



## 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  
106

Box  
37

Folder  
293

Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, confidential reports,  
Arthur Lourie, 1946.

Louise's Confidential Reports  
on Anglo-American Comm.

~~(Some from AUS - 12)~~  
most copies from Norson file

Jan. 25-  
April 21,  
1946

CONFIDENTIAL

LIST OF CODE NAMES USED IN A.L.'S LETTERS OF MARCH 21ST AND MARCH 30TH, 1946

Francis . . . . .	Crum
Dolly . . . . .	Hutcheson
Statler . . . . .	Crossman
Singer . . . . .	Singleton
Harvey . . . . .	Buxton
Gray . . . . .	McDonald
Whelan . . . . .	Leggett
Eccles . . . . .	Crick
Prince . . . . .	Aydelotte
Phil . . . . .	Phillips
Wordsworth	H. Beeley

Maurice . . . . .	Morrison
Bell . . . . .	Manningham - Buller





Do not include this but tell Meyer and Manson.

"Presumably Meyer communicated some of his information to the Emergency Council - and once given to the Council you might as well give it direct to the press."





THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

77, Great Russell Street,  
London, W.C. 1

25th January, 1946.

C  
O  
P  
Y  
  
Dear Dr. Silver,

I have been here now five days, and have had an opportunity of going through the material to be submitted by the pro-Zionist bodies here, and of meeting a number of members of the Joint Committee, and finally, to-day, of listening to the first day's evidence.

Dealing with the last point first, the questions put by members of the Committee are becoming somewhat stereotyped in character, and are inevitably familiar to anyone who has listened to the presentation in America. Judge Hutcheson, for example, in his cross-examination this afternoon of Leonard Montefiore (who appeared for the Jewish Colonisation Association) sought again to bring out the idea that the Zionist claim for Jewish immigration to Palestine was directed primarily towards a political objective, the establishment of a Jewish State - an objective with which he apparently does not sympathise. Thus, he suggested that as an inhabitant of Texas, of Scotch and other parentage, he saw no reason for the establishment of a Scotch State in Texas! In this connection I attach an extract from a speech of Colonel Wedgwood's in the White Paper Debate, with which at some stage we hope to confront the Judge. Montefiore, although certainly no Zionist, was fair in his statement and in his replies to questions; he emphasised the desire of the majority of displaced persons on the Continent to go to Palestine in preference to any other country. He was cross-examined at some length on the work of the ICA, and in answer to the question as to whether they would be able to settle more Jews in lands other than Palestine if they were given larger financial means, he replied that he doubted whether in present circumstances it would be possible to settle many more, even if they had forty million pounds instead of a million at their disposal.

Singleton tried to elicit from him the answer that, if conditions in Palestine were unsettled and if possibilities of settlement were made available in other countries, many of these Jews would be ready to give up the idea of going to Palestine. Montefiore's reply was that these displaced persons did not view the situation from a detached standpoint, but were, as he put it, in an "exalted" state of mind. It was not, perhaps, the answer that we would have given, but at any rate I think it served the same purpose, of making clear that, even in the given circumstances, Palestine would remain the first choice.

Brodetsky, on behalf of the Board of Deputies, dealt among other matters with the idea of Anglo-Jewry as a link between the British Government and World Jewry on the Palestine issue. He referred to Britain's sympathy and support for the Jews during the last 200 years, and to the corresponding disappointment produced by the whittling down, and finally abrogation, of the Mandate. As indicative of the support of Anglo-Jewry for the Zionist programme, he dealt with the resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Board in favour of that position. He was cross-examined at some length, and did fairly well, though he tended to hedge



Dr. Silver

- 2 -

Jan. 25, 1946

on some points, such as the question of the transition period, and whether the aim of a Jewish State necessarily involved a Jewish majority, in a manner which was not very satisfactory to some of the committee members. However, Harvey told me afterwards that in his view he had made a very excellent and intelligent witness.

The question of the J.N.F. clause was again raised at some length; also that of discrimination against Arab labour, and of the possibilities, in view of the evidence of Notestein, of the ultimate maintenance of a Jewish majority. In regard to this, Brodetsky suggested that he was a mathematician and not prepared to go in for prophecy, though he was also asked, and agreed, to provide figures for the density of population (asked for by Manningham-Buller) in the event of nearly a million Jews being introduced into Palestine in the next ten years.

On the whole, I have the impression - and this is borne out by conversations I have had both with Harvey and Francis - that the majority of the members, including in all probability Crossman, are taking an anti-Zionist point of view, and that only three - the same three of whom you knew in the States - remain friendly.

So far as the question of an interim recommendation for immediate action in regard to the situation in the Camps is concerned, in all probability a strong effort to obtain such a recommendation will be made, but only after the Committee has visited Palestine - the feeling being, even on the part of our friends, that not till then will they be in a position to say that they have sufficient knowledge of the facts to make such a recommendation.

In the course of his examination, Brodetsky was asked about partition, but rejected this as a possibility. On the other hand, I believe that one at least of our friends on the body is thinking in those terms, and would like to get something on the record so as to be able to pursue the matter further in Committee.

The hearings resume on Monday, when Sir Simon Marks (after immense behind the scenes activities) will give evidence on behalf of the EZF (instead of, as originally proposed, Janner). Entre nous, he is in a state of complete panic at the moment, and is retiring, with much material and lots of advice, for a week-end of study and meditation.

Gerold turned up safely with the rest of the bunch on the Queen Mary, and we have of course been working in the closest co-operation. He will have sent to New York a report on what he learnt en route - matters which were subsequently confirmed in conversations in which I later took part after their arrival.

It has been agreed that I should, if possible, go to Frankfurt, Prague and Vienna, and I am making arrangements to leave next week-end, provided the necessary facilities are given. One of the members of the Committee in particular expressed gratification that I might be on hand in case of need.

Ben-Gurion was in London for a day or two before the arrival of the Committee here, but has now gone on to Paris en route for Germany.

Warm regards,  
(howie)  
ARTHUR (signed)



Jan. 25, 1946

Extract from Col. Wedgwood's speech in the Debate on the White Paper in the House of Commons, 22 May, 1939:

...."Many hon. Members will have had cables from the United States. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~  
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~. I have had over a dozen, four of them from Texas -  
from Galveston, Houston, San Antonio, and Dallas. It will be remembered that  
100 years ago the Americans in Texas were faced with almost the same position as  
that with which the Jews are faced in Palestine to-day. They were then under  
Mexican rule; the Mexican Government stopped immigration and attempted to disarm  
the Americans; the Americans were not "taking any", and in three years Texas, the  
lone star State, was one of the States of America - free for all time. That is  
an illustration, because it is as well that we should realise the past history of  
America, as well as our own history."

copied 1/30/46:MH





3X

MEMORANDUM

The Committee concluded its London hearings on Friday (1st February) after having heard five full days' evidence. The proceedings have been very little reported in the London press, most of the papers seem to have no reference at all to the evidence, and even the reports in The Times were very meagre. I understand that the New York Times, and presumably also some of the other American papers, have carried fairly full accounts, but I have not yet received copies of these clippings.

I am asking the office here if possible to have a copy of the stenographic record of the evidence sent out to New York.

