



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 II: Harold P. Manson File (Zionism Files), 1940-1949, undated.

Sub-series A: Main Manson File, 1940-1949.

Reel
103

Box
36

Folder
170

Oumansky, Ambassador, 1944.

CONVERSATION WITH THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR UMANSKY

The conversation was arranged by our chaverim in Mexico with the cooperation of Lombardo Toledano, Umansky's very close friend.

First, a few words about the atmosphere prevailing at the above meeting.

I arrived at the Villa San Jose Purua, together with a committee of five members, on Sunday, July 2nd, at about 10:30 A.M. (It takes 3½ hours by automobile from Mexico City to the above place.) On my arrival at San Jose I registered at a hotel (nearby the villa) and notified Umansky of my arrival. While waiting at the hotel together with the other chaverim, I expected that Umansky would send a messenger to inform us of the place at which we were to meet. To my great surprise he came himself. When I opened the door, Umansky announced: "My name is Umansky, I have come to greet Mr. Louis Segal".

We met cordially. Mr. Umansky asked me whether I wished to have anyone present during our discussion. If so, there could be only one member present. We joked on the manner in which to appoint the one member, and after the procedure was over (Chaver Solkes was appointed to be present at the conversation) Mr. Umansky said: "Now I'm inviting you to be my guests at my home." (The conversation was conducted in English, a language with which he is very familiar.)

Umansky made available to our disposal his library where our conversation took place. He ordered a number of drinks, adding that regardless of whether I would drink or not, I would have plenty to choose from.

I began the conversation with the following questions:

(1) How does he view the present Jewish situation? What actually happens to the Jews after the German armies retreat from their positions on the Russian front?

(2) How does he envisage the solution of the Jewish problem after the war in the European countries, taking into consideration all economic and political aspects connected with its solution?

(3) What is his attitude and the attitude of his government to the demands of the Jewish people with regard to the establishment of a Jewish state (commonwealth) in Palestine?

(4) Whether Russian Jewry will be in a position, after the war, to participate (together with the other organized sections of the Jewish people) in Jewish activities connected with the upbuilding of Jewish life and Jewish positions in European countries and in the crystallization of Jewish aspirations with regard to the upbuilding of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth?

Umansky: Please do not insist on getting a direct answer to all your questions. We shall have a general talk and discuss your questions as well as others. Should any of your questions, in the course of our discussion, remain unanswered, you will then be able to bring them up again.

Here he added the following: I beg of you, make yourself at home. Feel free in your discussion. I am well acquainted with your movement (the Labor Zionist movement). I am also acquainted with the attitude of your movement towards Russia, communism, etc. I am familiar, as well, with your personal approach to these questions. It is very likely that this led me to agree to this meeting, as we have a great deal to talk about. Here he remarked: A great part of my staff devotes much time in the research of whatever is written about Soviet Russia in any language on this continent. I receive daily resume's of their findings. Some of them are being forwarded to my government.

I also beg you to consider our conversation (which is to be free and open-hearted) as off the record and unofficial, and to regard whatever will be said by me as my own personal opinion and not the opinion of my government or any other governmental body.

He concluded: I am cognizant of the various rumors going about in England, America and Palestine, as well as in other countries, with regard to a possible statement by England in connection with the Jewish demands on Palestine. I am also aware of the rumors that in conjunction with such a statement on the part of England, a new partition proposal may be made (similar to that of the Peel Commission). The country is, however, very small, and does not permit of any partition. My government will in the nearest future adopt a clear policy with regard to Palestine and in connection with the Jewish problem.

Segal: What can Jews do in order to so influence your government that its attitude will meet the present great Jewish tragedy and be in accord with the Jewish hopes for an independent life?

Umansky: If there is anything that would influence my government to adopt a positive attitude towards a Jewish Palestine, this policy will ~~will~~ not be dictated by humanitarian motives. Nor will it be dictated by the aspirations and program of the Zionist movement. It could, however, be dictated by the attempt on the part of the Labor Zionist movement to introduce in Palestine (which actually means that entire part of the world) a new economic structure in social life, a structure with which we have a lot in common. In connection with that let us discuss the structure of the Histadruth, the Zionist movement, etc.

Umansky: What is the present Jewish population?

Segal: About 600,000.

Umansky: How many are organized in the Histadruth?

Segal: About 150,000.

Umansky: What is the percentage of cooperatives in the colonies and in the cities (in agriculture, industry, etc)?

