



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 B: Additional Manson Material, 1943-1949, undated.

Reel
108

Box
38

Folder
459

Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, 1947 January 8.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE
ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

State Department Building

January 8, 1946



PAGES: 1 to 122

NATIONAL { 4266
 4267
 4268

WARD & PAUL
(ELECTROREPORTER, INC.)
OFFICIAL REPORTERS
1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

CONTENTS

	Page
Mr. Henry Honsky	3
Dr. Stephen D. Wise	20
Dr. Emanuel Neumann	38
Mrs. Judith Epstein	105



1-8
hc

HEARINGS BEFORE THE
ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Held in Room 474 of the Department of State Bldg.

Tuesday, January 8, 1946

MORNING SESSION

APPEARANCES

Mr. Henry Monsky, representing the American Jewish
Conference

Dr. Stephen D. Wise, representing the American Zionist
Emergency Council

Dr. Emanuel Neumann, representing the American Zionist
Emergency Council

P R O C E E D I N G S

The hearing convened at 10:15 a.m.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: Mr. Chairman, before we hear the next witness there is a matter to which I would like to direct attention in the hope that we may get further help upon it while we are here.

Yesterday Mr. Crossman asked a question of the first witness, Mr. Earl Harrison, about postal facilities. The reference is on page 22 of the transcript. It was mentioned again in the course of the evidence of Dr. Schwartz at page 60. The question put to Mr. Earl Harrison was:

"How are the postal facilities of these people? How do they get in contact? Do they write their relatives?"

Mr. Harrison answered, "There are none."

Mr. Crossman asked, "Could there be postal facilities if they were allowed? What is the physical difficulty about it?"

Mr. Harrison answered, "There seems to be a great deal of difficulty, although when I was there in July, I was told that the postal service would be set up within 30 to 60 days. At that time they said it was a matter of setting up rules and regulations which had pretty much been decided upon and recruiting local talent for carriers."

Mr. Crossman asked, "So that these people have no idea whether they have relatives alive or not in the Western

countries?"

Mr. Harrison replied, "Most of them do not. A few have been able through private organizations and individual soldiers ascertain these facts, but that has been a relatively small number."

The matter was altered a little in the evidence of Dr. Schwartz, but I do think it is desirable that we should have some information, if it is obtainable, through perhaps the War Department as to that matter. After all, the internment camps, or the camps in which these displaced persons have existed for a long time, one would think there ought to be-- and there may be--some postal facilities now.

I have discussed it with one or two members and we should like to have some information if it is available. I mention it now because we may be able to get information here, or we may in England. Thank you.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: All right.

We will call the first witness.

MR. ROOD: Mr. Henry Monsky of the American Jewish Conference.

STATEMENT OF HENRY MONSKY,

AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE

MR. MONSKY: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Commission, it is my privilege to address you as one of the co-chairmen of the American Jewish Conference. The American

Jewish Conference has submitted a written statement which we hope will prove helpful to your Committee in its effort to find a solution to the problem, the solution of which, we respectfully submit, has too long been delayed.

I approached this task with great humility, conscious of the gravity of the tragic plight of the Jewish people. I realize full well that whatever I might say will add but little to the mass of evidence already before you of the unprecedented suffering, the distress and dislocation of the people who were the innocent victims of evil forces of a character heretofore inconceivable.

I am encouraged, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Commission, by the firm belief that the Government of the United States and the British Government have, in recognition of the great humanitarian needs of a terribly wronged people, delegated to your Committee the responsibility of making recommendations in accord with the demands of justice.

The Jewish community of the United States is today the largest single Jewish community in the world, with an approximate population of 5,000,000.

The Jewish communities and the displaced persons in the war devastated continent of Europe do, and rightfully should, look to us for aid, succor, and rehabilitation, and they look to us to assist them in the establishment and maintenance of their future security.

We believe that the status of Palestine is an integral and inseparable factor in that future security.

As president of the B'nai B'rith it was my privilege to issue the invitation for a meeting which led to the convening of the first session of the American Jewish Conference. That first session was held in August 1943. It was convened to make articulate the position and the point of view of the American Jewish community and to effect, so far as possible, the common program of action in respect to the post-war problems and status of Jews and the rights of the Jewish people in respect to Palestine.

Represented at this first session of the Conference—and I think your Commission should be very much interested in this because of the seeming confusion as to just what is the point of view of the Jewish community of America in respect to the Palestine question. Represented at the first session of the Conference were 64 national Jewish membership organizations with an approximate aggregate membership of 1,500,000 American Jews.

These organizations elected 123 of a total of 502 delegates at the Conference. A great majority of the delegates, namely, 379 of the 502, were elected at community and regional electoral conferences which were held in 79 major communities and in every State of the Union.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Mr. Monsky, may I interrupt you for a

moment, not at all to limit the time you take, because you all have been very agreeable in submitting material. I read your material--I think most of us have--but I want to make this suggestion, that in respect of your statement which is a verbatim statement of this written material wouldn't it be more helpful to us if we had reference to it and you could expound or explain it more than just reading it? If you could do that it might be better. If you can't, why go right ahead.

MR. LONSKY: I appreciate your suggestion. It seems that Your Honor has a pre-vision of some kind, because in the very next sentence I am making reference to the material in the brief.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Thank you, sir.

MR. LONSKY: I appreciate your admonition.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: It is very nice you have given us this material in advance.

MR. LONSKY: May I remove from this folder this very thick book. I think you got the impression I was going to read it.

(Laughter)

MR. LONSKY: The delegates thus chosen, if Your Honor please, by democratic process truly reflected the point of view of the communities in the regions whom they were elected to represent, and the American Jewish Conference, constituted

as it was, does therefore in a very real sense represent the opinion of the American Jewish community. You will find, gentlemen, on page 3, 4 and 5 of the printed statement submitted by the American Jewish Conference, the full text of the Palestine Resolution.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Which book is that?

MR. MONSIEY: That is the blue-covered book.

I am not going to read the resolution. It is in the brief, and I assume the Commission will read it in due time if they have not already read it. I want to point out, however, the four main points that are asked in the resolution.

The resolution calls for the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration and for the Mandate of Palestine, whose intent and underlying purpose is to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. It demanded the withdrawal of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939 with its unwarranted restrictions on Jewish immigration and land settlement, and made the assertion that the White Paper was a violation of the rights accorded the Jewish people under the Mandate for Palestine.

Mr. Winston Churchill characterized it as a violation in the House of Commons when he said it was a breach and a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration.

The resolution asked that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and asked that the opportunity

be afforded the Jewish Agency to deal with problems of immigration and to develop to the maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of the country. This Palestine resolution was adopted at the Conference by an overwhelming majority.

Now recall I have told the Commission how the Conference was constituted, representatives of 64 national Jewish membership organizations with a membership of 1,500,000, which is one-third, or almost one-third, of the total Jewish population of America, and delegates representing 78 communities in every State in the Union where there were election conferences.

Of the 502 delegates, four delegates voted against the resolution, 19 abstained from voting, and more details concerning the record will be found on pages 6 and 7 of the statement which we filed.

There were several organizations, among them the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and its affiliates, which because of the diversified composition of their membership did not take a position upon that phase of the Palestine question which has to do with the ultimate political status of Palestine.

But it has been stated here, and I wish to underscore this statement, that as regards the abolition of the White Paper of 1939 and unrestricted immigration to Palestine and

the fulfillment of the spirit of the Balfour Declaration there was, and I venture to say there is now, virtual unanimity on the part of the Jews who have given any consideration to this problem.

You will find on page 8 of our written statement the report of the survey of American Jewish opinion, October 1945, the survey conducted by Elmo Roper, one of the outstanding analysts of American public opinion.

I challenge your special attention, gentlemen, to the form of the question in that survey. Question No. 1:

"A Jewish state in Palestine is a good thing for the Jews and every possible effort should be made to establish Palestine as a Jewish state, or commonwealth, for those who want to settle there.

"2. Jews are a religious group only and not a nation and it would be bad for the Jews to try to set up a Jewish state in Palestine or anywhere else."

As the result of the poll, the answers indicated 80.1% in the affirmative on the first proposal, and 10.5% in the affirmative on the second proposal, and 9.4% were undecided.

As you gentlemen of the Committee know, the Congress of the United States has by concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives expressed its commendation of the interest shown by the President of the United States in the solution of this problem referring to the Palestine

problem and directing that the United States use its good offices--I shall not repeat, but I have quoted here from the resolution of Congress that portion of the resolution.

In calling attention to this resolution I fully realize that it will be the responsibility of this Committee to base its recommendations upon a consideration of the facts as you now find them, having due regard, however, for the principle of fulfilling the intent and spirit and the letter of the promise made for the benefit of the Jewish people in respect to Palestine.

The declarations of American policy are made through the instrumentality of the Congress, and while that is not a mandate, the resolution means that the United States has once again spoken in furtherance of its traditional policy to purge the world of the forces of injustice and to remove the evil consequences thereof and to offer aid to the oppressed, the persecuted, the afflicted, and the homeless.

Much evidence will be presented to your Committee by representatives of organizations whose major interest and responsibility have been the upbuilding of Palestine, demonstrating the extent of the resources and manpower that have been poured into Palestine upon the faith of and in reliance upon the promises made to the Jewish people.

Such performance involving so much treasure and sacrifice and made with confidence within the pledges of responsible

governments, we respectfully submit, wholly apart from humanitarian considerations, cannot be disregarded.

Before leaving the subject of the Congressional resolution, may I read to you gentlemen a very brief passage from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate.

"The passage of this resolution will also furnish the occasion for the Congress to express itself forthrightly upon the horrible plight of the Jews in Europe, 5,700,000 of whom were victims of the Hitler and his mad men, according to the indictment expressed by the Allied Crime Commission. The war is over and the need for a Jewish homeland for the survivors where these persons can live and establish it is greater than ever. Your Committee feels, therefore, that the time is at hand when the longstanding pledges to the Jewish people shall be fulfilled."

Representatives of the American Jewish Conference, gentlemen, are now working in Jewish camps in Germany. Their reports corroborate fully the testimony already given to this Committee by Mr. Earl Harrison and Dr. Schwartz.

As late as December 1945 Conference representatives declared in a report made to us--and you will find the quotation on page 13 of the Conference's statement. I shall not read the quotation. I merely wish to underscore the final sentence in that report. Referring to the displaced persons,

"The overwhelming majority have expressed their desire to go to Palestine to begin a new life as soon as possible."

Now much has been said about immigration in other lands and some suggestion of that procedure is implicit in the terms of reference to this Committee. I should like to recall the substance of the statement made by Mr. Harrison concerning the inactivity of the Inter-governmental Refugee Committee, and also the observation made by Dr. Schwartz before this Committee, who, while commending the fine human spirit which motivated the recent directive of the President of the United States, was quite dubious concerning the possibility of substantial relief for displaced persons of countries other than Palestine under present immigration policies.