I shall not deal in detail here with the London evidence. In general, it is my impression that our case was not greatly advanced by the presentation in London. Those three members of the Committee who were friendly in New York have remained friendly here. On the other hand, the American Chairman (who, I gather, is very homesick, and regrets that he ever undertook this assignment) is becoming more confirmed in his opposition to the idea of a Jewish State. He seems to have been influenced by the notion that it involves in some way a "dual loyalty," - and unfortunately statements on the part of one or two of the Zionist witnesses here have not tended to disillusion him.

Nevertheless, the evidence which I think has made the deepest impression on the Committee was that of Amery, who advocated a partition proposal along lines somewhat different from those of the Peel Commission, the main modification being the exclusion of Western Galilee from the Jewish area, and the inclusion of the Negev; also the elimination of such complications as the sausage-shaped corridor suggested by the Peel Commission.

I have seen a good deal of Francis, and I gather that what our friends in the minority group are looking for at the moment is some arrangement which would combine political autonomy (including Jewish control over immigration) for a Jewish sector, with economic unity between that area and the adjoining territories of Transjordan, Syria and Lebanon. Their ideas are still far from clear, but in the case of one or two members at any rate there is a strong feeling that merely to recommend continuing immigration under a regime similar to the existing one will offer no solution.

So far as the hearings are concerned, the questions asked of witnesses have become rather stereotyped in character, and will be familiar to those who followed the hearings in America. There is little interest in British or international pledges or undertakings, and indeed, on one or two occasions Judge Hutcheson has gone out of his way to emphasise that, so far as "election platforms, Congressional Resolutions, and 'all that kind of stuff'" are concerned, he feels himself a free agent, and is approaching the issues in that spirit. At the very conclusion of the evidence on Friday Crum asked that, as a matter of record, it should be stated that suggestions that no account should be taken by the Committee of these undertakings and pledges, did not reflect the view of the Committee as a body. This was obviously a direct hit at Hutcheson's attitude, and I gather was very much resented by him; nevertheless, it probably needed to be said.

The question of the use of force and who is to be responsible for coercing the Arabs has come up time and again; likewise, what is meant by a "Jewish State," and why the Jews attach such importance to this and to the majority idea. With reference to this, Notestein's figures and forecasts have obviously made a deep impression on the Committee, which asks itself what prospects there are of a Jewish majority remaining such, even if a large volume of immigration were permitted in the immediate future. The JNF lease and non-employment of Arab labour generally also seem to worry various members of the Committee, and numerous questions have been put in this connection.

It is important  
that there should  
have been (it  
isn't too late) a  
reaction to this -  
particularly in  
Congress.



Singleton in particular has more than once attempted to bring out a distinction between the claims of Jewish Displaced Persons and refugees, and the "political" problem. In this he has had the support on the American side, not only of Hutcheson, but also to some extent of Aydelotte, though the latter seems to have been influenced in the last two or three days not only by Amery's evidence, but also by a letter which he has received from Professor Coupland (at present in South Africa) in which Coupland emphasises that he remains convinced that partition is the only solution, and points out that while the Peel Commission was unanimous in this, there were differences of opinion among its members on questions of boundaries.

The following matters which I have learnt privately may be of interest:

(1) Wadsworth accompanied the Committee over here, and is extremely active in promoting the Arab case - and probably in advising the Arabs. One of our friends described him as "a dangerous man." He has been playing up the Russian bogey, and the need for supporting the League of Arab States as a protection against the spread of Bolshevism!

(2) The idea of an interim recommendation for the immediate immigration into Palestine of perhaps between 50,000 and 100,000 Jews from the camps has been deferred until after the Committee visits Palestine. It was felt, even by our friends, that the Committee could not, in justice to itself, make such a recommendation without first having visited Palestine.

(3) The British members, with the possible exception of Crick, have been pressing (obviously on Foreign Office inspiration) the idea that the Jewish Agency will in due course have to be eliminated from the picture. It is "an anomaly" in the situation. In general, the British seem to maintain a more or less united front, with the doubtful exception of Crossman.

---

I want to conclude this note with three suggestions, which it is very much hoped will be followed up:

- (a) Pressure through the press and at the White House must continue. It is realised that the very existence of the Committee tends to hamstring action which would otherwise be taken. Nevertheless, the fact remains, as was made clear to me, that on the other side there is unremitting activity. So far as the American group is concerned, there is a possibility, amounting to a probability, of divided opinions, unless in particular the Chairman is convinced of the urgency and significance of feeling in America.
- (b) There should be a call for an immediate interim recommendation - this might be done by Taft and others on the floor of the Senate.
- (c) Of lesser importance, but nevertheless desirable: The Mowrer story about the Mufti should be kept alive, and it is suggested that it should be read into the record in the Senate by one of our friends there.

---

I am leaving for Paris early tomorrow morning, and my further movements depend on whether I can get the necessary Military Permit to visit Germany and Vienna. Francis in particular was very anxious that I should be available, and if things can be arranged,



I shall be in Vienna about the middle of this month, when the various groups into which the Committee will divide itself are to reassemble there.

-----

A.L.

London,  
3.2.46.





C O P Y

*Return to HJ*  
*X*

LONDON

FEBRUARY 5, 1946

NLT WEISGAL MANSON 342 MADISON AVENUE NEWYORK

LEAVING FOR PARIS MONDAY SHALL DECIDE THERE WHETHER PROCEED DIRECT PALESTINE  
OR FIRST VISIT EUROPEAN CENTRES GENERAL IMPRESSION ONLY IMPORTANT NEW ELEMENT  
HERE AMERYS EVIDENCE ON PARTITION OTHERWISE OPINIONS WITHIN GROUP MUCH AS  
BEFORE AMERICAN CHAIRMAN MORE DEFINITE IN OPPOSITION REGARDS

ARTHUR





CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM A.L. - CLARIDGE HOTEL, PARIS, FEBRUARY 5, 1946 (REC'D FEB. 13, 1946)

Z I rang up Gray\* this morning and he sounded very pleased to hear from me and asked me to come right over. He and a few of the others arrived last night. I took Jarblum along with me. We found a J.T.A. man there named Nathan who was acting as a temporary and very part-time assistant. We gave Gray suggestions as to whom to call and after Jarblum's departure I had a talk with him alone. It appears that Dolly\* is frightfully homesick. He has come to the conclusion that he now knows as much as he needs to know and would like to cut short the European end and also, if possible, that in Eretz. This is greatly distressing some of the others and if pursued - as it threatens to be - can develop into a scandal. It may mean, for example, no visit to Belgium or Holland, to Italy or to Hungary, etc. - though, of course, as far as the latter are concerned there are political difficulties also - which might, however, be overcome. The impossibility of writing an adequate report under the kind of time pressure which may be imposed is very present to the minds of some of the group, and one, I gather, spoke to B.V.C. in London who was much disturbed, though what he can or will do about it, I don't know. Incidentally, I learnt that Dolly\* was a bitter political opponent of F.D.R. - no wonder he took a negative line on pre-election promises and "that kind of stuff." I had lunch with Gray\* and - more or less by accident - with Whelan\*. With the latter I had ten minutes' talk alone and in the course of that brief conversation I was horrified by the kind of stuff that is being pumped into the mind of, and accepted by, an essentially decent, well-meaning but entirely uninformed gent:

(a) Zionist officials make their living out of a continuance of the conflict and therefore it pays them not to seek a way out. (Giving myself as an example - he had not realised, incidentally, to whom he was talking - I attempted to show him that there were other reasons than the £66 a month which I received for years in London which might induce devotion to a cause).