Segal: According to my information, which may not be one hundred percent authentic, the colonies are about 75% cooperative (that is the Jewish portion) and the cities - 25%.

Umansky: I wish we could hear such reports about the economic-social structure of other countries.

Umansky: Palestine has a serious Arab problem. This problem must be solved. How do you visualize the solution of this problem?

Segal: My answer to this question shall be based not on prepared theses or platforms of Zionist bodies, but upon the results of serious official and unofficial discussions in the ranks of the Zionist Labor movement on various occasions. The answer is: All Arabs now living in Palestine shall enjoy in the Jewish state unlimited rights and freedom in all walks of life, just as all free men enjoy them in all free countries. All unsettled lands which Palestine today has available and also those which may become suitable for colonization as a result of scientific ^{will}/endeavor, belong to the Jewish people.

Umansky: The answer sounds logical. I'm not interested in taking care of the Arabs in all countries. I'm interested in the welfare of the Arabs now living in Palestine, as affected by a Jewish state.

Umansky: A Jewish state will need protection, particularly in the early years. I cannot conceive of America, Russia or England being willing to send their soldiers to be killed for the sake of a Jewish state. How do you envisage the solution of the defense problem under a Jewish state?

Segal: In answering this question I wish to make the same reservation which I made before (unofficial, etc.). The Yishuv in Palestine has an organized defence-body. Particularly instrumental in the formation of this body was and is the Histadruth.

Umansky: Is it true that this organization was formed irrespective of England?

Segal: (I by-passed this question with a friendly smile). This defense organization would be sufficient for the protection of the country, were America, Russia and England to declare openly their great concern that peace prevail in Palestine. It is quite possible, that when the Arabs (those opposed to a Jewish Palestine) will learn of this concern of the three great powers, they will refrain from creating any disturbances.

Umansky: The wish is a good one, but its chances for realization are very limited.

Umansky: Jews must know that Soviet Russia, until recently, maintained a negative attitude towards the Zionist movement and a Jewish Palestine. We were of the opinion that Zionism has served to aid England's imperialistic appetite. Not always has Soviet Russia been in friendly terms with England. At present there is talk about a new world and a new order. Not everything that is being talked of can the Russian government accept as actual. However, if in the future world our relations with England shall remain friendly, our attitude to Palestine will also be friendly. Another question arises: What kind of a Palestine do the Jewish want? Should it be a country built upon new social foundations - it will then appeal to us. If, on the other hand, it will be a country which will encourage reaction and exploitation, it will not receive our support.

The Jews must also make clear to themselves the place Palestine is to have in the new world. Shall the country be under a mandate? If so, under whose? If not under a mandate, should the country be entirely independent or under international control or supervision?

Segal: Whatever has been so far created in Palestine testifies to the fact that the country is being built in keeping with the social aspirations of the international labor movement and progressive humanity. Of this the achievements of the Histadruth, the structure of the Zionist bodies and the democratic organs of the Yishuv are the best testimony. As for the question of Palestine's remaining under a British mandate, no mandate or international supervision, I do not know whether the Zionist movement or the Zionist Labor movement have any definite view as yet.

Umansky: I am a Jew and the Jewish tragedy pains me deeply. The Jewish tragedy in Europe is much greater than you realize. We have undisputed facts in our possession that the largest part of the Jewish population under Nazi rule has been exterminated. We have not published all the facts. Very often we refrain from publishing such facts because we do not want to be accused of anti-Nazi propaganda. Such an accusation would be inconvenient to us. You should know, however, that the Jewish situation is very very grave. I personally do not believe that the solution of the Jewish problem is possible unless it is approached from the stand-point of nationhood. In my judgment Jewish nationhood cannot be recognized without Palestine. The question of Palestine has, however, many complications. Some of them we have already discussed. I should like to point out to you one more complication. In 1913 Joseph Stalin wrote a book about the solution of the problem of small nations. He

Also had in mind the Jews, and included the solution of the Jewish problem in the general framework. I am convinced that that solution is not applicable to the Jewish problem, because the Jewish problem is unique. It will be necessary to speak to Mr. Stalin with regard to it. He may possibly be convinced. His opinions expressed in the book should, however, be reckoned with.

Segal: Has Stalin been approached lately with regard to this problem? Was this problem discussed in governmental circles recently?

Umansky: Recently, I do not know. A few years ago, yes. I do not know of anything done by the government during the war that could be construed as inimical to Palestine for the Jews. That does not mean, however, that my government has adopted a positive attitude towards this question.