I would consider it unfortunate, gentlemen, if your consideration of the problems which have been referred to you should be limited to the matter of finding a haven or sanctuary for Jewish refugees. Although I do not minimize in the slightest the vital necessity for immediate action in that regard, any other recommendation based upon such a limited perspective, however, would be only a temporary expedient and would contribute little to the status of the Jewish people.

The recommendations, we fervently hope, therefore, will be based upon the long-range point of view, and we hope that you will, after the many years of vacillation and

changing attitudes with respect to this vital problem, will concern yourselves with the restoration of the Jewish people to the status and security in a national Jewish home, as was intended by His Majesty's government when the Balfour Declaration was issued.

Testimony has already been given relative to the possibility of repatriation of Jews in Germany and Austria and other similarly affected countries. Reports amply demonstrate the deplorable manifestations of the anti-Semitism, even though not on the part of the governments in Poland and other countries in which the masses have been poisoned by the corroding influence of Nazi hate and propaganda.

While we recognize the necessity for and the value, theoretically, if not practically, of minority treaties, but also of rights and constitutions designed to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, all of that type and character of documentation, we are compelled on the basis of experience in many European countries to point out that such documents do not bring about a transition of the attitudes of the people except in those lands wherein the democratic tradition has become deeply rooted in the hearts and minds of the people.

To hope for such an eventuality in some of the European countries is to hope for the impossible except after a long and arduous process of evidence extended over a period of

years in the fundamentals of democracy as we know it.

Meanwhile, human lives are being sacrificed for the want of realistic measures.

In conclusion, gentlemen, may I urge your careful consideration of the Palestine Resolution of the Conference to which I have already referred. May I urge an expressed determination to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and the abolition of the White Paper of May 1939, thus permitting the gates of Palestine to be opened for unrestricted immigration, and thus removing limitations on land settlement in Palestine by the Jewish people.

We ask for recommendations that will enable the facilities of the Jewish agencies to be utilized to their full capacity in relation to immigration and economic development of Palestine.

As a final word, may I reemphasize our very strong feeling that we must not perpetuate the grave injustice upon the displaced persons of forcing them to go back to lands which represent nothing except terribly tragic memories and the scenes of gas chambers and charnel houses which took their loved ones. These lands offer them neither security, a chance for survival, nor peace of mind.

Palestine, we submit, offers them, if the spirit of the Balfour Declaration should be carried out, security, peace of

mind, and the opportunity for normal development as free men.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I purposely prepared this brief statement in order that I shall not go over the time limit, and I appreciate your patience in letting me present it in this manner. If there are any questions I shall be very glad to answer them if I can. I do not come here as an expert on legalistic matters that are involved, although I will be glad to answer any questions that I can.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: I would like to ask you who prepared that? That is a valuable document to me.

MR. MONSKY: That is prepared by the American Zionist Emergency Council and some counsel that represented them.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: It was very valuable to me.

MR. MONSKY: It is our purpose to try to be helpful.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Do you think it is complete?

MR. MONSKY: I believe it to be complete.

MR. TULIN: Mr. Chairman, I prepared it, and I think it is virtually complete. It was prepared in a rush, but I endeavored to insert in that every document which I thought would be relevant to the situation.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: I should like to add it is most valuable as a history to look at, the admirable manner in which all the documents are prepared.

MR. TULIN: Thank you, sir.

MR. CRICK: Could Mr. Monsky give us any guidance as to

the different representatives to whom we should address questions on particular aspects such as economic, political, or what you will? Is there any division?

MR. MONSKY: I think Mr. Tulin probably can answer that question, because they have delegated to him the responsibility of arranging the order of these witnesses.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: There is one question I want to ask you. There is a question raised in your material and in all of the material which is coming forth today and coming before us today and tomorrow which probably is not susceptible of a precise answer, but I think ought to be, and that is the point made with reference to Palestine being the place to which not only the displaced Jews but those in Poland and Rumania and other places would most like to go and ought to be allowed to go. Does that go into the point that Jews can never live in Europe, or cannot now live in Europe?

Underlying all this discussion and reading that I have been doing, that tone keeps rising, Is this the end of the Jews in Europe?

MR. MONSKY: All I can say is that I hope it is not the end of Jews in Europe. There are many parts of Europe in which I sincerely hope the Jews will be able to resettle and rebuild themselves and reestablish themselves.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Which places?

MR. MONSKY: In France, Belgium and Holland and other

territories. I don't know but what it might be possible after the United Nations has operated a number of years, and if there should be a complete collaboration between the nations and if we can expose some of the other countries in Europe to some of the principles and ideals of democracy as we know them over here and in Great Britain, sir. I wasn't drawing any invidious distinction between us and Great Britain with respect to that.

I recall that the representatives of your Government at the San Francisco Conference were very cooperative in the matter of inserting a safeguarding clause in the trusteeship chapter of the United Nations' Charter, recognizing there were some rights in respect to Palestine that the Jewish people had, and that other mandated people had that should not be destroyed.

I do have great loyalty to the United States and to its tradition of democracy, and I do believe that when we expose other people to it in the rest of the world that in the course of time there may be a resettlement of Jews in those countries.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: The emphasis is on that rather than never.

MR. MONSKY: That is not my language. You didn't find it in my manuscript.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Now all those countries, Belgium,

Holland, France, for the present there is no place for them.

MR. MONSKY: I think it is perfectly safe to predict that it will be a place that is rather uncomfortable for them in the next 15 or 20 years.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: I see. I just want to get clear whether experiences in that part have been such, as far as the section of opinion you represent, a firm conclusion has been reached that there is no place any longer, won't be any place any longer, for Jews in those countries.

MR. MONSKY: For some time to come. I hope there will be places again in the future, because I am more optimistic about the future of civilization than to say never, that the Jews couldn't live in any land on the face of the earth.

MR. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, would it be helpful before the next witness is called to take 2 or 3 minutes to answer Mr. Crick's question?

MR. TULIN: May I ask what the question was?

MR. CRICK: I gather that the different witnesses appearing today will each deal with a particular phase of the problem they consider.

MR. TULIN: We have endeavored to arrange it that way.

MR. CRICK: In order to avoid putting questions around to people, I wonder if you would tell us to whom we should address certain types of questions.

MR. TULIN: The next witness, I think, will be Dr. Wise, who will cover a certain part of the historical phase and to whom questions can properly be addressed relating to that subject. The next witness after him will be Dr. Emanuel Neumann, to whom I think you may address almost any question relating to the Zionist position, to the position of the Zionist organizations in this matter, both historical and economic and political. Then I think Mr. Gold or Mrs. Epstein, I am not sure which, will testify. Mr. Gold will testify as regards the financial contributions and investments of American Jewry in Palestine, based on the faith placed by American Jews on the pledges of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, and questions relating to those subjects should, of course, be addressed to him, and Mrs. Epstein will give you testimony of a very interesting nature respecting the work of the Hadassah, an organization that is concerned with health work in Palestine, and she will be able to answer any questions relating to that phase of the matter.

MR. ROOD: The American Zionist Emergency Council has submitted a corrected copy of their document. (Distributes corrected copies.)

The press has asked for statements of this nature. The persons appearing have only supplied enough for the Committee members, and if you wish statements from the persons appearing you will have to see them.

The next person to appear will be Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, speaking for the American Zionist Emergency Council.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN S. WISE,
AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

DR. WISE: May I venture, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee, to make this statement to you: I appear here quite frankly with very great reluctance. I have been of that group of Americans deeply appreciative of the President's fine interest in the fate of the displaced persons, but deeply conscious and aware of the truth that the facts with regard to Palestine and the status of the Jews--the facts are known, well known--have been considered over a series of years by a series of British-named commissions, among such commissions the notable Appeal Commission, or Royal Commission.

So, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, you will forgive me for saying that nothing but a stern sense of duty as the veteran member, and in a sense, leader, of the Zionist movement has led me to appear before you and to present what I believe to be the unanswerable case for the Zionist cause.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: May I with the greatest deference to your point of view direct from your statement remind you, sir, that history records that the impact of the same facts is different at one time than at another.

DR. WISE: I am grateful to you, sir, as a member of the

judiciary for reminding me of that important truth.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, perhaps it is unnecessary to make the point that Zionism is a historical continuum, to use that awkward Latin term which has come to us through German metaphysics. American Jewry has taken its part in the Zionist movement for two generations and we have stood within the historic framework of the Zionist movement.

I beg to add, for the benefit of those who cannot be as familiar with the problem as is the witness, who has given the largest part of his life to this cause, that there has never been a time—I use your term "never" for a moment—in the 19 and more Christian centuries during which there has been an abandonment or a waiver in relation to Zionism on the part of Jews.

A reservation must, with frankness, be made with respect to that period which runs from 1820 to 1895, just exactly 50 years ago, when Juddnstwat, the Jewish homeland, of Dr. Theodor Herzl of Vienna appeared. During those 70 years there were the beginnings of a movement in favor of renunciation of Zionism, but only in western Europe, France, a very, very slight scumbration or reverberation of it in England, sir, and particularly in Germany where under the impact of a group of Jewish leaders who for the most part misunderstood Moses Mendelsohn, the great Jew of the 18th century, it was

imagined the Jews could more completely assimilate themselves to the European and Christian environment if they forswore or abandoned Zionism.

That abandonment never touched the heart of the European Jewish people. Eastern Europe contained three fourths of Jewish population. In 1881, for example, there were 5,000,000 Jews in Russia who had never heard of the German and French forsaking abandonment of Zionism. Zionism remained a part not only of Jewish aspirations, but of the Jewish faith. It was a large part of the faith of the Jewish people.

That is not an unfair definition of Zionism, a goodly part of the faith of the Jewish people. On the one hand there has been through the centuries, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not detain you unduly, what we in the Hebrew call the *Hibat Zion*, or *Ahavat*, devotion to Zionism.

But I am sorry, speaking with the frankness of my colleague, and of my privilege in the witness chair, that love of Zionism, of the Jews expressing themselves in daily prayer and in daily hopes and passions, was supplemented, I lament to say, by the Christian world--I do not wish to give offense, but it were more accurate to say a Christless world, nominally called, which converted what Dr. Herzl called a glorious ideal into a mere full necessity.

I cannot help stressing that because one of the gentlemen

of the Committee said yesterday, or I think asked the question yesterday in interrogating the witness, "Does not persecution die down from time to time?" And there was a reflection of that in your query of Mr. Monsky a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, "Is it now or never?"

If the persecution dies now, of course we shall not in the next 10 or 20 years see a revival of the hideousness, the ghastliness of anti-Jewish action perpetrated by Nazism and tolerated in too many states such as Hungary, Rumania, and I am sorry to say even resistant Poland, which came temporarily under the Nazi dominion.

Yugoslavia almost alone among those states resisted that.