(b) The Jews of Germany had made an immense contribution to the civilisation and intellectual advancement of Germany; their elimination would be a calamity for Europe. (This, of course, was Bevin's argument. Of German Jews there are as a matter of fact very few left in Germany. In any case it would be a pretty grim suggestion that they must remain there against their will to fertilise again Europe's intellectual life - after what they have gone through.)

(c) The schools in Palestine are turning out ultra-nationalists of the Hitler Jugend type. (I attempted to tell him something of the colonists in Palestine and expressed the hope he would really be given a chance to see for himself.)

(d) He himself has come across ill-informed people, not particularly interested, who have said it might be a good idea to send the Jews to Palestine - in other words all this emphasis on Palestine is merely giving a new impetus to anti-Semitism.

(e) He was wondering if Ch.W. might not accept the idea that Jews should find new homes in countries other than Palestine. (I told him that Ch.W. was emphatic in his view that Jews took anti-Semitism with them to the lands of their dispersion; I also quoted what happened in South Africa when in 1936 a boat-load of 500 refugees produced such a reaction that the immigration laws were changed making further immigration of Jews into South Africa almost impossible.)

Unfortunately, we were interrupted at the end of 10 minutes or I don't know what further exhibits might not have been produced from the little chamber of horrors that malicious gossip and misinformation, as well as an almost primitive fear of the disagreeable specter of the Wandering Jew have created in the mind of this man.

\*See end of next page for code names used.



The only bright spot was that Prince\*, according to one of our friends, had begun talking of an immediate immigration of 100,000 or 150,000 within a year and a substantial Aliyah thereafter. Apparently all the people from England are agreed that the White Paper must go - but this may mean no more than clearing the camps and a very limited subsequent immigration - I don't know.

Today one of the people from our office in Paris who is on good terms with the military took over my passport to the military permit office to get me a visa for Frankfort or the British Zone. The British major (who, I gather, was at one time in charge of Belsen and of whom one of our people gave me a very scathing description) gave one look at my name and immediately recognized it in connection with an application that had been made in London to accompany the group - and turned thumbs down! For the first time in my life I felt myself almost a notorious character! Subsequently, our representative spoke to Judge Rifkind in Frankfort who said he was very anxious to have me come. The general who had to clear it, however, was not there at the time and it will have to wait until tomorrow - which may be too late since Crum and Leggett left this afternoon for Frankfort. I was not so anxious to get to Frankfort since in any case the members will be travelling around in a car and I can hardly hope to accompany them. But I did want to go there as a necessary stepping stone to Vienna - where they have to be by the 16th. It is all to the good that G.F. is going along - also (though unfortunately she is not too well informed) Ruth Gruber for the NEW YORK POST.



\*Code Names Used:

Gray.....McDonald  
Dolly.....Hutcheson  
Whelan.....Leggett  
Prince.....Aydelotte



CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM A.L. - CLARIDGE HOTEL, PARIS, FEBRUARY 7, 1946

Here I am back in my hotel room with an hour ahead before dinner with B.G. The hearings before MacDonald and Phillips terminated this afternoon and they have already taken the train on to Frankfort where they will learn whether they are to go on to Switzerland and Italy or cut short their wanderings and meet in Vienna on the 16th with the Chairmen and the others.

As I mentioned in my last note I arrived here Monday afternoon and the members of the Committee destined for Paris and Frankfort arrived here that evening by boat and train. The following morning (I believe I am repeating myself but have no copy of my earlier letter) I called on MacDonald and with Jarblum helped suggest a program, and that afternoon the Zionist group was heard. The following day (i.e. yesterday - Wednesday) I turned up at the Hotel Raphael where MacDonald and Phillips were staying in time to hear the first of the series of witnesses who were to appear before them. The meetings were held in Phillips' sitting-room without a secretary and with a J.T.A. man and myself as the only members of the audience - an audience which assumed secretarial duties when the phone rang in MacDonald's or Phillips' room! Moreover, I assumed the function of marshalling and introducing the various witnesses as they arrived - from which you will gather the informality of the proceedings.

The first of the witnesses and in some ways the most impressive was Guy de Rothschild - son of Baron Edmond. In 1941 or so, having escaped from unoccupied France he had eventually joined de Gaulle's staff in London. He had visited Palestine fairly recently, and proceeded in most excellent fluent and colloquial English to indicate the need for a Jewish State - for the Jews in Palestine, for the 600,000 in Europe who want to go there, and for Jews in other parts of the world who wish to remain perfectly good nationals of their countries of domicile. The Jewish nation was to-day a historical fact - for many Jews (those in the two first categories above-named). They no longer felt allegiance to any other nation. They demand two things: the right of immigration to Palestine and the recognition of their independence. He was questioned about the attitude of the Rothschilds generally, and distinguished between the older generation who were too old to think seriously on the subject in any fresh way and the younger group in which he included not only himself but Lord Rothschild in England, a sister-in-law there, and the two sons of Baron Robert - who had become Zionists. Incidentally he said that the two latter had been prisoners of war in Germany and in 1940-41 had had a pretty bad time at the hands of their French fellow-prisoners.

I think he made a strong impression on Phillips who probably regards himself as a little bit of an aristocrat and hardly expected from young Rothschild (I should say he is about 35) quite so outspoken a statement on behalf of "La Nation Juive." He was followed by a series of people - some of them very assimilated like Baumel who has a Christian wife and children - who all pleaded for an open Palestine. Edmund Fleg, the writer - a fine spirit whom I think Phillips failed to appreciate at his true worth - spoke eloquently of the need of a Jewish home. He was one of several witnesses who had survived deep personal tragedies. Two sons of his had been killed by the Nazis. Another man who testified had lost several members of his family, including his daughter, to the gas-chambers in Poland.

I was delighted to see again old Dr. Weill-Halle whom I had met in 1937 at Zurich as a non-Zionist member of the Council of the Jewish Agency. He escaped the S.S. on one occasion by a matter of minutes - taking to his bicycle as they mounted the staircase to his apartment. He described how until 1934 he had had no interest in things Jewish and how he had finally been driven to the conclusion that there must be a place, Palestine, to which Jews could go as of right. The same approach was that to-day of M. Meiss, the President of the "Consistoire" - the representative organization of French Jewry. Another interesting group was represented by JeProyken - the fighters



in the Jewish section of the French resistance movement, the Maquis - who also took a strong Zionist line. The only groups contra (i) the Communists, who did not appear under that title, but under some other disingenuous nomenclature, the real nature of whose aims could be gathered in due course from the fact that they asked: (a) for the inclusion of Russia in the Committee of Inquiry; (b) dissolution of the reactionary Polish army abroad; (c) the solution of the Jewish problem by the establishment everywhere of "democracy" and (d) the setting up at once of an independent Palestine State where everything would "arrange itself" between Jews and Arabs. (ii) The Bund, which appeared this afternoon. These I fear made an impression on Phillips because they told what, unconsciously I believe, he wanted to hear; namely that the Jewish problem must be settled in the countries where Jews are; that already in France there had been a considerable amelioration in regard to anti-semitism since the end of the war; that the statement (put to them by MacDonald) that there were ten thousand Jewish orphans in France was probably exaggerated. The only real problem was the thousand children from Buchenwald - the others were almost all born in France and did not therefore constitute a real problem - the state would contribute to their maintenance. The Jews in Germany were a special case - they should be allowed to go where they wanted, even to Palestine. In Poland the situation had been exaggerated; the leader of the group even said that he believed he had recently seen a statement by a body which he compared with the Board of Deputies of British Jews (!) advising against emigration. On this he was corrected by one of his colleagues who pointed out that what they had advised against was panic not emigration!