Umansky: What is your estimate of the number of Jews who will go to Palestine during the years of 1945-1950?

Segal: Do you mean to imply this question that the war will end in 1944?

Umansky: Let's hope so.

Segal: We estimate that within the first five years after the war Palestine will absorb a minimum of one million Jews. We would surely want to see even more. Taking into consideration the Jewish plight and the anxiety of the Jews to reach Palestine, the number of one million should be regarded as a minimum.

Umansky: Where will this million Jews come from?

Segal: About 750,000 Jews will come from European countries including Poland, Lithuania and Latvia. A considerable number will come from the Balkans. We also hope that a great part of the Jews who escaped from Poland and are at present living in Soviet Russia would desire and be able to go to Palestine after the war.

Umansky: The Jews who now live in Russia are Soviet citizens. Do you expect American Jews too to go to Palestine to help in the upbuilding of the country? No illusions should be entertained about the upbuilding abilities of the Jews who will survive this war. They will be broken in both mind and body. It will be necessary to enlist an element of builders who have not lived through the horrors of the war. Is anything being done in America in this field?

Segal: From your reply about the Polish Jews now living in Russia I deduct that you doubt whether it will be at all possible for them to leave Russia for Palestine. This would not be fair to these Jews. This will also be of no benefit to Russia. The Jews who ran away to Russia have not yet adjusted themselves to the economic structure of Russia. Why should they not be able to go to Palestine if they wish to? I shall ask you another question:

Should Russia adopt a friendly attitude towards a Jewish Palestine (and we hope it will) why should Russian Jewry not be given the opportunity to contribute in manpower to the upbuilding of that country? In America there is very serious talk about training an army of pioneers for Palestine. Large groups have not been organized as yet for that purpose. Should it become clear that the Jewish State is a fact such a movement may assume large proportions.

Umansky: I wish to ask you a question: (please answer it clearly)
How is it that the Labor Zionist movement in America follows in the steps of the Jewish Labor Committee, the Forwards Association and the Dubinsky gang? I can hardly understand such an attitude on your part. The Jewish Labor Committee thrives mainly upon two negative planks:

1) opposition to Zionism; 2) opposition to the Soviet Union. How could you follow these two things?

Segal: I shall give you a detailed, frank and clear answer: First of all I would like you to free yourself from the impression that the Labor Zionist movement is following anyone. The Zionist Labor movement has a philosophy of its own, a clear-cut program in Jewish life and society in general. All actions of the Labor Zionist movement are dictated by the life-philosophy which the movement has set for itself in the national, economic and political sense. The Labor Zionist movement is not a part of the Jewish Labor Committee, not because of the attitude of the latter towards Russia, but because of the freedom of action which it wished to reserve as a part of the Labor Committee and which the latter refused to grant. The Labor Zionist movement is not and never was represented in the Forwards Association. Internally, we have no influence upon the policy of the Forwards. Externally, through our activities, we do influence its policy mainly in Jewish and Palestine problems. The ILGWU is a union comprising members of various political opinions, united on economic grounds.

I am under the impression that what you think of us in connection with our following others or our opposition to Soviet Russia originates from our having serious social differences with the Jewish communists in America. They have sinned much against the vital interests of the Jewish people, the labor movement and against social morale. (In this case I enumerated the following points). 1) Their attempt to break the labor movement; 2) their agitation to undermine the morale of social leaders not connected with their movement; 3) their penetration into labor bodies with the object of dominating them or breaking them;

4) their opposition to the American government with regard to lend-lease; 5) their picketing government agencies against the war before America entered the war and before the German attack on Russia; 6) their employment of warlike methods against political opponents, thus undermining the morale of social activities. (I did not mention their actions in connection with the pogroms in Palestine.)

We follow with deepest interest whatever is taking place in Russia. We have the greatest respect for the achievements of Russia in the field of the education of the masses, the attachment of greater value to the average individual, the new social ideas embraced by the Russians, the attempt to introduce a new social order in the country. We have special esteem for Russia's heroic role in the present war. We admire the loyalty of the Russian people to its land and government.

The Jewish communists in America, however, are trying to create the impression that our opposition to them spells opposition to the Soviet Union and to everything created in Russia. This is a slander on our movement and I am thankful for the opportunity you have given me to clarify these points.

Umansky: This clarification, to a certain extent throws a new light on the whole question, but let us pass on to other points.

