and, in order to further the admirable object which he has enunciated, will he consider using these people, who are well trained, to put down organisations of this kind, whether Arab or Jewish?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I shall have to depend, in regard to that, on the advice of our military advisers who will, I am sure, ask for any forces they require.

Earl WINTERTON: In view of the fact that the members of that most gallant force, the Palestine Police Force, are in some doubt about their terms of service, will the right hon. Gentleman make it clear that the relatives of those killed and also those seriously wounded will receive

exactly the same pensions as they would receive if they were killed in action, in view of the fact that they are fighting against as vile and treacherous a foe as the Nazis?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I understand that is the position, but I would like to give a considered answer. Perhaps the noble Lord will put down a question to my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. H. HYND: In considering the suggestion made by the hon. and gallant Colonel Hutchinson, will the Prime Minister be careful not to set up anything like the "Black and Tans"?

Mr. GALLAGHER: While joining in the strong expression of sympathy for the dependants of those who suffered as a consequence of this terrible outrage, may I ask the Government seriously to consider, in dealing with this problem of Palestine, the necessity of bringing about an independent Palestinian State where Arabs and Jews will have to co-operate together?

THE PRIME MINISTER: As the hon. Member knows, we are now considering with representatives of the United States of America what should be the permanent solution, and we are making great progress in those talks.

Major LAGGE-BOURKE: Is the Prime Minister aware that a report has already been circulated in this country from General Barker showing that he has for some time desired to take over the whole of the King David Hotel, and has been unable to do so and in view of that will the Prime Minister initiate early inquiries; and will he also publicly disclaim any association of the Government with the statement, which was reported in the "Jewish Standard" of July 12th to have been made by the hon. Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman), advising Jews to go underground and oppose the airborne division by all means other than violence?

THE PRIME MINISTER: With regard to the first point, I have not seen the statement by General Barker, but I am having an inquiry made into the position with regard to the King David Hotel. As for any statement of Government policy, that is made by responsible Ministers, and not by other individuals.

Mr. JANNER: Whilst expressing my deepest sympathy with those who have suffered and my horror at and condemnation of the dastardly actions which have been taken by these desperadoes, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is aware that these feelings are those of the Jewish communities of the world; that the Jewish Agency Executive and the National Council of Palestine Jewry have expressed similar sentiments and are desirous of suppressing those responsible as rapidly as possible?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I have noted that statement and welcomed it.

July 23rd, 1946.

CASUALTIES IN EGYPT AND PALESTINE.

Mr. MICKARD asked the Secretary of State for War the number of British Army personnel killed and wounded in Egypt and the number killed and wounded in Palestine during the months of May and June, 1946.

Mr. LAWSON: The returns so far available show that the following casualties occurred during the months in question: killed in Egypt nil, wounded fifty-one; killed in Palestine three, wounded ten.

CONDUCTED ARMY TOURS.

Mr. S. SILVERMAN asked the Secretary of State for War for what purpose Army welfare organisations of Palestine Command are organising and conducting tours for soldiers to inspect the settlement of Yagur; and why they are informed that the Jewish Agency has been favoured and encouraged by an unfriendly foreign Power, Great Britain's wartime ally, solely to challenge British military, political and economic interests in the Middle East.

Mr. LAWSON: I have no information on this matter; I have called for a report and will write to my hon. Friend.

PALESTINE EXPENDITURE.

Mr. KEELING asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the total of his Department's expenditure in Palestine during the most recent period of six months for which figures are available.

Mr. DALTON: £17½ millions for the six months to March 31st, 1946.

July 24th, 1946.

DESTRUCTION AT W.L.Z.O. HEADQUARTERS.

Mr. G. PORTER asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is now in a position to make a statement in regard to the destruction of the headquarters of the W.L.Z.O. in Tel Aviv.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: This building has not been destroyed. As regards damage sustained when entry was forced on June 29th, I have nothing to add to the reply given to a question by my hon. Friend the Member for East Wiltshire (Mr. Orbach) on July 11th.

PUBLICATION OF McNAIR REPORT.

Mr. STOKES asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will now publish the McNair Report on Jewish education in Palestine.

Mr. GEORGE HALL: The report will be published very shortly.

Mr. STOKES: Can my right hon. Friend say whether the report will be available in the library before the Debate next week?

Mr. KENNETH LINDSAY: Can I press the right hon. Gentleman on that point?

Mr. HALL: I am afraid that it will not be available before the Debate next week. We are doing everything that we can, but it must be published simultaneously in Palestine and in this country, and there has been some difficulty in getting copies to Palestine.

Mr. LINDSAY: Is there any particular reason why it should not be published simultaneously, within the next four or five days, in both countries?

Mr. HALL: I have considered that, but at the moment it does not appear to be possible. I will, however, look at the matter again.

Mr. STOKES: Can my right hon. Friend say whether the report condemns the extreme form of nationalist education conducted, and if it recommends a reform?