The leader regretted that the greater part of their movement had been wiped out in Poland. Apparently, however, he found no lesson in what had happened there for his own hopes of a solution on the basis of a combination of the eventual realisation of the brotherhood of man and universal socialism. Nevertheless just as Hutcheson was impressed by the Communist memo in London so Phillips I think lapped up - or so it seemed to me - the rosy generalities of these people. I have little doubt however that MacDonald will in due course seek to put him straight.

As for me, here I still am; and still uncertain as to my next move. That I shall know tomorrow. The office here finally got into touch with Judge Rifkind in Frankfort, who said that he would be delighted to have me come on to Frankfort - but it may now be too late as the group in Frankfort, Crum, Crossman and Leggett, left to-day on their tour of the camps (together with Rifkind) and then go right on to Stuttgart, Munich and Vienna. I am not anxious to go to Frankfort - but after my experience in Paris I feel I could be of real use in Vienna - and I can't get to Vienna without obtaining a prior permit in Frankfort!

So there we are for the moment. This is my fourth night in Paris and very dull on the whole they have been - three dinners with B.G. and one dinner with MacDonald (last night) with whom I took a long walk thereafter from his hotel to the Place de la Concorde and then up to the Etoile and back to my hotel (the Claridge). I also arranged breakfast for him with B.G. this morning.

Yesterday we had a most excellent (probably black-market) lunch ("we" being B.G., an American army chaplain and myself) to which we were taken by Ruth Kluger who is in charge of the Paris office of the J.A.

Friday midday. It looks pretty definite that I shall not be able to get to Germany. Too bad, but rien a faire. In that case I shall get on to Palestine as soon as accommodation is available.



CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM A.L. - CONTINENTAL HOTEL, CAIRO, FEBRUARY 28, 1946

I have just returned from Meza House where the Commission is staying (a good half hour by taxi out of Cairo) and am due back there for breakfast at 8:30!

But before I record to-day's little budget: I landed in Alexandria Monday evening, spent the night there, came on to Cairo and after some messing about finally located a telegram from Shertok asking me to remain here till the Committee arrived. That they did this afternoon by plane from different points of departure. This evening I rang Francis and he suggested that I should come over after dinner - and in due course I found myself (feeling like an awful interloper) part of a group which included also Harvey, Gray, Whelan, Maurice and Statler, and an Englishman who seemed to be in charge of arrangements. The result was there was very little chance for intimate talk - most of the conversation being directed to proving that Maurice was really a Tory, accompanied by much good natured chaff. Bell and Harvey had been to Poland. I gather from Harvey that they found it a dreadful experience. None of the Committee got to Hungary or Rumania. They were only told on the 19th, I gathered from Beeley, that it would not be possible to arrange for them to enter. They then arranged for a telegram to go to the head of the Hungarian Jewish community inviting representatives to come to Vienna - but in transmission the fact that the Commission would leave Vienna on the 26th was somehow lost and the Hungarian representative only arrived in Vienna on the 26th - half an hour before the Committee had to leave (all this makes me regret the more bitterly that I didn't manage to get to Vienna. I think I could have prevented this kind of mistake). Beeley told me, however, that they had had enough information from other quarters in Vienna - including from a man associated with the Red Cross, one Marton, (a Jew of whom I had heard in a letter from Lichtheim in Geneva) to know what the views of the Jews were. What they had hoped to obtain more information about was the attitude of the governments concerned.

Of more importance as regards developments within the Committee was a remark to me in an aside by Francis that "they" were out to "get" the Jewish Agency - in the sense of putting an end to recognition of the right to representation of the Jewish people as a whole in regard to Palestine. He is still anxious to have the matter of America's interest in the Mandate through the 1924 Convention brought out in Congress - the right of the Jewish Agency to recognition being a part of the Mandate and therefore in his view unchangeable without the consent of the U.S. I am to breakfast tomorrow with Gray and Francis.

In the morning I went to the British Embassy to see about admission to the hearings and found an old friend in the shape of Ernest Main in charge of press relations. I had been in touch with him in London when as a free lance journalist he had been engaged in writing his book "Palestine at the Crossroads." I arranged to have lunch with him on Sunday as I want to hear of his experiences in Iraq during the war - he was there right through the Rashid Ali business.

Subsequently, I got into touch with Evya Wilson and arranged for admission to the hearings for the leaders of the Zionist Organization here, as well as for myself. The head of the Federation here is Maitre (i.e. Lawyer) Castro. He told me this morning that King Farouk had arranged for the Chief Rabbi and (separately) for Cattani Pasha who is the Rosenwald of Egypt to come and see him on Sunday. He had had long talks with each of them ranging over many subjects but not a word on Palestine or the Committee. This was taken to mean that the King was against their appearing before the Committee - a fact to be inferred from his regal silence on the subject. This is



all to the good. The explanation is probably that if they (and particularly the Chief Rabbi) appeared, the question of the mob attacks in Cairo and Alexandria a few months ago on the Jews of those cities must inevitably come up, and however anti-Zionist or neutral the evidence given by these gentlemen on the Zionist issue what they would have to say on the riots couldn't do Egypt any good - hence better that they should not appear at all.

I had breakfast with Gray with various secretaries and members at adjoining tables. I am beginning to feel like an international spy and I am quite sure Wilson wonders what the hell I am doing here. Subsequently I went up to Gray's room and later to see Francis. Francis was about to take a bath - so nothing daunted, we carried on the conversation while he scrubbed and I sat on the edge of the tub. Notes:

(a) By way of further information on the desire to put an end to the Agency - the most determined man on that point is apparently Dolly! I knew in London that he was much upset by Jackson's evidence which, as I think I wrote at that time, served to confirm his dark suspicions about the double loyalties implicit in Zionism. His feelings on the subject of course suit the British down to the ground.

(b) It looks as if they (the Committee) will be so guarded and protected in Palestine as to be given very little freedom of movement. (As one Britisher put it to them "after all if anything happened to you it might cost a lot of men their jobs").

(c) Partition seems for the moment to have receded into the background.

(d) So far as the group from Maurice's area is concerned, Gray seems to have a little hope about Eccles; and Francis about Statler.

(e) Some of the members (including I imagine our Texan friend) feel that they know what is to be known and would gladly cut things short. (All this amounts to little, I am afraid, but here it is for what it is worth).

(f) I gather that one of the members saw a hefty file on the Mufti in Nuremberg - also that a report of an agreement between Hitler and the Mufti was cabled to America - presumably this came out in the press while I was on the boat. Incidentally, I saw Main again later and he mentioned to me the "great pressure" that was being exerted to get the Mufti back. In Paris I was told that it was anticipated that the Mufti would be released within a couple of months. He is living in great comfort in a villa near Paris and has freedom of communication, including visitors.