In my own lifetime, Mr. Chairman,--I am going to be 72-- my life has been singleness with Jewish persecution. It began, I remember, in 1881 and 1882, the beginnings of the awful persecution of the Jews in the then Czarist Russia, which persecution, I cannot help adding, never caught the heart of the people of Russia even in those days, save as they were inflamed by liquor or moved in one way or the other, I mean handfuls of them, to have part in the terrible pogroms of 1881 and 1882.

To show you, which of course you know, how terrible it all was, the procurator of the Holy Synod said to Andrew D. White of Cornell, then Ambassador to Russia, "Your Excellency, there are 6,000,000 Jews in Russia. Two million

of them must become Christians, must be converted, two million must get out, and two million we shall kill. Then there will be no Jewish question left in Russia." That was the beginning.

Then for me as a young student both in America, England and Germany there came the German anti-Semitism under the august though covert patronage of Bismarck, and with the support of such men as Richard Wagner, his British son-in-law, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and his more than faithful coadjutor, with the help of such leaders and academicians as Professor de Lagarde, Professor Treitsch, and many others whom I might name.

Then in 1890 there was that bitter anti-Jewish feeling, anti-Semitic it is called, but I venture to call your attention to the circumstances that the Arabs, though Semites, as we are only a little fragment of the Semitic people, are never included within the orbit of anti-Semitic hatred. So it is we who are the victims of anti-Semitism and in that we stand alone.

During the last 20 or 30 years, apart from the Hitler thing, there were the Rumanian persecutions.

Mr. Chairman, you may remember, though much my junior, that John Hay, at the instance of President McKinley, made the famous Hay protest to the Rumanian government because Rumania seemed for a time ambitious to rival Russia in the

matter of persecution.

In the 10 or 15 years between the World War and the beginnings of Hitlerism, I am sorry to say the Polish government, nominally democratic, and the Endekas, a political party in Poland, treated the Jews in fiendish fashion, and the present conduct of the Polish people toward the Jews is little more than a survival of the attitude toward the Jews of democratic Poland in other days.

So when you ask the question, as one of you gentlemen did yesterday, "Does not persecution die down?" of course it dies down. It has died down today, God give it that it shall die down for generations, and it may be if there ever becomes a Christian world it must certainly disappear, be banished from Christendom.

But, Mr. Chairman, the question is to what are these persecutions due, and we Zionists answer with one voice, the major cause of our unhappy status is our political and national homelessness, homelessness.

Dr. Herzl, to whom I have already referred, made that very clear in his little paper. He saw that clearly and he made it clearly. He felt that the Jewish people--and I borrow the phrase of Mr. Winston Churchill--"had no permanent home which was theirs of right and not on sufferance."

Dispersal was hinted at yesterday, that dispersal may be good for a people, and a very distinguished statesman of your

empire, your commonwealth of nations, even went so far as to do us Jews the honor of asking us to rebuild Europe, to remain dispersed and to perform the task of recreating European civilization.

All I can say to you after the annihilation, and my figures come directly from Nuremberg, Germany, after the annihilation by Nazism of 6,200,000 Jews--and those are the figures which Justice Jackson and his associates have come upon--in the European lands, central and eastern Europe, not, of course, of Holland, Belgium, France, and I include Italy, which is very recently safe for Mussolini and his gangsters are gone, and, of course, England, the Nazi Europe has made the Jew feel hopeless. He is homeless and hopeless.

One of you gentlemen asked yesterday, "What about Poland? Will the Jews never feel at home in Poland?"

Let me bear a moment's testimony. I happen to be president of the American Jewish Congress, and I called a World Congress last August. To it came a delegation of Jews from Poland led by Dr. Sommerstein, outstanding in the life of Poland. They said to me and my American associates, "We are not going to give up our life in Poland. We and our fathers have lived in Poland for a thousand years and there is to be no exodus of Jews from Poland. We are going to maintain our position."

But what is that position? When you went to war against the Nazis in defense of Poland there were 3,300,000, which were reduced to 75,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, they have probably become 50,000 or 60,000 because of the uninspired venturing to differ from Sir Frederick Morgan, an uninstigated movement of the Jews who had not been heard by the Polish Government but for one reason or another the Polish government finds it impossible to protect against the surviving remnant of the Endekas. That is the Polish name for the anti-Semitic party reinvigorated from 1825 to 1933.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Jews have lived in Poland for a thousand years. There are records of Jewish life in Germany from the 7th century in Cologne. We have the records of Jewish synagogues, congregational life, dating back to 951. In other words, more than a thousand years, and at the end of that time there are a few thousand Jews in Germany, some of them insisting, "We are not going to give up our status in Germany. We love Germany. We are German Jews."

But the Jews of Rumania, of Hungary are simply saying, and I quote a line, "Goodbye, proud world. I am going home." And for the homeless Jews home means Palestine.

May I say a word about a distinguished Jewish name you know, Baron Maurice de Hirsch of France, who in 1890 and 1891 conceived the idea of dispersal. It will interest the

English gentlemen to know he chose a Jew whose name was Col. Albert Goldsmid, father of the first Countess of Swaythling. George Eliot used Goldsmid as the person around whom she painted the portrait of Daniel Deronda.

Well, Baron de Hirsch sent him down there to beg the Jews of eastern Europe—it was to end that second tide of dispersal from Russia, and the report has it that Baron de Hirsch spent hundreds of millions of francs in the Argentine under the leadership of Col. Albert Goldsmid of the English Army.

There are today, it must be admitted, 300,000 Jews in the Argentine. I hope my figures are accurate. If they are not I venture to say Dr. Neumann or another witness will correct me. There are not more than 15,000 to 20,000 Jews today on the soil of the Argentine. They were colonists to begin with, but the Argentine has not won their devotion to the soil, their will to build a land, which can only be done on the soil and through related industry, and they have gone into all sorts of industry in the Argentine so that not more than 15,000, in other words, 5 percent—possibly 20,000 is an overstatement—of the 350,000 Jews in the Argentine are today producers.

I wish to add, in explanation of my own position, that I understand that of the Jews of Poland and the Jews of Italy and the Jews of Germany not many remain who say, "We are

going to stay where we are."

To show you how completely I sympathize with that viewpoint, I happen to be the founder of the World Jewish Congress which in 1936 was established at Geneva. The aims of the World Jewish Congress were twofold, to help in the rebuilding of Zion as the Jewish national home, as the Jewish commonwealth, and second, to safeguard the rights of Jews wherever threatened, wherever impaired. So you see we had in mind there would always be, as we thought, millions of Jews resident, quite apart from England, Canada, South Africa, and the United States of America, there would always be goodly numbers of Jews who would remain in the lands commonly known as the lands of dispersion and who love their country, the lands in which they live, as I, an adopted citizen of my country, love my country and yield to no one in my devotion and the uttermost of my loyalty to my own country, which is the United States of America.

Lay I for a moment refer to this history: In 1897, 2 years after Dr. Herzl wrote the Judenstaat, a group of us founded the Zionist Organization of America, then known as the Federation of American Zionists. It was a day of small beginnings. It wasn't easy to move American Jews in that day to join us, and there was a rather small membership for a time.

The great change came with 1914, first the World War,

and then, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, there came the blessed accession to the leadership of the Zionist movement a great American, a great American statesman and jurist, and a true friend of man, of all men, irrespective of faith and race, the late lamented Justice Louis D. Brandeis. He became the leader of the Zionist movement and he remained that until his appointment to the U. S. Supreme Court, when it became necessary for him to withdraw from active leadership.

But it is not too much to say I betrayed no secret. He remained its invisible and inaudible leader to whom we turned constantly for counsel, appearing to him at all times for his sage judgment, for the wisdom and the purity of his counsel, and the whole Zionist movement took a great upward swing with the leadership of Mr. Justice Brandeis, who brought other figures of distinction such as Mr. Justice Frankfurter, and Professor Kallan to his reenforcement.

I think it will interest you to know that both before and after his election in 1915 President Wilson, then Woodrow Wilson before his election, said to Mr. Brandeis and to me, who happened to be his friend, that he was deeply sympathetic to the Zionist cause. As he put it, and some of you gentlemen will understand the term, "I am a son of the manse, a son of a Presbyterian clergyman, and therefore I am with you completely and I am proud to think that I, a son of the

manse, may in some degree, however slight, help you to regain the Jewish national home and to rebuild Palestine."

President Wilson, and I say Mr. Balfour also, because all of this happened before he became the Earl of Balfour, were concerned with Zionism time and again.

During Mr. Balfour's brief visit to America, I think it was in 1915 or 1916, and then in England, there began to be the consideration of the question whether such a declaration as the Balfour Declaration should not be made. The Balfour Declaration was roughly drafted by the advisers of Mr. Balfour, including some Exiles and others. I happen to know that it was sent to the United States because it would not have been issued, as the President said to me, unless Mr. Balfour as Minister for Foreign Affairs of the British government had secured the assurance of American support therefor. It would interest you to know that not the first, but almost the last draft, which deals with the question of yours of yesterday, Sir John, used the term "national home for Jews."

The American Government changed that, submitted its revision to the British Government, substituted "national home for the Jewish people" for "national home for Jews," something of which the British Minister for Foreign Affairs took note in a recent communication to a member of the House of Commons of your party, I think. I think there are no other members of the House of Commons. (Laughter.)

Yes, the President and our Government insisted upon that, but may I mention a collateral circumstance, and then I am immediately done. I don't want you to be too optimistic, too hopeful. I just need 5 minutes more if, Mr. Chairman, you can be patient with me that long.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: More than patient, sir.

DR. WISE: Thank you.

There was a meeting of the American Jewish Congress, its first meeting, in December 1918. I was in London at the time. I had the very great joy of watching the first appearance of an American President in London in December 1918, and I remember standing near the statue of George III while President Wilson passed by. (Laughter) I felt at the time that George III didn't like the reception President Wilson had and the enthusiasm which was his from the British people welcoming for the first time an American president.

Mr. Wilson had the kindness to present me, at the ceremonies associated with the presentation of the freedom of the city of London to him, to Mr. Balfour. The following day I was at the British Foreign Office having tea with Mr. Balfour and I brought him a message.

I said, "Mr. Balfour, people say that you don't read the newspapers. If that be true perhaps you haven't seen what happened in my country among the Jewish people yesterday." He replied, "No, I did not. My reputation is justified. I

do not read the newspapers." Perhaps that was why he was so wise. I said, "I want you to know, Mr. Secretary, that yesterday there was a meeting of the American Jewish Congress and by virtually a unanimous vote--I think there were two dissenting votes--this was done: The British Government was asked to assume a protectorate over Jewish Palestine."

Mr. Balfour had not heard of that. His answer was, "Dr. Wise, your people pay us a very great compliment. Very few of them have lived in England, and yet you do us the honor of asking us to assume a protectorate over Jewish Palestine." I said, "Yes, it has that much confidence in Britain." Not that it has remained uniform for the last 25 years, but that was the confidence with which we began our attitude toward England.