How is the Zionist movement constructed? I know about the shekel. I am also acquainted with the structure of the Congress, the funds. Is there no danger in your selling the shekel that the rich man may buy many shekels and dominate the congress? Why do you need several funds? What do the different factions represent? What does the religious faction want? Do they really want to tie religion with State? (He had no difficulty

in recalling the Keren Kayemeth, but did not fully remember the Keren Hayesod).

Why do you call the workers' fund in America - Gewerkschaften Campaign? Why has the Zionist movement given up the Zionist symbol, making all political representations through a Jewish Agency? The term 'agency' is not a symbol for something that a people wants, while, Zionism - everybody knows what that stands for.

Segal: I clarified all these points for him. He made note of some of the answers. In the end Umansky told me that he had previous appointment with two ambassadors. He maintained, however, that our conversation was not concluded and asked me to return at 2:45 P.M. (it was 1:30 P.M.; our conversation started at 12:00 noon).

Continuation of the conversation

2:45 P.M.

Present: Umansky, Segal, Sulkes.

Umansky: I am familiar with the negotiations concerning the Palestine resolution in Congress. It was shelved under the pretense of military expediency. This is nonsense. The opposition is purely of a political nature and originated in Washington or London. Were it actually for military reasons they would have had to consult us. They have to consult us in all questions concerning the conduct of the war. In this case we were not consulted. There are apparently certain elements here and in England who are opposed to the whole thing.

Segal: Did you not mention to me before that you know of rumors concerning a declaration to be made in England in favor of a Jewish State in Palestine?

Umansky: Do you know Yiddish?

Segal: A little bit (smilingly).

Umansky: Those rumors may be compared to what it is called in Yiddish:
Writing with chalk upon the water.

Umansky: I am fully informed about the efforts being made for the
formation of an Arab federation. I can see great obstacles for a
Jewish State, should an Arab federation come into being before the
X Jewish question with regard to Palestine is solved. It is in the
interest of the Jews that the Arab federation should not come into being
before the status of the Jews in Palestine is established, since it is
possible that an Arab federation would consider it its primary duty to
fight Jewish independence in Palestine.

Segal: What is your government ready to do in order to prevent this
fatal situation?

Umansky: It is a part of the general problem which we have discussed before
and to which we shall still return.

Umansky: The leadership and the influence in the future world will be in
the hands of the following: America, Russia and England. This has
already been established by the course of the war. People with
engaged in political affairs must accept it as a fact and reckon with it.
Russia will cooperate with the other states to the fullest extent if
they follow the right path. Should any mistakes be made, we shall
step into the center of the situation, voice our opinion clearly and
insist upon our rights. Actually this happened already in Italy. We
had no reason to give it wide publicity. Politically the final set-up
in Italy was established along the lines of our proposals.

Segal: Has this statement any connection with the final solution of the Palestine problem for the Jews?

Umansky: It may have. So far we have not established the direction in which our interests lie. This point is in the course of crystallization. In connection with this I wish to remind you again that much depends upon the kind of a state you desire to establish in Palestine and upon whom the state shall be dependent.

Umansky: What is the outlook in the elections? Has President Roosevelt a good chance to be elected? It looks as though the Republicans are already starting their tricks. They are politically trying to please Jews by adopting a pro-Palestine resolution. Should Roosevelt not be elected it will be fatal to America, and fatal to England. (Here he paused, and I added - fatal also to Russia). Not fatal to Russia, but important to Russia; Russia is ready to cooperate with others if the road is clear. Russia will go its own way if the road with others will not be clear.

Umansky: I am cognizant of the Zionist sympathies of the Labor movement of America especially towards the labor movement in Palestine. I'm also aware of the attitude of the labor party to Palestine.

Segal: The warm attitude of the Labor movement grows. I have recently seen Lombardo Toledano. He has displayed the warmest interest in a Jewish Palestine, and in general in the solution of the Jewish problem through a country of its own. He promised to organize a pro-Palestine labor committee in the Latin American countries.

Umansky: Very interesting. I want you to know that the two representatives of the Embassy, who recently visited Palestine, have reported to my

Government very favorably about Palestine, especially about the Labor movement. Their report contains many positive points in your favor. I also want you to know that my wife and my daughter brought me an unfavorable report about Tel-Aviv. (Here he became sentimental and said: my daughter unfortunately died recently. She was the only child I had.) They have reported money-madness on the part of the Jews, over-indulgence in parties, dances, etc., and a lack of interest in common affairs. This, however, they related only about Tel-Aviv.