#### LIST OF CODE NAMES USED HEREIN

Francis	Crum
Dolly	Hutcheson
Harvey	Buxton
Gray	McDonald
Eccles	Crick
Maurice	Morrison
Whelan	Leggett
Statler	Crossman
Bell	Manningham-Buller



CONFIDENTIAL

REPORT FROM A.L. FROM CAIRO, MARCH 3, 1946

At the conclusion of the morning's session of the Committee at which Azzam Bey gave evidence, Gray came up to me and asked me if I knew of a throat specialist in Cairo. I introduced him to Emil Najjar who was standing next to me and Najjar undertook to arrange an appointment with the physician. Najjar (a young and intelligent lawyer) is chairman of the Cairo Zionist Society and he subsequently had two long conversations at the hotel with Gray, in which at different times and for varying periods other members of the Committee who happened to be passing took part. What follows represents items of interest reported on by Najjar:

Apart from the public hearings some of the members have seen certain people privately and informally. Among these have been Sir Walter Smart (Oriental Secretary to the British Embassy) and Cattani Pasha and his brother. Smart's line was that he was optimistic about the future of British-Arab relations. The British need the Arabs; they have no desire to colonise the Arab countries; and since neither British nor Arabs want Russia in the picture they will be able to come to a mutually satisfactory arrangement. But it is necessary first to liquidate the Zionist business. Gray added that he was afraid that the British members of the Committee had the air of being at one about the need to wipe the slate clean and make a fresh start. They are embarrassed by their promises. On the other hand, they would pay a high price to have a unanimous report. For one thing they would like to show the Russians that they are able to work in unity with the Americans. Gray added that as far as he personally was concerned it was not always easy for him to get on close terms with the English members because they think he is committed to the idea of a Jewish state. He went on to say that the Jewish state formula troubled even our friends on the Committee and that it seemed to him a tactical error.

Harvey joined them for a while and remarked that Maurice had been deeply impressed by what he had seen in Europe. Harvey went on to say that he (Harvey) could understand why no country wanted to receive the survivors of European Jewry. All the best elements had been killed off. It would take a generation or two to restore the stamina and quality of what remained (the same idea in a less pronounced form had come out in my conversation with Harvey in London). While conversing with him it was suggested that the British members of the Committee might wish to stop immigration to Palestine - Harvey denied this but agreed when Gray said that their acceptance of further immigration was conditioned on American military participation. (My reporter also said on Arab consent as well, but this was not clear). Harvey added that there was pressure on the Committee to go to the Lebanon and Syria so that they might see that the Arabs were capable of economic development without Zionist aid. Najjar suggested that what had been done there would have been impossible without the French -- this was dismissed by Harvey with the remark "the French are notoriously bad colonisers." (In the afternoon Harvey rang me. He said he was troubled about some matters and we arranged to meet for breakfast tomorrow. He will come into Cairo). Gray, Statler and Phil met Cattani in a private house "at a cocktail party." This was apparently arranged by the American Legation. The Cattanis are people of great wealth and one of them is titular head of the Jewish community. Gray described him as a kind of Egyptian Rosenwald. Najjar remarked that the difference was that despite his 200% Egyptian patriotism on the Zionist issue, a test of his "Egyptianness" was to be found in the fact that he sent his children abroad to be educated. Cattani urged that there be no effort to force Jewish immigration without Arab consent - otherwise the life of every Jew in the Middle East might be endangered! It is to be noted that prior to the arrival of the Commission Cattani and the Zionists had entered into a gentleman's agreement that the one would not appear if the other did not. The "cocktail party" was of course a device to evade this arrangement. But then, as one of the Zionist leaders here remarked, the Cattanis always were "des salops." (Incidentally, French



has proved much more useful to me here than English). We shall try to take some action to overcome the damage done by Cattani - who undoubtedly impressed some of the members and whose comments were only transmitted to the others.

Other items which emerged from the remarks of Gray and Statler were that Maurice and Bell had their minds made up and didn't want to listen anymore and that the representatives of American and British Christian missions had expressed themselves unfavorably to a Zionist solution as otherwise "we will lose all standing with the Arabs." At one point Dolly passed and jokingly remarked "I have reached an age where I have nothing more to learn!" To which Najar replied, "Then, it is time to apply what you know." Najar asked Statler how it was possible in connection with Azzam Bey's evidence about Arab toleration of their Jewish minorities that no member of the Commission had asked a question about the '41 pogrom in Iraq, or those of last November in Cairo and Tripoli. The answer given by either Statler or Gray was "We don't know about these things. But in any case were told not to ask questions outside the scope of the memorandum submitted by the League." Incidentally, I gather that last night members of the Commission dined with British and American Near East experts at the Legation. To return for a moment to the Cattanis; Najar told Gray that on the Palestine issue they did not represent one in a hundred of Egyptian Jewry. Actually, when the Moyné murderers were executed a twenty-four<sup>hour</sup>/fast, self-imposed, was observed among the poorer Jewish quarters in Cairo (a fact which was kept private to avoid unwanted reactions). Of the Egyptian Jewish community (about 80,000 in number) surprisingly, only one-third are recognized as citizens. To obtain citizenship it is necessary to make an application which is acted on administratively. In the case of the Moslems action is virtually automatic. In the case of the Jews technicalities and delays generally arise so that although they have been settled in Egypt for centuries, some two-thirds of the Jewish population have been unable to obtain citizenship. The Cattanis, incidentally, were registered as Austrian citizens till 1910. In answer to Gray's question as to how he explained British policy, Najar said that it is a policy of diversion. Had the British been determined to prevent the pogrom of November 2nd, it would not have happened - but they hoped thereby to divert attention from Egyptian demands on themselves. Actually, they obtained a respite for only three months, as witness the unequivocally anti-British disturbances of February 21st. On this occasion, incidentally, there were Egyptian students who came to the Jewish quarter crying "you are our allies against British imperialism - vive the Sternists!" I gather, however, that the Jews remained quietly at home.

The argument which the British continue to advance is that it will require six divisions (in which American participation would be expected) to impose a Zionist solution. I understand Bentwich is here and has been meeting with Gray, Maurice and Statler. I hope to hear more of him tomorrow, but am told that he is pursuing a pro-Magnes line - though exactly what he is advocating I have not heard. It seems that he is complaining inter-alia that the Jews have never done anything to seek a rapprochement with the Arabs.

A word in conclusion about the position of the Jews in the Oriental countries. Najar warned Gray that an anti-Zionist solution will not help them - on the contrary it will be the beginning of the end for them. For it will be conclusive proof to the Arabs that they are weak and without support - a cardinal crime. On the other hand, Palestine Jewry will certainly not remain passive, and a state of agitation will inevitably result, which will affect the Jewish communities everywhere. Moreover, it must be remembered that the Jewish population of Palestine today is more than twice that of all the countries of the Arab League - so that even numerically speaking the first issue is that of the future of the Yishuv. The answer (Zionist



solution or otherwise) must be a clear guarantee by Britain with or without America of the position of these communities. Paradoxically, there will be less need for that guarantee in the event of a clear determined pro-Zionist policy than vice versa.