Mr. Balfour said, "That is a very great compliment." May I remind you it was only a few days before the appearance of General Smuts' little pamphlet--a little copy of which I handed to President Wilson--on mandates and the mandated territory, which, of course, is famous to you gentlemen.

Mr. Balfour said this to me--and it is in my diary and I wrote it at the time to Mr. Justice Brandeis, and I feel that the Declaration of November 2, 1917/^{is} an unforgettable date in Jewish history--"It means that all Jews who may at any time in the future wish or require to dwell in Palestine

shall be free to do so."

The President a few months later, on March 3, I think it was, returned for a brief visit to America, and during his visit he met a delegation of us, including the Hon. Lewis Marshall, chairman of the same Jewish Committee, and one or two men and myself, and the President used this historic term, "In Palestine there shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth."

I speak of that earnestly, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee, for a moment because neither Mr. Balfour nor any one of us dreamed we were to remain a minority in the Jewish homeland. After all, we have been minorities everywhere through the centuries, and we have grown utterly and hopelessly weary of minority status, and least tolerable would be minority status in the historic Jewish homeland bound up with our spiritual achievements, with our moral aspirations, and with something more, gentlemen.

I have seen it. I have been in Palestine. I was there for the first time in 1913, 1922 the second time, and in 1935. I hope to go again this year because I think I can still spill good news to English gentlemen, we are going to have the next Zionist Council in Jerusalem, with the approval and benediction of His Majesty's Government, I hope.

Palestine is a miraculous transformation; for a clergyman that is a very strong term to use, but there are modern

as well as ancient miracles. There has been in these days the miracle of our common victory over the Fascist enemy. The transformation of Palestine by my people is such a miracle. The physical transformation, just taking soil and planting it, fixing it upon the terraced hills in order that those washed away terraced hills might once again be the seat of vegetation and of produce and of beauty. Intellectually, morally, and spiritually there has been nothing less than a transformation.

May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that transformation has hurt none and helped all. It has uniformly served. Whatever our friends may say with regard to their reluctance—I think you used the term, or another member of the Committee—to exchange material benefits for political disadvantage, I cite the fact that the number of 600,000 Arabs in Palestine before World War I has been doubled since that time due to natural increase and emigration of Arabs from neighboring countries.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I make an appeal as a minister of religion to you. I make the appeal not only in the name of my people, and 80 to 90 percent of my people in America would say "Amen and Amen" to what I am saying to you today, although they might well wish that it were better said, in addition, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will agree with me, the American Christian people, as will be borne out by the

testimony to be submitted hereafter, the American Christian people have been in complete sympathy with Zionist aims and aspirations, and I venture to add, the English people. Politicians, statesmen in England, may at times dissent from the views of the English people, but I venture to say to you, Mr. Chairman, if a poll were taken today of the English people an overwhelming majority would say, "Yes, the Jewish people should have Palestine."

The English people might well have the right to say, "We have freed the Arabs from the hardship of the then Turk rule. They were serfs up to the year 1918, serfs under and within the Turkish Imperium."

Now they have six free—and I do not include Egypt—or nearly free Arab states. We just ask for that little strip of land, 10,000 miles on the outer rim of Asia Minor, as compared with the million square miles of the Arab imperium.

Mr. Chairman, may I be forgiven if I say to you that the Christian world, and I include England within the Christian world, I do the honor of considering it one of the great Christian nations, for such as both in its very great Protestant or Anglican population and in its Catholic population the Christian world suffered six millions of the people of Jesus of Nazareth to die, to die in the most awful way—the only Jews of eastern Europe who survived, literally, were those who fled to Russia and those who lived in Palestine. You will

forgive me if I say as I close that the Christian world owes the Jews some reparation, I think a great measure of reparation.

We have blessed the Christian world; we have given the Christian world its holiest treasure. The Christian world, if Christian it be, and it is represented finely by England and America, represented by your Committee, cannot do less than say to the Jewish people, "You have labored, you have grieved, you have suffered, you have long been injured. Palestine shall be yours."

And I say to you, and you will forgive me if I use a Hebrew phrase, which translated is, "For out of Zion shall go forth the law of the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." I remind you, sir, that was before the second temple, that was before the coming of Jesus.

I believe, I have faith in the unexhausted spiritual capacity of my people. Once again I prophecy out of Zion shall go forth a higher law of justice and neighborliness and righteousness and the word of the Lord shall yet again be heard in Jerusalem.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your patience. Do you wish to ask me any questions, or are you stunned?

JUDGE HUTCHESON: I do not wish to ask any questions. I have a feeling like Tennyson spoke about when he said,

"Faint and far o'er cliff and scar, like bells from

elfland softly pealing."

I would rather leave it that way. As far as I am concerned there are no questions.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: Dr. Wise, you mentioned your age.

DR. WISE: Yes, on St. Patrick's Day I shall be 72.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: I should like to congratulate you on your memory for dates and figures above all, and I should like to add this: You mentioned again that those whom you represent in a sense might desire that what you had to say should be better said. I doubt if they can say that.

DR. WISE: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOOD: Dr. Emanuel Neumann.

STATEMENT OF EMANUEL NEUMANN

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

DR. NEUMANN: Gentlemen, I have been requested by my colleagues and organizations I have the honor to represent—

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Would you let me ask you a question before you begin? Is there someone in connection with your side keeping up with the progress of the time so that we may know how we are getting along and when the next people will come along?

DR. NEUMANN: We have a little committee on arrangements and we are trying to so dispose the time and the subject matter that it will be a minimum of duplication and a maximum of dispatch.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Are you proceeding in accordance with it?

DR. NEUMANN: Oh yes. We are well ahead of our schedule. I must apologize in advance, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that I will have to take a little time in making this part of our presentation. I have been asked to deal particularly with the political and quasi-legal or political situation and the problems arising under the documents.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Which is your book?

DR. NEUMANN: The books are two. First there is the statement filed by the American Zionist Emergency Council entitled "The American Zionist Case." But secondly there is this volume of documents which we have gotten up in a great hurry, but I hope not too badly. I shall in my presentation deal substantially with the matters contained in this published statement, but I would prefer, so far as references are concerned, to use this volume of documents.

I would appreciate it immensely if those of you who are so disposed would follow me when I come to this volume. We had very little time to prepare, Mr. Chairman. The announcement that hearings were to be held in this country came to us so unexpectedly. I have a fair familiarity with the subject matter. The time that was available for preparation was nevertheless brief, and I hope that I will be forgiven for inadequacies here and there.

Jan. 8
2-1

DR. NEUMANN: I would like, first of all, before approaching these documents, to make a brief statement regarding our general approach to the problem. The desperate plight of masses of uprooted Jews and the grave problems arising from that condition furnished the immediate impulse for this inquiry.

Accordingly, it has been suggested to us by well-meaning friends that in approaching the Palestine question we do so on the "humanitarian level." In the context of this inquiry that would mean that we should avoid treating, or at least stressing the political issues involved. But we who have lived with this problem not for months or years but for decades, are deeply convinced that we cannot do justice to the tormenting needs of the Jewish people unless we deal with the subject, not only on its humanitarian side, which is so obvious and readily understood, but in its political and economic aspects as well.

Under the terms of reference of this inquiry, this broader and more basic approach is definitely indicated.

The "political conditions" are given first place in the first paragraph, and quite properly so. Moreover, if the inquiry is to be fruitful, the term "political conditions" must include not only the social, economic and administrative policies pursued in Palestine, but also the basic political policies of which they are the expression.

2-2

This constitutes a fundamental difference of viewpoint and approach between the millions of Zionist and the pro-Zionist Jews whose position I have the honor to represent, and the viewpoint of some non-Zionist spokesmen. I say some, not all; for many who describe themselves as non-Zionists actually share the Zionist position in its essentials. But there are others, both Jews and non-Jews, who are sincerely desirous of being helpful to the refugees and of promoting Jewish immigration into Palestine, but whose approach is essentially philanthropic. They would base their plea upon humanitarian considerations and frame their proposals accordingly.

That is not our approach. We appreciate fully the value and importance of humanitarian aspects, naturally. We come not as supplicants for mercy but as seekers after justice. We propose not to plead for favor but to assert a right. That is the essence of our position. All else is elaboration and documentation.

We assert for the Jewish people or any part thereof the basic right of entry into Palestine and the right to rebuild their national existence on their ancestral soil. We assert a right; but, as we shall see, it is a right not based on naked force. It is a right grounded in moral considerations of the most compelling nature, rooted in history, sanctioned by reason, approved by the conscience of

2-3

humanity, recognized by the nations of the world, and finally established in international law.

The question as we see it is, therefore, whether the established rights of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine shall be honored and implemented or whether the repudiation and denial of these rights shall be sanctioned and continued.

This question, gentlemen, is fundamental and must be squarely met. From the answer must inevitably flow consequences of the most far-reaching character in relation to the whole refugee problem.

If it is answered in the affirmative, that problem is largely soluble. If it is answered in the negative, the refugee problem remains hopelessly insoluble.

This conclusion is not a matter of theory or conjecture.

Doctor Wise has reminded you that this is not the first attempt on the part of the British and American Governments to deal with the refugee problem--largely a problem of Jewish refugees. There have been a number of attempts in the form of committees and commissions, international conferences, and international agencies--all of them remarkably barren of results.

To mention only a few:

In 1938, on the initiative of the late President

2-4

Roosevelt there was convened in Evian, France, an International Conference on Refugees. The conference was a tragic failure. None of the countries represented could see its way to receiving a substantial immigration. The conference eventuated in the establishment of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, which has been in existence these many years.

Late in 1943, there was held the Bermuda Conference on Refugees.

Early in 1944, our Government created its own War Refugee Board which was recently dissolved. All of these and other efforts were commendable as expressions of interest.

Now and then, here and there, something was done to alleviate suffering and to find refuge, permanent or temporary, for limited numbers of refugees. But it is no reflection upon those who participated in these efforts to point out that all in all, and viewed in relation to the staggering proportions of the problem, their practical achievement was virtually nil.

So far as Jewish refugees are concerned, the reason is not far to seek. Pursuant to instructions, they approached the problem on the purely humanitarian level, while the question of Palestine was rigidly excluded from consideration as being "political" and "controversial."

They were all bound to proceed on the assumption that

2-5

the one country decreed as the Jewish National Home must be barred and remain barred.

The exclusion of Palestine was the rock on which these efforts foundered. This was due, of course, not to ignorance of geography or economics, but the result of political decisions previously taken in London on the sole responsibility of the British Government.

Paradoxical as it may sound, it was the vaunted "humanitarian approach" which avoided the "controversial" issue of Palestine that resulted in the continued destruction of human life.

This may help you to understand our reaction to this much abused phrase, the "humanitarian approach." It is an expression that is superficially most appealing, but in the present context it represents a course which experience has proved to be pitifully inadequate and deceptive and savoring slightly of pious hypocrisy.