Segal: I do not know what elements your wife and daughter came in touch with in Tel-Aviv; neither do I know the environment in which their impressions were formed. It is clear, however, that Tel-Aviv has a large organized labor movement; Tel-Aviv has also negative outgrowths of individuals and groups who have no concern for the community and want to grab for themselves all they can. This emphasizes the responsibilities on the part of the labor movement to form in Palestine a social life which is altogether strange to people who look out only for their egotistic interests.

Umansky: I once had a conversation with Jabotinsky. He made me sick. To my question as to how he visualized the solution of the Arab problem, he replied: very simple, we will remove them from the country.

Umansky: We are annoyed by the Jewish behavior in connection with Poland. Whenever a representative of the Polish government-in-exile arrives in the United States, the Jews welcome him in grand style. This is degrading to Jewish pride, since the Jews are well aware that the members of the Polish government, (with very few exceptions) are outright anti-semites. Jews should know that the present Polish government will

exercise very little power in the leadership of Poland. How do you account for Jewish behavior towards the Polish Government in exile?

Segal: I do not agree with your point of view. We have many grievances against the Polish Government-in-exile. We are fully aware of their crimes.

We have not yet made peace with the idea that their sins should be forgotten by us and by the world. However, the Polish government-in-exile was recognized by the United States, England and Russia before the Jews recognized it. Prior to the latest border dispute between Russia and the Polish government-in-exile, the representatives of the latter visited Russia unhindered in any way and were received in style. You cannot expect that the Jews, a people without a land, without a government, and of course, without any power, could hardly have displayed more pride in their relations with the Polish government than did the great powers of the world.

Umansky: I have followed with great interest the session of the American Jewish Conference. This conference has politically erred by not inviting Michaels, who at that time was a visitor in the United States, to greet the conference, at a time when the conference has received non-American representations, i.e. from the Yishuv in Palestine. It was surely an oversight not to invite him. He told me that he was very anxious to address the Conference.

Segal: The subject of inviting Michaels was never brought up for discussion and no decision in connection with it was taken. It is quite possible that subconsciously some people were afraid that such an invitation may be associated with the prestige of communist elements in this country. At any rate, I want to assure you that no discussions on this question took place.

Umansky: If Chaim Weizman was sitting in your place I could not have had a more frank and thorough discussion. We have much in common. We may disagree only in methods, but in essence both of us desire the revision of the social structure in the world.

Segal: This is quite true, however, even Russia is not static on the question of methods. There are constant changes going on in Russia which bring closer to it those who were before estranged. I am a member of the movement which believes in democratic socialism and in the change of the social structure of society through education, enlightenment and through other democratic methods.

Umansky: Many of those who preach democratic methods, particularly the representatives of capitalistic society, aim through those democratic methods to enslave the poor masses. We believe that our approach to the world is ideologically and methodically a correct one.

Segal: I believe that Russia is not essentially a static country. Many changes have taken place in recent years in the application of methods.

Umansky: This is not true. Could you name any examples?

Segal: Let us take the question of religion. In the early years of the Revolution the government strongly fought all religions in Russia. Houses of worship were turned into meeting-clubs. The clergy did not enjoy any liberty. At least this is what the press reported. Recently we read about a special conference of representatives of all religions convened with the fullest sympathy of the Russian Government, offering religion full opportunity for development. Is this a change in previous methods?

Umansky: No, this does not constitute a change of policy on the part of the Soviet Government. It does constitute, however, a change of attitude on the part of all religions in Russia. Were the Church in Russia in the early years of the Revolution to declare Stalin as God's messenger and the Soviet system as a Command of the Lord, we would have given it our protection. Who then changed - the Government of the Church?

Segal: Let us return to the problem of Palestine for the Jews. What could we do in order to bring about a favorable attitude on the part of the Russian Government?

X Umansky: The Labor Zionist movement must make clear to our government its way of upbuilding Palestine. The new social structure which is being introduced there, the achievements of the labor movement there, its answer to the Arab problem, to the question of defense and in general all aspects X pertaining to the upbuilding of a Jewish State. Such a memorandum should be clear and frank and formulate the program of the labor movement. You may also prepare apart from this, a memorandum from the World Zionist Organization. I am confident, however, that the World Zionist Organization cannot speak in as clear terms as the labor movement.

Segal: In what way will such a memorandum reach your Government?