I had lunch yesterday with Ernest Main, with whom I had been friendly eight or nine years ago when he was writing his book on Palestine. He told me a few interesting things which I shall record separately. He is now press relations officer at the British Embassy. He suffered an unfortunate accident in Aden in 1942 - a balcony on which he was sitting collapsed and he suffered the loss of a leg. This afternoon Sasson and I were invited to tea by - of all people - a distinguished Moslem dignitary from Iran. He is the spiritual head of the Shiites who number between seven and eight millions, mostly in Iran and the tribesmen of Iraq. His name (not for publication) is Sayyed Irakayen (spelling doubtful) and he is a genuine friend of the Jews. He lives in Teheran and when the Jewish children from Russia came through and needed shelter he provided one of his houses for 30 or 40 of the children. He has come to Cairo for health reasons. He is a big middle-aged somewhat portly man with a pleasant rather benevolent-looking face, and is garbed in a black turban and a long flowing gray robe. He showed us a picture of a function at the El Azhav University with himself on the right of Sheikh El-Azhav and the then Prime Minister, Nokrasky Pasha on the left. Another picture in which he was prominent was of a group of the leaders of the Arab League, among whom he said, with something of a twinkle in his eye, he does pro-Zionist propaganda! The conversation was conducted in Arabic with occasional translations into French for my benefit and was concerned primarily with mid-Eastern politics as they related to Iran. Our friend said inter-alia that for twenty years he had seen at close quarters, and detested, British imperialist intrigues in Iran - but after experiencing the Russian occupation (including not least the Russian soldiers attacks upon their women folk) the Iranians were praying for the Russians to get out and for the British to remain. As to why he personally was so friendly to the Jews, he explained as follows: His father, who was apparently a man of means, died when he was young (he was born and lived at that time in Iraq). His estate was managed by Jews who not only looked after it with scrupulous care but substantially increased its worth. When in the course of time he went to Iran, not knowing much about business affairs he called on some Persian Jews, told them of his experience in Iraq and asked them to help him in similar fashion. This they had done no less meticulously and with no less success than their coreligionists in Iraq. In addition to all this our friend indicated that he had heard with sorrow of all that had befallen the Jews of Europe and was anxious to help them. It was an agreeable tea party and a refreshing experience save that I ate too much Turkish Delight and large pecan nuts (straight from his estate) and am suffering accordingly!

I spoke to Rood, the American Secretary of the Commission, with regard to procedure and I gather from him that government officials and military in Palestine will probably be heard in camera, also that some members of the Commission - but not the whole body - are to visit neighboring Arab countries.

I leave tomorrow for Jerusalem.

LIST OF CODE NAMES USED HEREIN:

Gray	McDonald
Harvey	Buxton
Statler	Crossman
Maurice	Morrison
Bell	Manningham-Buller
Dolly	Hutcheson
Phil	Phillips



CONFIDENTIALEXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM A.L., JERUSALEM, MARCH 13, 1946

As I see things, when the Committee gets down to business the struggle will center around the question of a unanimous report (which will be a compromise) or a majority-minority report. The majority group is probably contemplating a frontal attack on the continuation of the Mandate; also the liquidation of the Agency and a very limited continuation of immigration. The minority has probably not crystallised a single point of view but would favor in all probability an immediate grant of 100,000 certificates with directions for a substantial continuation of immigration thereafter, but without defining any endziel - in fact a somewhat strengthened Mandate so far as immigration is concerned, leaving to the future the question of a Jewish State. As to a compromise formula presumably discussion will center around an agreed immigration figure and the position of the Agency. At present partition is very little in evidence, but it may come to the fore later on.





TOP SECRET

Talk with Crum at the KD on 15.3.46. (by T. L.)

Crum began by telling me that there was an investigation on into the deletion from the stenographic record of Crossman's questioning of Auni Bey on the Mufti.

He mentioned, off the record, that the session with the South African party had been cut short when the Chairman got a message that the building was mined or something.

We then met George Backer and Crum told us about a conversation he had with Manuilsky, the Ukrainian delegate to UNO, who had told him that Bevin wasn't impressing them, since he was talking like a Trade Union leader trying to win a Trade Union election. M. said as regards the Inquiry that Moscow was sore because of the off-handed way in which the British were behaving, not having deemed it necessary even to consult them or advise them beforehand about it.

As for him (M), he came from Kiev and he knew that despite all their efforts the Nazi poison had strongly infected the people (as if the Ukrainians had to wait for Nazi anti-Semitism). M. mentioned Stalin's green light to Churchill and Roosevelt at Yalta on Palestine, and said that he thought that if the British consulted Moscow on Palestine, they might get somewhere. He mentioned Maisky having brought back a good report from here.

To make this clear, I asked if this meant before or after the Inquiry's findings, and Crum said it meant before the British and American Governments announced their decision on the findings of the Committee.

The London interview followed a San Francisco meeting between Crum and M, at which the latter told C. that his chief aim was to convince America that Russia really wanted and needed peace.

Backer said that the Isolationists, including the Patterson-McCormacks and Hearsts, etc. were shouting again following Churchill's Fulton speech. They don't care if Russia takes Persia and everything else in Europe, and even Britain, as long as they have the few Pacific islands that America wants.

Crum talked about a "liberal" partition, and Backer said he no longer called it partition but rather a re-definition of frontiers and C. talked about taking out "that triangle" and then we, the Jews, could negotiate on our own with Syria and Abdullah for future arrangements. This was in reply to my question what about the JVA - could it be an international concession, and he said, of course. Why couldn't we negotiate with the Emir for it?

About Russia's attitude, he said that the British didn't seem to want to handle Moscow properly, the way M. had suggested that Russia wanted to be treated, but instead, insisted on this policy of building up the Cordon Sanitaire of Arab States, on which Backer commented they're still a few generations behind the times.

I asked whether the British didn't seem anxious to get American consent for their Palestine plans so as to form an Anglo-American line-up against



Russia to which C. replied that they couldn't get American consent along the lines they seem to be going.

C. emphasized that he thought there must be a definitive solution now and also mentioned that he'd had a stand-up row in Vienna over the non-issuing of an interim report as he wanted the 100,000 to be granted immediately and the British had sent a Foreign Office man to Vienna apparently to curb this. The British members held that such a report would prejudice the whole issue and couldn't see Crum's point of view that the admission of 1500 had already, in fact, abolished the White Paper principle.

Earlier Backer had asked him how he had got on at Nuremburg to which he replied he was disappointed with Jackson. He had asked him if he had anything on the Mufti to which J. replied in the negative, when C. knew from others there that they had stuff.

When I asked why he thought J. had said no, C. said he was puzzled but perhaps he didn't have enough of a case to say anything about it.

C. said that he had learned in Vienna of the instructions from Hitler to the effect that in the case of any ransoming of concentration camp inmates, no Jews were to be included as an agreement had been reached with the Mufti that all Jews be exterminated.

vv He had also learned there that the Hitler-Mufti agreement included relegation of Ibn Saud to secondary importance by making the Mufti the supreme head of a new Pan-Islam. (During the talk George Merany passed our table and C. referred to him as an agent provocateur.)

#### Earlier Talks with Buxton

Buxton seems a nice old guy, with emphasis on the old. He came into the PP newsroom with the usual compliments for the paper and asked: "But why don't you have any ads in the paper?" When I showed him the copy of that day's paper, he looked at the ads and mumbled something about "Why hadn't he noticed the ads before?" He also asked jokingly who had "advertised his being a Methusaleh" -- a reference to our publishing his age (68) in the paper.

When in the course of conversation I remarked something about the first hundred thousand and the long-term political solution, he said: "What, you want something more than the 100,000?"

On another occasion, I asked him what he thought of the official reason given for there not having been an interim report, and he said that that was his point of view that the two problems were closely inter-related.

Both he and Crum talked about the Nottestein evidence at Washington as having been very important and other sources confirm that they've taken N's figures as most reliable.