We realize that those who have put the present policies into effect and are executing them so rigorously have done so not out of native inhumanity, but for reasons of political expediency. It is therefore futile to address to them humanitarian preachments which do not touch the political problems with which, in their official capacity, they are primarily concerned.

We, at all events, who have been responsibly concerned

2-6

with these matters so long and so intimately, are clear in our own minds that in a world governed by power and politics, there are definite limits to the scope of philanthropy and humanitarian effort.

Cases of individual hardship are susceptible of alleviation by philanthropic treatment, but where the destinies of millions of people are concerned, philanthropy proves bankrupt.

Outside of established quotas, you cannot arrange the transport of one thousand refugees, their exit from the country of origin or their entry into another country without running at once into political barriers, problems, and difficulties which can only be resolved by political and diplomatic means.

We have reached the point now, at which the admission of 900-odd refugees to this country--and I'm proud of my country, but this is a fact--as a special emergency measure a year and a half ago was hailed as a great humanitarian act. They were not permitted to settle anywhere in the United States, but were kept in a camp at Oswego for 18 months. Only a fortnight ago they were finally permitted to apply for permanent residence. Oswego epitomizes the situation. If 900 refugees from Nazi Europe already on American soil constituted a problem and had to be kept in a detention camp for a year and a half, gentlemen, what hope or prospect

2-7

is there for the emigration and resettlement of hundreds of thousands in this or any other country half-way acceptable to them?

For years piteous appeals on behalf of groups of refugees were launched by numerous organizations. Large-hearted individuals made frantic efforts to induce this or that government, this or that country to accept a limited number-- in South America, in Central America, in Australia, in the frozen north and the blazing tropics. It hardly mattered where. Beggars can't be choosers.

Jewish leaders have gone hat in hand to statesmen and politicians. Proud men whose ancestors were kings and prophets in Judea went on their knees to petty officials "clothed in a little brief authority" and appealed for mercy for the unfortunates. They climbed the backstairs where the front door was barred to them. They probed the personal idiosyncrasies and weaknesses of the individuals to whom they appealed. They reasoned, cajoled, and entreated.

Such methods did not bring us very far. The more we implored and entreated, the more suspicious the world became of such immigrants whom nobody wanted.

Doctor Wise has spoken of Jewish national homelessness. There are some Jewish opponents of Zionism who object vehemently to this theoretical homelessness of the Jewish people. I submit, gentlemen, it isn't we who are concerned

2-8

with theory. It isn't a theory but a condition which confronts us today and will not be remedied in the measurable future unless the Jewish people is assured a home of their own which they can enter as of right and not on sufferance.

Permit me to refer to one incident in which it was my lot to have participated personally. No doubt, you have all heard of the ill-fated Struma and its human cargo of 763 refugees.

They embarked on this unseaworthy boat, crowded four or five times beyond its capacity, and in damaged condition. They sailed from a Rumanian port towards Palestine. What other destination would they or could they think of? They had no papers of any kind, let alone precious immigration permits to Palestine. This was in the spring of 1942.

The ship finally anchored in the harbor of Istanbul, but the Turkish authorities would allow no passengers to land unless assured in advance that the British authorities would permit their eventual entry into Palestine, a permission which was not forthcoming. The representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine set to work. They initiated parallel negotiations with the Turks in Istanbul and Ankara and with the British authorities in Jerusalem and London. At the same time they cabled us frantic appeals to second their efforts at this end.

The Colonial Office would not intervene; it was a

2-9

matter for the High Commissioner in Palestine, Sir Harold MacMichael. Sir Harold would not intervene; there was a fixed policy. True, even within the niggardly quota left open by the White Paper of 1939, there were still at that time tens of thousands of immigration permits outstanding and unused.

But, it was pointed out, the regulations required that the prospective immigrant should apply for a certificate before his departure from the country of emigration. When applying, he had to present his passport, exit permit and other papers, all of which had to be in good order.

The passengers of the Struma had not complied with these regulations. They had no papers of any kind. They had presented themselves to no British consul. There were no diplomatic relations between their countries and the Allies. They were simply fleeing for their lives from the flaming hell of Nazi Europe. The fate which awaited them back "home" was the concentration camp and gas chamber. But they had no visas; hence they were illegal immigrants. Sir Harold would have none of them.

In response to one of the several cables we received, I personally went to the Turkish ambassador in Washington, explained the circumstances and appealed to him on humanitarian grounds to communicate at once with his Government at Ankara in order to secure permission for the refugees to land on Turkish soil temporarily, or at least to permit

2-10

their ship to remain in port and secure food from the Jewish community of Istanbul while we continued our efforts to persuade Sir Harold.

The Ambassador was kind and cooperative. He did not quite see the point of Zionism, but he did agree that on humanitarian grounds such a boatload of refugees ought to be saved if possible and promised to help.

In the meantime, Sir Harold had relented sufficiently to consent to the admission of the children on board the Struma. They were to be separated from their parents and sent on to Palestine. The rest were to return to Europe or roam the seas.

They were no concern of his. But while he was making up his mind and before the intervention of the Turkish Ambassador could become effective, the Government at Ankara had grown impatient of the many delays and ordered the Struma to leave port. Its engines, like most of its equipment, were in bad condition and the ship had to be towed out of port and on to the open sea. Presently it sank. Whether it struck a mine, sprang a leak, or was torpedoed by an Axis warship remains unknown, but 762 out of the 763 refugees on board perished--the men and the women, as well as the children whom Sir Harold had just consented to admit to Palestine.

I have given you, gentlemen, a factual recital of this

2-11

event which left its wound deep upon my spirit. At the time I was stunned as a wave of horror swept over the Jewish world. I may say in this distinguished presence what I have not revealed hitherto even to family or friends--that I have been haunted ever since by the Struma and my own role in that frightful affair. In sleepless nights I reviewed those events, searched my own conduct and at times reproached myself bitterly for the ineffectiveness of my intervention. Perhaps if I had reached the Ambassador a few hours earlier, if I had been more eloquent and persuasive, perhaps if my tone had been more urgent and less diplomatic, these people might have been saved, at least the children.

I have prayed to be forgiven if one drop of the innocent blood of these sainted dead be upon my head.

This, gentlemen, was my experience in dealing with the refugee problem on the "humanitarian level."

If any further conclusive proof were required of the failure of that approach, it is the recent request of President Truman addressed to the British Government, Prime Minister Attlee, requesting the admission of 100,000 refugees in Palestine--a request which was not granted. I would here call your attention to one point in that letter.

President Truman's letter was based entirely upon humanitarian grounds. The letter avoided basing the request either upon the Balfour Declaration, the Palestine Mandate,

12

er any other legal or political document. It failed, and we now have this inquiry.

Permit me to point out that the letter was dated August 21, 1945. This is January 8, 1946. Four and a half months have passed and not a single one of the 100,000 on whose behalf Mr. Truman appealed has been admitted to Palestine, or to any other country for that matter.

The final report of this Committee is not expected for another four months, unless it should make interim recommendations at once, which I understand is possible under the terms of reference.

It is reasonable to expect that additional time will be taken by the two Governments to consider the report and arrive at decisions. Thus the better part of a year will have passed from the time when Mr. Harrison made his investigation. Whatever the outcome of this Inquiry, and we shall all hope for the best, one fact is certain:

There will be fewer Jews alive in Europe in April or May, 1946, than there were in June or July, 1945.

Such, then, has been the position of great masses of the Jewish people in the past. Such is their actual position today.

as Doctor Weitzman once said, the countries of the world fall into two categories: countries from which the Jews must go and countries into which they may not enter.

Hence the ghastly tales of the St. Louis, the Struma, and the Patria and others. Such is the actual position of the Jewish people.

But this, gentlemen, is the crux of the issue: Such is not their position in law or equity. The Balfour Declaration, the Mandate, and international treaties were all designed to bring about a fundamental change in the Jewish position in the world. They were all designed, among other things, to provide all Jews who found themselves in any way in conflict with their environment with a home to which they might freely go, with a national home in which to re-establish their national existence. Such a home was legally provided and is available to them as of right, even though the custodian of the premises chooses to bar their entry, gun in hand.

No one can say how many hundreds of thousands of Jews who have perished since 1939 would have been alive today if their legal right to enter Palestine had been respected. But certain it is that large numbers who actually escaped from the Nazi hell would have been able to settle in the Homeland and become part of that virile and flourishing community but for the action of the Mandatory Power. Gentlemen, we, the Jews of America, want no more Strumas; nor do we want from now on to go hat in hand to beg any country, any government, any official anywhere to admit Jews on

14

suffrance when under international law they are entitled to come into Palestine as of right.

What, then, is the nature of the right or rights upon which we take our position? I have used the word both in the singular and the plural but that implies no inconsistency. Under the documents submitted here, particularly the Mandate, it is clear that several specific rights have been recognized and granted, such as the right to enter Palestine, the right to state lands and waste lands, the right to colonize, to develop the natural resources, the recognition of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the recognition of Hebrew as an official language, etc.

But all of these and other specific rights stem from one basic right accorded to the Jewish people: the right to national restoration in Palestine.

Here I would like to make a preliminary observation before I go further. I request you gentlemen to please not regard my treatment of this subject as comprehensive or exhaustive. You will hear additional witnesses abroad in London and Palestine. If the representatives of the Jewish Agency should appear, they will be in the best position to discuss the question comprehensively and also much more authoritatively as the official body. But we would prefer that before leaving these shores you have a statement of the position of American Zionists, however inadequately I

may present it.

Now, the first official pronouncement on this subject by any government in modern times is, of course, the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, which remains the key document and cornerstone of the various international covenants and instruments based upon it. It is therefore well to examine that key document rather closely.

There have been repeated attempts from that day to this to represent the Balfour Declaration as being vague, ambiguous and subject to conflicting interpretations. Subtle minds and skillful hands have long been at work in a persistent effort to generate about it a pea-soup fog and to sow doubt and confusion regarding its substance.

All of these attempts have failed. Morally and intellectually speaking, the Balfour Declaration has, if anything, gained in strength and clarity as a result of the innumerable analyses to which it has been subjected. There is hardly a legal instrument or political document which does not in the course of time give rise to commentary and exegesis. But I venture to assert that when all is said and done, the underlying purpose of that Declaration and what it was intended to signify is exceedingly clear, leaving little room for doubt.

If any doubt is entertained, it can, in almost every instance, be resolved by the usual methods, by applying

ordinary rules of construction: (a) by the internal evidence; (b) by the attendant circumstances; (c) by the explanatory statements of its authors; (d) by its antecedents.

The key words in this Declaration are these: the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. The only part requiring any discussion is the phrase "national home" which is admittedly an innovation to international law. What was it intended to convey?