Umansky: (After considering the question) I am ready to forward such a memorandum to my Government. I do not care who the addressee of the memorandum is, I must however know who the authority is behind such a memorandum.

Segal: Could it be possible for the labor Zionist movement to send a delegation to Russia and personally contact Russian governmental officials,

and to acquaint the Russian people in general and Russian Jewry in particular with the achievements in Palestine. In this wise the delegation would become acquainted with the various phases of Russian life and Russian Jewry.

Umansky: This is not the time for it. The war must first come to an end.

At any rate the memorandum should constitute the first steps.

Umansky: What are the differences between the Right and Left Poale-Zion?

I'm partly acquainted with the reasons for their split. What are their present differences? The Left Poale Zion never wanted to cooperate with general Jewish elements, they are also not a part of the Zionist Congress. Lately I have heard about a change in their policy. What then differentiates them from the Right Poale Zion?

Segal: First one must remember that any split leaves a psychological breach with individuals as well as movements. I then pointed out to him a few points with which the Left Poale Zion justify their separation. When I mentioned the question of Yiddish he remarked: in this they really have something to be considered seriously. (Here followed a few-minutes discussion on the language-question). I stressed the fact that people come to Palestine from various countries with different cultural back-grounds, with manifold languages and dialects, and therefore the cultural unity of the country commends the Hebrew language to become the language of the Yishuv and of the Jewish Government.

Umansky: What happened to the Jewish World Congress that was planned to be held in America? Has it taken place?

Segal: I told him the reasons for the postponement of this conference.

I also told him about the invitation extended to the Jewish anti-

Fascist Committee and the Moscow Kehila, and that the reply received from them was very vague.

Umansky: I am interested that a delegation from Russia should participate in this conference when held. I am also ready to inform my Government about my interest in this matter, if you will write me about the conference, its program, etc.

Segal: I believe we may summarize our conversation.

Umansky: If you think that we can do it, I am satisfied, but please remember, that you are the one that is rushing, not I.

Segal: I then summarized our conversation stressing our mutual understanding about the memorandum to the Russian Government and his readiness to forward it to the proper authorities. I thereby also told him that I still have no answer to my last question about the possibilities for Russian Jewry to cooperate with the Jews of other parts of the world in the reconstruction of the Jewish place in the European countries and in the restoration of Palestine in the post-war era.

Umansky: This will depend greatly upon the future set-up of the world and the relationship of Russia to such a set-up. It will also depend in a large degree upon the character of the organization or organizations dealing with these problems, and their attitude towards Russia's way in society. In principle, I fail to see why our Government should be opposed to giving the Jews of Russia an opportunity to cooperate with other parts of their people in Jewish questions. However, the policy will finally be framed when the road upon which the democracies will go in the post-war era will be clear and Russia's participation in it. At this opportunity I wish to tell you how deeply I am impressed by the

manner in which the Jewish community in Mexico is displaying its good will towards the Russian Government and people. It is not so much a question of the material help which Russia is receiving from them through various enterprizes -- it is rather the question of good-will and good relationship.

I am also cognizant of what the Yishuv in Palestine and its Labor movement is doing for Russia. I also strongly follow all activities conducted in America.

Umansky: Now let us have a clear understanding as to how our conversation will be made public. You are entitled to inform your immediate colleagues as well as those, in your opinion, responsible bodies in Jewish life about our conversation. The press should not know about it. I, on my part, shall inform those bodies that I deem necessary. Should the press make public the contents of our conversation, I shall have to declare publicly that we never met, it being understood that this will end our friendly approach to certain matters that were brought out in the course of our conversation.

Segal: This understanding stands.

Umansky: Is Sidney Hillman helping you? I understand that he still enjoys the President's confidence. Is he of any assistance to your movement?

Segal: Sidney Hillman was never an opponent of the Zionist movement. On the contrary, he has always maintained a friendly attitude to the Histadruth in Palestine, and on many occasions has also displayed interest in Zionism. He recently issued a very warm statement supporting, in his name and in the name of the Amalgamated, the Commonwealth Resolution that was proposed in Congress. The Amalgamated Union is also actively participating in the Gewerkschaften Campaign of the

Histadruth. The union recently contributed \$30,000 to a certain institution in Palestine.

In parting, he addressed me in the following words: "Please give my regards to one man in America - to Stephen Wise. He is a very charming person. I beg of you to convey to him my regards."

We parted at about 4.35 P.M.