In the interval between the two Weizman sittings, Buxton asked Crum how he thought their Chairman had handled W. to which C. said: "very badly". He was "boiling up and almost exploded," he said. Buxton asked why C. said this business of quoting old statements is an old courtroom trick that made him sore. Apparently, as a result of this B. in the afternoon session prefaced his question to Wn. with a remark to the Chairman that they'd heard a good deal of "history" in quotations from twenty-year old documents.



CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM A.L., JERUSALEM, MARCH 21, 1946

During the past few days there has been relative peace and quiet here as most of the members were traipsing around either seeing sights locally or visiting our neighbors, so I occupied my time doing a spot of useful work in the office.

Genold covered himself with glory by getting himself arrested, and half of today's "Palestine Post" seems to have been written by him -- including an editorial on democracy in the Lebanon and a notable pro-Zionist interview with the Maronite Archbishop. I saw him for a while this afternoon -- none the worse for his experience and on the contrary rather bucked by it all. If for nothing else his trip here was justified by this episode.

I gather from Francis\* that the origin of Hutcheson's famous remark to Magnes "Behold an Israelite in whom is no guile" was elicited by the fact that Hutcheson had been informed -- apparently by some British official -- before the hearing, that Magnes had been warned by terrorists that he would be murdered if he appeared; and Hutcheson took this rather odd method of giving him his moral support. Francis\* thereupon enquired from Magnes whether it was true that he had received such a threat, and was informed that the story was entirely without foundation!

As I suspected would be the case, partition has begun to rear its head again in the thoughts of various members of the group -- indeed one report has it that as many as five of the Americans (i.e. excluding Dolly) are beginning to regard it as a possible solution. Statler who was very much for partition, however, seems to be wobbling now in favor of bi-nationalism. So far as the facts are concerned, I gather that the body have decided to accept the Peel report as a basis and their function in this aspect will be to bring the facts from 1937 up to date. One idea apparently is that a general outline of a partition scheme should be recommended with the establishment of the Jewish Agency forthwith as a provisional Jewish government which shall thereupon enter into negotiations with Transjordan for the settlement of the final boundary and other matters of mutual concern. All of which sounds to me a little too much like "Zukunftsmusik" especially the idea that T.J. would at that stage be ready to negotiate anything at all.

Apparently Singer is ready to make what he describes as "great concessions" for a unanimous report. Francis, however, has made it clear that there is no possibility for a "trade" on the basis of a grant of the 100,000 certificates and beyond that no more. He is extremely anxious that the present quiet should continue at least until the Committee reports, but that unfortunately is not in our hands. At the same time there is a sinister but unconfirmed report of provocative acts in preparation the purpose of which would be to goad Jews into retaliatory action.

\*See list of Code Names Attached.



CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM A LETTER FROM A.L. - GENEVA, APRIL 8, 1946

Since my last letter describing the conversion (or from another point of view, apostasy) of Dolly, I have lunched with Harvey, dined with Gray, and had tea with Francis. The result of all this gastronomy and of subsequent information is as follows: Dolly's initial statement (a copy of which I have seen) is not quite as strong in tone as I had been led to believe -- e.g. he talks of an immigration of "up to 100,000" in the first year and not of 150,000. But it nevertheless represents a sufficient change of spirit to rejoice the hearts of our friends -- who now find themselves working with him as a team to the mutual satisfaction of all (except the ). The first fruits of this was at a meeting of the committee yesterday. Dolly arrived with a brief declaration to the effect that they base their discussions on the principle that immigration must continue and in general they must accept the obligations of the mandate as still binding. This was forced by him to a vote -- result: six Americans pro, four British against -- Maurice and Statler abstaining. I gather that Phil asserted himself for the first time declaring that it would be against his conscience to do anything to put an end to . The next meetings should be quite hectic. The position of Statler, who is being accused of treason to the Empire, can hardly be a comfortable one. So far, however, ~~his~~ he is (within limits) sticking to his guns. In particular he took a strong line in opposition to any suggestion of making continuation of immigration dependent on "liquidation" of -- even going so far as to file a memorandum on this subject. His line is quite rightly, that you must change the policy which has brought about terrorist activity if you really wish to put an end to the terrorism. But this stand has not made him popular with his chairman et al.

I have been getting the most discouraging replies from the aviation companies about the possibility of getting a passage home this month. However, I have by no means given up hope. In the first place I am putting in an application for a priority by boat in case the air-passage does not come through; and secondly the necessary strings will be pulled.

The conclusion of this is being written in the train to Lausanne -- en route for another meal -- with Francis. Shall also see Gray I believe.

- - - - -

The two chairmen are on speaking terms again. I foresee a dangerous time when the British will come along with some compromise proposal and the Americans will have to decide on their own attitude.

Gerold Frank and Ruth Gruber of the N. Y. Post suddenly turned up on Thursday at the Hotel where the Commission is staying. They keep on appearing at intervals in pursuit of the main actors rather like a pair of musical comedy characters. I saw them the same evening. They were immediately advised on all trends to leave the hotel where the Commission was staying - by Hutcheson because he doesn't -- quite understandably -- want journalists about at this time -- and by us because even if they did learn anything they could not publish it at this time, and a leakage could only do harm; in addition it is a matter of prime importance to keep Dolly sweet ~~→~~ and their presence would be quite an irritant in the circumstances. I gather they have bowed to the attack and will remove themselves to Geneva.



Continued April 7, 1946

I wasn't able to post this last night and want to add a few words.

It looks more and more as if things are heading for two reports. The Americans remain clear in their determination not to be whittled down on the immediate immigration of 100,000 -- continued immigration thereafter and cancellation of the land restrictions. From this the British are poles away. Dolly seems to be getting stronger and stronger in his new-found or at any rate newly revealed convictions, and has even apparently indicated privately that the main trouble stems from the 1922 lopping off of Transjordan which so greatly restricted the possibilities of colonization. Not that he particularly likes the Zionists (Weizmann was too clever, B. G. too aggressive and Mrs. Golda Myerson too mannish) - or Zionism - but apparently he has come to accept the justice of their position in terms of the legal documents and also has come to regard it as inevitable that, with the driving force with which it is endowed, it will achieve its aim sooner or later. But perhaps most interesting was the reaction on him of his visit to Syria and Lebanon. He agreed to the visits to the Arab countries only under considerable pressure from the British. The result was the contrary of what had been intended - he came back with the conviction that the Jews can't be left to the mercy of an Arab state.

The solution which he prefers as I have already indicated is a binational state with continuing "full immigration" consistent with the welfare of the country. I gather                    have given him up as hopeless and are concentrating their efforts on seeking to seduce what are regarded as two weaker sisters -- & though if the others remain firm I doubt they will succeed. At the same time it is pretty clear that the American report (under Dolly's influence) will state in so many words that Palestine as a Jewish State or as an Arab State is out.

One of our American friends told me that a copy arrived yesterday of an ad by the Emergency Council in the N. Y. Times about the omission from the records of Auni's cross-examination about the Mufti. Our friend was rather caustic about the ad which he said was cheap, contained a number of untruths and did us no good. The British of course were infuriated about it. I have not seen the ad so am unable to judge.



CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM A LETTER FROM A.L. - GENEVA, APRIL 11, 1946.