Allow me to draw your attention first to the internal evidence--not all of it. The letter of Mr. Balfour, then Foreign Secretary, in which he conveyed the decision of the British Cabinet, describes the Declaration as an "expression of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations."

What were these "Jewish Zionist aspirations" on which the British Cabinet was placing the seal of official approval? They were well known.

The Zionist movement had been organized well before that. It held its first Congress in Basle, Switzerland, in 1897 under the Presidency of Doctor Theodore Herzl, the author of "Der Judenstaat," to which Doctor Wise has referred. From that moment until his death in 1904, his life was dedicated to that ideal--a political-territorial solution of the Jewish problem.

The first Zionist Congress over which Doctor Herzl

presided adopted the basic formulation of "Jewish Zionist aspirations," known ever since as the Basle Program. It states the aim of Zionism to be "the establishment of a publicly secured, legally assured home for the Jewish people in Palestine." This was in 1897.

Gentlemen, home is a simple word, plain and modest, but one of the most meaningful in the English tongue. It is a word rich in overtones. "A man's home is his castle," in which he enjoys security and a measure of sovereign immunity from interference.

Under Anglo-Saxon law, a home may not be invaded even by officers of the law except under warrant secured by due process. The struggle for Irish independence was carried on under the slogan of "Home Rule," asserting the right of the Irish people to autonomous government in their own country, their "home."

You will find the same overtones and implications in Justice Brandeis's classic formulation of Zionist aims to which reference has been made, I think. This formulation antedates the Balfour Declaration. It was made by Justice Brandeis in June, 1915, in an address delivered in New York. Two years before the Balfour Declaration, Mr. Brandeis stated the aims of Zionism in these words. This is taken from a collection of essays by Justice Brandeis on Zionism:

"Zionism seeks to establish in Palestine for such

Jews as choose to go and remain there, and for their descendants, a legally secure home where they may live together and lead a Jewish life where they may expect ultimately to constitute a majority of the population and may look forward to what we should call home rule." I think that is a fairly satisfactory statement of Zionist aims prior to the Balfour Declaration.

I call your attention to the fact, gentlemen, in the Basle Program as well as in Justice Brandeis' formulation, you will find the same phrase "in Palestine." The expression "home for the Jewish people in Palestine" was, therefore, of Zionist coinage.

The Declaration was a rephrasing of the Basle Program. It improved upon and invigorated the original Zionist formulation by adding the word "national" before "home" to make it crystal clear that what was intended was not homes for Jews, but a national home for the Jewish people.

You will note further that the Declaration explicitly provides for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine. Obviously, this was done to allay any apprehension lest a large Jewish immigration and the creation of a Jewish majority should result in the curtailment of the civil and religious rights of the native Arab population.

If what had been intended was a relatively small or

19

moderate immigration of Jews who would remain a minority in a predominantly Arab country, then the application of that safeguarding clause should have been reversed. It would have been logical to stipulate that the Jews settling in Palestine should be assured their civil and religious rights rather than the large non-Jewish majority. As a matter of fact, Gentlemen, historically, certain non-Zionist formulations which had been submitted to the British Cabinet before the Balfour Declaration was issued, did read substantially that. They asked for reasonable facilities for immigration of Jews in Palestine and for safeguarding their religious and civil rights in that country. In the Balfour Declaration, this wasn't done, but a safeguarding clause was applied to the non-Jewish communities for the reasons I have explained.

I have already touched on some of the antecedents of the Declaration by referring to the Basle Program. But as I am sure you will hear more fully in London, the Balfour Declaration was an authentic expression of Anglo-Saxon thought on the Jewish question developed over a long period of time.

In England there was a well defined movement among leading Christian spokesmen and statesmen, particularly during the 19th century, in favor of the national restoration of the Jews in Palestine. Perhaps the most prominent

20

was the Earl of Shaftesbury, a distinguished man of letters, statesman and social reformer, who flourished in the first half of the 19th century and who carried on what amounted to an unremitting campaign in favor of the idea. The Christian Zionist movement in England is treated at length in Sokolow's Standard History of Zionism.

I think reference has been made, or should be made, to a Petition in this country circulated in 1840 by the Reverend Elackstone, addressed to the President of the United States, who mentioned in this printed statement an American-Zionist Committee. That petition was signed by some of the most distinguished names in America at the time.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: While you are making that search, I might say we will continue until 12:30.

DR. NEUMANN: I have this question to put to you, if I might:

I intend, if you so desire, to go into the documents and mandates and discuss the provisions. Would you care to have me do that in my initial presentation, or do you prefer to discuss that matter rather in the form of questions that might be put to me?

JUDGE HUTCHESON: Well, to the extent that you think the documents are not self-interpreted and you feel that you should interpret them for us, of course you may do so. However, Sir John and I have studied all that, and we don't

21

think questions as to what you think this document means would be very good. I think probably you better just follow your own course, bearing in mind that certainly the lawyers on this Committee are going to read those documents.

MR. MC DONALD: I want to be sure you are not reflecting upon the non-lawyer members!

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: Speaking for those who come from another part of the world, we should like to hear everything you have to say which bears upon the subject at all; but at the same time, where documents are concerned, we have, as far as we can, to put upon those documents the interpretation that we think right. I'm not sure, as the Chairman said just now, that arguments upon those really help very much, but it doesn't mean, believe me, that we do not desire to hear any views you wish to express upon them. Leave it on the basis that he or I will address questions upon the interpretation of those documents; we may or may not agree, but we've got to form our own view.

DR. NEUMANN: I quite understand that, but I would only like to point out that I hope we all realize that the entire question, the entire issue, rests ultimately upon the interpretation placed upon them.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: I think so, too. As I said earlier, the putting together of the documents is of great convenience to us in every way.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: If you like, as is done in court, you may file a brief in which you discuss them, and it would be more helpful. I have never gotten very much out of an oral argument.

DR. NEUMANN: I am extremely grateful to you for the suggestion. I'm sure we will avail ourselves of filing a written brief in the shortest possible time in dealing with the documents in some detail.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: This has been very helpful, so I think we will stop at 12:30 and come back at two o'clock, when you will be ready to go along. Then tomorrow morning we will finish the oral presentation.

DR. NEUMANN: Yes, so far as I am concerned, I hope I will be finished before tomorrow morning. I hope that the others can be gotten in tomorrow. I don't know whether it can be done in the morning, or whether it has been planned to run into the afternoon, but I am advised we hope to be through in the course of the morning.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: I want you to understand there is not the slightest hurry, so far as we are concerned, because there are plenty of other days before we depart from this hospitable country.

DR. NEUMANN: We will try to get through by tomorrow morning.

Gentlemen, I have spoken of the internal evidence, but

23

actually, it is quite unnecessary to rely upon internal evidence or the historical background when we have before us the authenticated statements of the men who were personally responsible for the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and were most intimately connected with the formulation of this policy. On Page 2, the bottom of Page 2, is the phrase "The establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." We say that was intended and understood by all concerned to mean at the time of the Balfour Declaration, Palestine was expected ultimately to become a Jewish Commonwealth or a Jewish State if only Jews came and settled there in sufficient numbers.

Thus President Wilson stated on March 3, 1919, to Doctor Wise and his associates "I am persuaded by the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government, that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish Commonwealth."

Mr. David Lloyd George, at the time the Balfour Declaration was issued, quoted with complete approval in his testimony before the Palestine Royal Commission in 1937, the following explanation by Mr. Balfour himself when proposing the Declaration to the Cabinet for adoption:

"As to the meaning of the words 'national home' to which the Zionists attach so much importance, I understood it to mean some form of British-American, or other protectorate

under which full facilities would be given to the Jews to work out their own salvation and to build up, by means of education, agriculture, and industry, a real center of national culture and focus of national life."

It did not necessarily involve the early establishment of an independent Jewish State, which was a matter of gradual development in accordance with ordinary laws and political evolution.

There could be no doubt as to what the Cabinet then had in their minds. It wasn't their idea that a Jewish State should be set up immediately by the peace treaty. On the other hand, it was contemplated that when the time arrived, if the Jews had responded to the opportunity afforded them, that was the only condition mentioned by Mr. Lloyd George-- if the Jews had in the meantime responded to the opportunity given to them and had become a definite majority of the population, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth.

The notion that Jewish immigration would have to be artificially restricted in order to insure that the Jews should be a permanent minority never entered the heads of anyone engaged in framing the policies set by Mr. Lloyd George. That would have been regarded as an injustice and as a fraud on the people to whom they were appealing. Those are strong words, gentlemen, and they are not my words.

Mr. Winston Churchill, who was a Member of the Government which issued the Declaration, made his views clear in an article in the Sunday Herald, London, February 8, 1920. He said "If, as may well happen, there should be created in our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of our British Crown, which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred in the history of the world which would from every point of view be beneficial and would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire."

I believe he was a Member of the Cabinet. If not, I would be corrected by you, sir--the Cabinet which issued the Declaration.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: You won't be corrected by me; my memory isn't so good!

DR. NEUMANN: I wondered whether you happened to recall that.

MR. JUSTICE SINGLETON: 1917? I think so, yes.

DR. NEUMANN: The Palestine Royal Commission of 1937 supplies the following additional evidence on the subject in its report:

"General Smuts, who had been a member of the Imperial War Cabinet when the Declaration was issued, speaking in Johannesburg on the third of November, 1919, foretold an increasing stream of Jewish immigration into Palestine, and

in generations to come, a great Jewish State rising there once more.

I would at this point like to draw your attention to one document which is an American document--not a document officially enacted by Congress, but nevertheless of extraordinary interest and most helpful in shedding light upon the understanding at the time of the Peace Conference regarding the nature of the Declaration and the nature of the undertaking.

I am referring to Document 26 on Page 4. This was taken from the Outline of the Tentative Report and Recommendations of the Intelligence Section of the American Delegation to the Peace Conference. This is quoted in full in David Hunter Miller's work, *My Diary of the Conference at Paris*, Volume 4, page 263. Here is how this American group which was preparing the official recommendations for the President and the American plenipotentiaries to the Peace Conference dealt with the territorial disposition of Palestine as part of the territorial settlements.

I will only comment upon it.

The most interesting thing about this particular document, from my standpoint, is that the term "Jewish national home" simply disappears. It doesn't occur at all. It speaks instead of a policy by which Palestine would be recognized in time as a Jewish State. Why was the phrase

"national home" omitted here?

I believe simply on the ground that it struck the Americans working on these recommendations as an innovation, and they preferred to paraphrase the Balfour Declaration in their own language, and this is as they understood it--eventually the prospect of a Jewish majority, eventually a Jewish State.

I am citing this simply to indicate how the nature of the Balfour Declaration was understood to be at the time on this side of the Atlantic as well as on the other side of the Atlantic.

Lloyd George and Churchill and Balfour spoke of the eventual rise of a Jewish State. The same thing is said by President Wilson in America. The same thing you will find in these recommendations to the American plenipotentiaries.