Mr. HALL: I would prefer that the matter was left until my hon. Friend sees the Report.

[We regret that owing to pressure of space, the debate in the House of Lords (July 31st, 1946), a number of questions in Parliament and other matter, have had to be held over.]

(Continued from page 175.)

Aviv that were searched were found stripped of practically everything they had contained.

The looting which accompanied the searches in many places—although perhaps of secondary political importance—had a very severe psychological effect on the Jewish public.

The official communiqué stating that the "first step" in the operations is virtually completed, does not imply that conditions have returned to normal. The Jewish institutions housed in the buildings of the Agency in Jerusalem have started work in temporary premises, but normal proceedings are hampered by the lack of files and documents which have been removed by the troops. In the settlements everything is being done to restart work, but in many places a large percentage of the workers are under arrest—in some places the entire male population. More than 3,000 people were arrested, the bulk of them people from the settlements. Efforts are being made to secure volunteers for work in the villages, and students as well as pupils of the upper classes in secondary schools are going out to help. In the meantime, the thousands of detainees are kept in camps, some of them in the detention camp at Latrun, where the members of the Agency are confined, others in temporary camps set up at various places. It was stated in Jerusalem that some of the detainees would be released, but nobody knows what to expect. Wholesale arrests were made in many places, sometimes because the settlers refused to reveal their identity, answering the questions of the police by saying: "I am a Jew in Palestine or a Jew from Givath Chaim, etc." Fathers from Tel Aviv visiting their children in the settlements were often arrested together with the other settlers, and even in the towns people were taken from their houses without explanations, and are still under arrest. No one can say what principles will be followed by the authorities in their decision as to who is to be released. The existing emergency regulations give the Government practically unlimited powers, everything being done by administrative measures, and there is no legal way to challenge them. It was reported that busloads of detainees are being transferred to a camp at Raffa, in the extreme south, and for the time being it is almost impossible to get in touch with anybody arrested. In order to understand how this state of affairs must affect the general public it should be borne in mind that connections between the towns and the settlements are very close and that to-day thousands of people are unable to ascertain the whereabouts of members of the family and of friends.

The position is most severe in Yagur, the Kibbutz near Haifa, where the military found a considerable amount of arms. At Yagur the whole settlement was combed for hidden arms. As these lines are written searches are still going on. The entire male population was removed—this happened also at another place—and heavy damage was caused to buildings. It is hoped that after a short time the troops will leave the settlement, and only then will it be possible to estimate the losses caused. It is, however, not a question of material damage only. The agricultural settlements were built up with so much zeal and devotion, and miraculously escaped destruction in wartime. It is therefore doubly depressing that gardens and vineyards, houses and fields should now be subjected to the hardships of a "military occupation."

Dr. Weizmann immediately demanded the release of his colleagues in the Agency and has been in touch with leaders in Jerusalem and in Tel Aviv. The municipality of Tel Aviv has called on its citizens to keep discipline and not to give way to despair. Mr. Harry Sacher arrived from London and members of the Executive were awaited from the U.S. The question of non-co-operation with the Government is considered as a possible measure to be adopted under the present extraordinary circumstances. It is stressed by many that whatever the course to be taken, it is of paramount importance not to endanger the Yishuv and the achievements of colonisation in every field. While it must be made quite clear to the Government that the Jews will do everything in their power to maintain their rights to further immigration and colonisation, the Yishuv must not allow itself to be provoked into actions which might cause irreparable damage. It is noted with satisfaction that during these days of bitter trial a ship with more than a thousand immigrants has been led into Haifa port.

GERDA LUFT.

[The above letter covers events only up to mid-July.]

THE ANGLO-PALESTINE BANK

Incorporated 1902

LIMITED

STAFFORD HOUSE, 20, KING WILLIAM STREET,
LONDON, E.C.4.

General Management - TEL AVIV

Branches:

Tel Aviv, Jaffa, Jerusalem, Haifa, Tiberias, Safad, Petah
Tikvah, Hedera, Hadar, Hacarmel, Rehovoth.

Affiliations:

The General Mortgage Bank of Palestine Limited, Tel Aviv.
The A.P.B. Trust Company Limited, Tel Aviv.

UNDERTAKES EVERY DESCRIPTION OF BANKING
SERVICE FOR BUSINESS WITH PALESTINE

"THEODOR HERZL"

by Joseph Fraenkel

10'6

Published by

ARARAT PUBLISHING SOCIETY LTD.

Obtainable from the Zionis Federation,
75, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1

Planned ★ Produced ★ Printed

Reflected in SALES

The printing you use can be termed the "mirror to your products." Good printing reflects the commercial possibilities and creates the desire to purchase. Economy in printing may not mean cheapness; it is not the initial cost but the business it attracts. Consult the Firm that will Plan, Produce and Print for your individual requirements at an economical price.

★ Telephone Temple Bar 2468

THE PRESS PRINTERS LTD

93, Long Acre, London, W.C.2

PRINTERS OF "THE NEW JUDÆA"