Yesterday was a very busy day - worked on a memorandum from early morning commenting on some material which had been submitted to us, then out to the city of mystery, lunch (at his invitation) with Harvey, tea (together with Nahum) with Gray, and then a subsequent talk with Harvey once more (at the conclusion of which he told me to call him by his first name), dinner in the train and then straight to hear Jacques Thibaud together with Nahum.

I am a bit troubled about our communications to the States because of the J.T.A. leakage on Monday. So far only Gray knows about it and he was a good deal put out and is in particular anxious about what effect it may have on his colleagues when they learn of it. The J.T.A. has put Gerold in a mean position incidentally, because they put a Geneva date-line on their report, and of course he is known to the members of the group as the J.T.A.'s Geneva representative pro-tem - whereas he had specifically informed Dolly that he would observe confidence and not seek to disclose information on current developments within the body.

Alors, revenons a nos moutons ! It is clear that <sup>0.6.725</sup> have decided that in the light of the attitude of the others they would have to revise their stand at least on the 100,000. A memo was accordingly prepared by Bell which is a cunning document, dripping with friendship and the spirit of compromise ("not much betweenus") and agreeing that it will be necessary on humanitarian grounds (only) to admit at any rate the old and infirm and the very young; but since he fears Arab reactions to the entry of people of military age, the latter would apparently not benefit from these humanitarian considerations. As to the national home, no one can deny that it is established and while provision should be made for continuing immigration, it would be inadvisable to mention specifically the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate or to make reference to the Jewish National Home ! One of the experts in a little memo to a friend on the body pointed out that this would mean in effect to accept the position that the obligations under the Mandate have been carried out and no one could now start from scratch. I think our friends are fully aware of the trap; and forewarned is forewarned.

In estimating the present situation within the body, it is well for a moment to consider what might have been. In the first place as Harvey said to me, we don't perhaps fully realize the intensity of the attack and the gravity of the danger to the Sochnut; that danger which involved at least a serious reduction in rights and status was avoided a) by the determined opposition of the three musketeers of whom in this respect perhaps the doughtiest fighter was Harvey himself and b) as a result of the ultimate conversion of Dolly. On this front <sup>0.6.725</sup> have now apparently completely abandoned the fight - as too, is the case I think with regard to the attack on <sup>2/25</sup> - though this may be revived -



this may be revived-again, however, in view of the firm attitude of our friends as well as of Statler, without much prospect of success. It seems pretty clear now that the land as well as the immigration provisions of the White Paper will go - though the land issue has not been fought out yet. On every one of these points but for the fact that there was an American half to the Commission and that ultimately that half, has, as a result largely of the changed attitude of the judge, been solidified, our position would have been disastrous. So that on balance our cooperation with the commission has to my mind been justified 100% - for without it much of the improvement which has occurred within the group would certainly not have come about which is not to say that we are out of the woods or that our Zionist program is about to be achieved. It is rather once again the story of the Rabbi and the goat - but in this case a particularly overwhelming and smelly kind of goat which might have been the cause of prolonged discomfort - to put it mildly.

One of the matters on which I was questioned was the possibility of arranging for the immediate accomodation of tens of thousands. Fortunately on this I was able to draw attention to a memo on housing which was submitted to the Committee immediately prior to its departure from ~~Y.K.~~. It appears by the way that a couple of generals have been brought over from Germany and questioned as to how long it would take to remove the inhabitants of the camps to Palestine - the answer being a maximum of four weeks! At the same time another little trap which is being set by the ~~British~~ in order to qualify the concessions, they are now ready to make on the immediate immigration issue, is to make the rate of entry conditional on the availability of accomodation. To this a suggestion was made by some one ( I don't know whom) that that question should be determined by a body composed of representatives of the Agency, the J.D.C., the Army and the Palestine Government. This too has obvious dangers which we shall of course do our best to press home.

Statler gave what was described to me as a brilliant presentation of the case in behalf of Halukah. Apparently however, he remains almost alone in his convictions on this subject. The body has in fact not yet come to grips with that part of its term of reference which calls for recommendations in regard to a permanent solution - and it may well be that they - or rather the American section - may satisfy themselves with the cancellation of the White Paper, immediate recommendations with respect to immigration and some general provisions for its continuation, and not attempt to suggest anything radical for the future. On this we shall know more in a few days - if all sources of information will not be suddenly closed to us by reason of such indiscretions as that contained in Monday's J.T.A. story. Tomorrow all of us here in Geneva (which for your information now includes in addition to Nahum and Moshe, Dolik Horowitz and his wife) are moving to Montreux en masse.



CONFIDENTIAL

EXCERPT FROM A LETTER FROM A.L. - MONTREUX, APRIL 16, 1946.

We moved over to Montreux on Friday but so much activity has been generated in the intervening days that I feel as if we had been there for weeks. The hotel certainly must be wondering what kind of an international plot is being hatched there.

We arrived in time for dinner. We had hardly sat down (Nahum, Moshe, Dolik H., Mrs. Dolik H., Gerold and Ruth Gruber, plus secretary from Geneva) when the concierge came along with a look of deep respect to say "On vous appelle de New York". This fillip to our prestige was very timely as it happens, since we had just informed the head-waiter to his disgust that none of us wanted wine with our meal. Well the call from New York was only the beginning. Before long there were calls to or from London, Paris, Geneva, Lausanne, telegrams to Jerusalem and South Africa and a call from Milan about the unfortunates at La Spezia. Finally our friend came along with his eyes goggling, to say that there was a call from Rome.

The J.T.A. leak, and even worse George Lichtheim's story in the Palestine Post - the further distribution of which by Falcor we only just succeeded in stopping - did what Francis called "irreparable damage"; and the immediate result was that one of the chiefs of the Palestine C.I.D. (= U.S. FBI) was flown over to look after the "security" of the members of the Committee which is a polite way of saying to spy on the activities of certain of the members from America. All of which has served greatly and most unnecessarily to complicate life.

Anyway things are moving along and to judge by such reports as now percolate through, we ought on the whole to keep our fingers crossed - though I still see pitfalls. The trend reported in my last letter is being maintained and Singer's crowd seems to have caved in definitely on the hundred thousand, continued immigration, repeal of the Land Legislation (though with certain reservations), and any frontal attack on the Agency or the Haganah. In addition to preparing material on financing the hundred thousand, we had the opportunity over the weekend of doing one very useful job at the request of one of the musketeers. I must say that I think our presence here has been of very great value, because even the best informed and most anxious to be helpful can't be expected to see the nuances and implications in the same way as do we who have lived with the business. Friend Harvey incidentally with whom I am lunching today said that he thought the report would be "the biggest step forward for Zionism in 25 years". Well that remains to be seen. But certainly the intentions are of the best and the situation is improved out of all recognition by comparison with a year ago.

Tuesday afternoon: My luncheon with Harvey did not come off after all and I lunched instead with Gray and Lola Hahn-Warburg, who has come here for a few days. Some of the things I learnt during lunch in regard to the recommendations troubled me -



particularly a rather sweeping condemnation apparently, of both the non-alienation and non-Arab labor clauses of the J.N.F. I suspect there is also a condemnation of the Agency for its failure to take effective action in regard to terrorism. We are doing our utmost at the moment incidentally to obtain the inclusion of a resolution in favor of specific financial and other assistance to make possible the settlement of the 100,000 otherwise we may find ourselves hamstrung by administrative opposition and lack of means.