I would also like to call your attention to the modification given in this American document for this policy on Page 5. I would draw your attention to the lower half of the page.

It is right that Palestine should become a Jewish State if the Jews be given the full opportunity to make it such. It was the cradle and home of their vital race which has made a large spiritual contribution to mankind, and is the only land in which they can hope to have a home

of their own, being in this last respect, unique among peoples. I would like to stress the last words--the recognition of the fact that the Jewish people as such--not individual Jews, but the Jewish people as such--were recognized to be unique among peoples of the earth in this respect:

That they were the only people that had no territorial basis for cohesion and existence and no home of their own.

I think, gentlemen, that there can be little doubt that the purpose of the Balfour Declaration was properly expressed by these statements that I have cited.

What was taking place was a territorial settlement--the disposition of the territorial problem. One of the areas detached from the Ottoman Empire was to be established in one form or another, and it was the intention of the statesmen, and they so declared that this territory shall be reserved for Jewish resettlement, while at the same time many provisions were made for Arab establishment--the establishment of independent and semi-independent Arab States.

I want to confirm what Doctor Wise has said, speaking as an American, that the Balfour Declaration was from its inception and could be so regarded the child of Anglo-American statesmanship, although it was, of course, formerly a British pronouncement. Great Britain did not wish to assume the responsibility of promulgating the Declaration without the assurance of American approval and support, which

was forthcoming.

JUDGE HUTCHESON: I think we have reached the point to stop.

Dr. NEUMANN: This is a convenient point, Mr. Chairman, at which I will be glad to stop.

(The meeting recessed at 12:30, to reconvene at 2:00 p.m.)



1/8/45

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:00 p. m.

Judge Hutcheson: You may proceed.

Mr. Rood: Dr. Neumann, will you resume the stand?

STATEMENT OF DR. EMMANUEL NEUMANN -- Resumed

Dr. Neumann: I am going to try, gentlemen, to cut my supplementary statements as short as possible. I recall this morning there was a suggestion of the questions to be put and--

Judge Hutcheson: Might I say, in our district we were always taught that if a lawyer, or a presenter, will present his points so that the persons to whom he is talking will say, "Those are good points," and then, if he would rest on his brief, they would really read the brief and find out something, whereas, if he presented his points badly, they would say, "Well, I don't like his points, and I won't read his brief."

Dr. Neumann: Well, I thank you for that sound advice. I am going to leave much of what I might have said to the written brief. I would like only to make one point on the subject which we discussed briefly this morning, namely, the subject of interpretations, if I may.

I would like to point out that, in view of the Mandate, the interpretation of the terms of the Mandate was not intended to be left to the judgment of the Mandatory alone. That, I think, emerges from a reading of the Mandate. It provides, in article 27, that no terms of the Mandate may be varied or altered except by the consent of the Council of the League of

Nations.

There is also in article 26 a legal procedure for securing a judicial opinion from the tribunal at the Hague in the event there is a conflict between two member nations of the League of Nations regarding the interpretation of the terms of any mandate.

In addition, there was also set up by the Council of the League a special international body to review the reports of the Mandatory and its administration, to subject such reports to critical review and analysis, and to report thereon to the Council. That was the permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

In other words, a great many safeguards were deliberately devised and thrown about the execution of the several trusts to insure faithful execution of the trusts.

So I would like very strongly to make the point that the interpretation to be placed upon the obligations or the provisions of the Mandate could not possibly be regarded as something in the sole discretion of the Mandatory.

Judge Kutcheson: The trustee, you mean, was not given the authority to construct the terms of the trust instrument, but the League of Nations was to make that construction if anything was necessary to give any further directions, like a court would in directing trustees; is that your idea?

Dr. Neumann: More or less. I won't go into detail, but

I would like to point out that the Mandates Commission frequently commented on the operations, the activities, of the Mandatories, including Palestine, and that in the instance before us the White Paper, back in '39, which placed a new construction, a new interpretation, on the terms of the Mandate, was submitted by the Mandatory to the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. Its opinion was sought, and the Mandates Commission declined to approve the interpretation which was then being placed upon the Mandate for the first time. That interpretation was rejected by the Mandates Commission. There was no meeting of the Council of the League thereafter, war broke out, so that, as matters stand, the White Paper of 1939 was issued by the British Government as its own paper on its own responsibility but without ever getting the approval of the Mandates Commission or of the Council of the League of Nations.

I may add at this point that so far as this country is concerned, something has been said on that subject authoritatively. You know that there is, in addition to the Mandate, a special British-American convention on Palestine, in which the Mandate was included, in which the United States assented to the Mandate, and to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain, pursuant to the terms of the Mandate. There were two points in that first article of the Convention. One, that the United States was assenting. It insisted at the time

that its consent was required. The second point was that it assented to the administration of Palestine by a Mandatory pursuant to the terms of the Mandate.

If we will bear that in mind, I would like then to follow it up by saying that in March, 1944, President Roosevelt stated that the American Government had never given its approval to the White Paper of 1939. In other words, reserving whatever right America might have under that Convention, in respect of this White Paper promulgated with respect to Palestine.

So that I should say that the matter of interpretation is an extremely important one. Almost any obligation can be avoided by interpreting the terms of the obligation. That is clear.

If you will permit me, I would like to return for a moment also to this intriguing preposition "in". It has intrigued me very long. "In Palestine." I must say that for a long time this has struck me as an ingenious but very elusive subtlety. The distinction between "Palestine as a National Home," or "National Home in Palestine." And with a great deal of mental effort I have as yet been unsuccessful in capturing the aura of substance of this distinction and precipitating it into something concrete.

I assume that those who speak of the distinction mean to suggest that the use of this expression implies some restrictive meaning, some qualification. Well, I have asked myself

what qualifications or restrictions could be implied. I think that it could be either one of two things and nothing else. Either a geographical limitation or else a qualitative limitation or qualification.

Let's take the first for a moment. Could it mean, could it imply, a geographical limitation? That is to say, shall it be read as if the Jewish National Home was to be established in a part of Palestine? In other words, as if the preposition "in" was equivalent to the expression "somewhere in Palestine," or in a portion of the country. I submit, gentlemen, that that would be a very strained and unusual use of the word. When we speak ordinary language, which is not intended to conceal but to express itself, we use that preposition quite differently.

If, for instance, we speak of the hope for a democratic regime in Spain, do we mean in a corner of Spain, in Barcelona? Not at all. If we talk about the Nazi regime in Germany, we don't mean in a corner of Germany. Not at all. It is quite clear that we mean the country as a whole. That is the ordinary use of the term.

So that the National Home in Palestine meant in Palestine as a whole. There can be no question about it. As I pointed out this morning -- I mean, these are tricky subtleties -- the trick resides in pronouncing the preposition "in" as if it had been italicized, which it was not: "in Palestine."

Now, as I pointed out, the Basle Program of the Zionist movement used that phrase. Certainly we didn't mean to imply qualification. Justice Brandeis uses the same expression, "a home for the Jewish people in Palestine." He didn't intend to imply a qualification.

We don't have to rely upon our own interpretation. We have an authoritative interpretation of that, or finding on that, given by the Royal Commission, the British Royal Commission, as you find in the documents, where they said that the situs, the site of the Jewish National Home, was intended at the time of the Balfour Declaration to include the whole of historic Palestine, including Trans-Jordan. So that we must accept this conclusion of the Royal Commission, that "in Palestine" there could not possibly have been meant a territorial, geographical limitation.

Now, if it isn't a geographical limitation, what would it be? A qualitative limitation? Well, that would go to the substance of the expression "National Home." As to that, we have discussed that -- what was meant by "National Home." We found that this was regarded as being the embryo of the Jewish state. Whatever the interpretation placed upon the term "National Home," it doesn't derive from the preposition "in" but rests upon its own bottom.

I mention this because a whole literature has grown up, gentlemen, on this fugitive subtlety, "in Palestine," and it

was employed again and again in the course of the process of whittling down the original obligation over the years. Other methods were used. But, as we know, as a result of the White Paper, we have come down to this, that whereas the international obligations, the provisions of the Mandate, the Anglo-American Convention on Palestine, all provided for the facilitation of Jewish immigration, the White Paper has virtually brought immigration to a complete stop; whereas the Mandate required the close settlement of Jews on the land, there have been enacted in Palestine laws, gentlemen -- and I do not wish to be offensive to anyone, but I must characterize them as they are characterized in Palestine, these laws in Palestine, the land laws, as a vestigial remains of Nuernberg legislation, Nuernberg laws.

They are designed, land ordinances, to prohibit Jews from acquiring land or houses or any interest in land in the largest part of the country. This applies to Palestinian Jews where the residents are citizens. It applies to foreign Jews. The terms of the ordinance are carefully drawn. The word "Jew" never appears, but that is quite immaterial. We know that. We go behind, we pierce the veil, and find the intention behind the words.

Mr. Cram: May I ask if that is the matter referred to on page 210, subject of Palestine land transfers, regulations?

Dr. Neumann: Probably.

Mr. Crum: I simply wanted to identify it.

Dr. Neumann: Yes.

I would like to point out, under the legislation enacted in Palestine, if I were a Jew born in Palestine, if I had been living there for five generations back, my family, I would be barred from the possibility of purchasing a plot of land, a lot on which to build a house, in the largest part of the country. So far as I know, Palestine, the site of the Jewish National Home, is the only country in the world today where such direct discrimination exists, officially imposed.

So far has the White Paper gone.

And, as for the area: First, as the Royal Commission said, it was intended to include Trans-Jordan; Palestine and Trans-Jordan. Two-thirds or three-quarters of the area was lopped off. Then came the Royal Commission and proposed a partition of western Palestine, setting aside one-fifth of western Palestine for a Jewish state, and the rest of it for an Arab state.

Following this Peel Commission came the Woodhead Commission, and that commission went further and proposed a still smaller area. And finally we got this land legislation which, gentlemen, sets up a pale of settlement in Palestine, a Ghetto. We are free to acquire land without restriction in, I should judge, 1-1/2 percent or 2 percent of the total original area envisaged for the Jewish National Home.

Well, this is not even partial discharge of obligations. It is a complete repudiation, virtually complete repudiation.

Well, now, I have discussed the meaning of the declaration, the nature of the obligations, and pointed out the repudiation. Still a question remains, I am sure, whether the policy envisaged originally, many years ago, is necessarily valid. It is a fair question and one that ought to be met.

Assuming the legality, validity, of our position, what of its moral validity? What of its political validity from the point of view of politics, of statesmanship, quite apart from the legal position?

First regarding the moral validity of the policy: In my humble judgment, its validity has not decreased but increased with time. The reasons which originally moved the powers to adopt this policy exist today, but with vastly increased force. The position of the Jewish people whose position the Balfour Declaration was to have improved has meantime deteriorated appallingly. I needn't go into that.

On the other hand, what of the position of the Arabs? After all, as I understand it, it is suggested that they are the adversary in this case, the Arabs and their claims, and the claims of their position. You all know the dispositions made with regard to Palestine after World War I were not isolated. They were part of a whole complex of territorial

settlement. The Arab claims were fully canvassed and considered and a balance of equities, as it were, was struck. Not only were Arab claims and needs taken into account as against Jewish needs and Jewish claims, but the Arabs themselves were consulted. And, as you know, the official accredited representatives of the Arabs at the Peace Conference agreed to the Palestine settlement on the understanding that their claims were going to be recognized.

As you know, it has been suggested and it has been said that the representatives of the Arabs had withdrawn their approval of the Palestine settlement because they did not get their aspirations fully satisfied, particularly in respect to Syria and Lebanon. They were outraged by the fact that Syria and Lebanon were placed under the French Mandate, and beginning with the San Remo Conference the Arabs no longer went along. In the meantime things have happened. Not only the states originally created for the Arabs, Saudi Arabia, Iraq -- Iraq having been meanwhile emancipated of its mandate, in 1932, and made independent -- but quite recently, for all practical purposes, the mandates for Syria and Lebanon were also terminated, and their independence recognized. So that, as of today, the Arabs have received satisfaction of all of the claims or of the settlements promised to them in connection with the Peace Conference after World War I.

Now, of course there is no comparing the position of the

Jews and the Arabs. The Arabs are among the wealthiest people in the world in respect of land. In Southwestern Asia there are some perhaps fifteen million Arabs occupying a territory of more than a million square miles. Making allowances for vast deserts, and everything else, there is room, and room to spare, vast areas to roam in.

Why, gentlemen, only yesterday I was struck by an item in the New York Times which interested me greatly. It is entitled "Economic Revival Planned in Syria." It has to do with plans for irrigation and the like, very much like the plans projected for Palestine, the Jordan Valley Authority, in which I am very deeply interested.

What struck me here is this: The Arabs of Syria and Lebanon are anxious to undertake large-scale development -- 1,000,000 acres. Now, this is what they pointed out:

"Syria has a population of only 3,000,000, but she once supported 20,000,000. The Deir-ez-Zor district along the upper Euphrates in northern Syria was the great granary of the Roman Empire, inhabited by 15,000,000 persons.

"Population Insufficient.

"Fertile topsoil still covers the area, but its ancient irrigation system has been destroyed and the present population of 100,000 is insufficient to exploit its richness."

I imagine Dr. Loudermilk may be able to testify on land use in all of the countries of the Near East.

There is an actual shortage of population in the Arabic states. Vast territories where there is no population.

I would like in this connection to quote you another item. When I testified before the Congress some time ago we spoke of Iraq and the size of the territory as being much larger than England and Wales put together, and I quoted -- if I haven't it here, I will submit it to you in writing -- a representative of Iraq who was speaking before the Royal Geographical Society, I think, in England, and said that Iraq needed population. I think I have it here. This is the pamphlet, "Zionism of the Arab World," which is substantially what I submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1944. It has a map of the Arab countries and a shaded portion showing the area of Palestine -- 10,000 square miles out of 200,000 square miles.

Now, in a paper presented to the Royal Asia Society in England in 1926 --

Dr. Aydelotte: What page?

Dr. Neumann: You have this pamphlet?

Dr. Aydelotte: Yes.

Dr. Neumann: Page 8.

Dr. Aydelotte: I didn't mean to interfere with your reading.

Dr. Neumann: Will you permit me to quote myself for a

few lines, or would that be in bad taste?

Speaking of the area which the Arabs have, I say:

"Their present domain is not only vast but greatly underpopulated. The combined populations do not exceed some 15,000,000. All of them could be comfortably accommodated in Iraq alone if it were fully developed."

That should not be understood that the Arabs of all Arabia should live in Iraq. I am only saying that there is a great deal of room there. Actually the sparseness of population in the Arab countries is one of their greatest problems, their greatest weakness, and the greatest source of danger to their future security. The Arabs have not too little but too much land, and lack means and manpower to develop and defend what they have.

In a paper presented to the Royal Asia Society in England in 1926 it is stated:

"The size of the country is 150,000 square miles, about three times that of England and Wales, while the population is only 3,000,000."

That was in 1926.

"What Iraq wants above everything else is more population.

"A similar situation obtains in Syria, where only one-sixth of the cultivatable land is being cultivated.

"For the Arab hand, thus richly endowed, to reach

out and strike at international commitments with a view to its annexation and its interest in the Arab domain is not only a breach of international law but a case of incipient imperialism."

As I have shown, therefore, morally speaking, the need for the Jews has grown far greater than ever, while the position of the Arabs has not deteriorated but improved. Not only have all the Arab countries been recognized as independent states, but a great step has been taken in the direction of ultimate unification of the Arab countries, which is one of their national aspirations -- the Pan-Arab League.

That is the situation from the point of view of the moral validity, I think the real core of the matter is the final consideration, and that is the political validity of the policy today from the point of view of world statesmanship and of democratic statesmanship in particular. As to that I would like to make just a few observations.

In the final analysis, this question of the practical political validity of a policy comes down to this, the implementation of many a policy is fraught with exertions and difficulties. That is not the case with respect to Palestine alone. We have plenty of headaches in other parts of the world. We have them in Europe. We have them in Asia. We have them all over. The question resolves itself to this: Is it worth while in a particular instance to undertake the

exertions, to make those efforts, to face the difficulties, in order to achieve certain results? Do the results justify the effort? Does it pay?

Well, let's look at it for a moment, look at this question for a moment from the point of view of all concerned. I will omit the Jews; from their viewpoint it certainly does pay. The Jewish people could hardly pay too high a price in effort, in exertions, in sacrifices, in labor, in order to achieve this end, a home, security. So we needn't talk of that. But from the point of view of the world, from the point of view of the democratic world.

Gentlemen, there are two gains in the implementation of the Zionist policy in Palestine from the point of view of the democracies, a negative gain and a positive gain. The negative gain is a solution, in very large measure, of this terrible problem which confronts the democratic world, which has confronted it for years; not merely the problem of feeding, clothing, transporting refugees, but, gentlemen, the political problems which have been created by that situation. The frictions, the irritations, the international tensions, the existence of anti-Semitism, the persecution of the Jews, have not reacted only upon the Jews, they have been a most fruitful source of international and national tensions in the various countries. Anti-Semitism has been employed for the promotion of Fascism and Nazism and will continue to be employed in

the future whenever a new Hitler should attempt to try out his wings.

Therefore, it is of the utmost concern to the civilized world that this problem be solved, that it be removed from the agenda. That is a negative gain. But that isn't all. There is certainly a positive gain in the establishment in Palestine, on the Eastern Mediterranean, progressive democratic commonwealths, on the periphery of Europe. I need hardly point out, gentlemen, what was the situation during this last war. I should imagine it is known. The whole of the Near East was a quagmire of intrigue, disaffection, and treachery.

In Iraq there was revolt, the stab in the back. As a matter of fact, a wave of pro-Nazi and pro-Fascist sentiment swept over the Near East, particularly among the ruling classes. In Egypt, Prime Minister Pasha had to be removed from office and held in confinement. It so happened that when the English got to Tobruk they discovered that some of their plans, so I have been told, had fallen into the hands of the enemy. The Chief of Staff of the Egyptian Army was arrested as he was about to board a plane for a rendezvous with the enemy. Such was the situation in that whole area at that highly critical moment, critical not merely to Great Britain, critical to the world, critical to the democracies.

There was only one spot, there was community that provided terra firma. That was Palestine, the Jewish National Home.

These countries, these Arab countries, who were allied with Great Britain -- Egypt had a formal alliance, as did Turkey, Iraq, Saudi Arabia had none -- not one declared war. Not one of them lifted a finger. War wasn't declared even after Egypt was invaded.

The only country from which came contingents of volunteers who fought in this war by the thousands was Palestine. And I am sure there are many in England, as there are in this country, who appreciate the point that if, for example, the Balfour Declaration had been carried out, the policy had been pursued more vigorously, and if at the outbreak of the last war there had been, not five or six hundred thousand Jews, but a million and a half or two million Jews there, how much stronger would have been the position in the Near East as an outpost of democracy.

Certainly I think there is validity for this point of view, for this position, from the British point of view.

I would like at this point to state that time and again the suggestion arose that the ultimate destiny of Palestine, if and when it was constitute as an independent, self-governing state, was that it be, that it maintain its connection with the British Commonwealth of Nations in some form. In England, one of the staunchest pro-Zionists, the late Lord Wedgewood, had carried on for a long time an agitation in favor of Palestine becoming the seventh

dominion. I think he founded the Seventh Dominion League. He wrote a book on the subject. The question is open. The establishment, the carrying out of this policy, does not necessarily imply an ultimate break or severance of connections between Palestine and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I would like to touch upon this question even from the Arab point of view. Now, I have lived in Palestine, gentlemen, for about eight years. I think I am somewhat familiar with the situation, at least as it was in those years, and I came back only at the outbreak of war. When we speak of the Arabs there, it is most important to make a careful distinction between those who speak for the Arabs and the masses, the Arab masses. It is not to be assumed that the political interests and the political ambitions of ruling Arab groups are necessarily identical with the interests of the Arab masses. In my opinion they are largely incompatible. If I had the time I could develop the point.

In any case, what the Arab world needs is not merely the satisfaction of external political ambitions and forms. What it needs is a vast amelioration of the condition of the Arab masses, who, for the most part, are overwhelmingly illiterate, very poor, downtrodden, exploited. Many people believe that the creation of a modern and progressive society in Palestine would have a tremendously stimulating and vitalizing

effect, an alleviating effect throughout the Near East. To a large extent that is true already today.

The Arabs are a gifted people in many ways. They are endowed with a quick intelligence. There is a lag, a lag of centuries, which will take time to make up, but it will be made up, I think, in the course of a few generations. To facilitate, to accelerate this process of closing up the gap, the cultural lag, the differences in level between the European or American level, let us say, and the Oriental level of the economy, of social development and the like, to do that is, in my judgment, conferring the greatest possible benefit upon the whole area.

6

I was very much interested to see this item in the Times, to which I referred, these great plans for irrigation. I would like to conclude on this note. You are going to hear, I understand, from the engineers who have been working on irrigation and power schemes for Palestine. I noticed Dr. Loudermilk in the room this morning. I have been interested in this matter ever since he called my attention to the possibilities, and for the past three years we have had American engineers at work both here and there, trying to discover what are the potentials, what can be done to increase the agricultural and industrial possibilities of Palestine for the benefit of all its inhabitants.

The engineers did not approach it from any other standpoint

but that, naturally. In the process, the course of their work, they inevitably came across other possibilities in adjacent countries which interested them professionally as engineers, possibilities in Syria, possibilities in Iraq, and in the course of this period from time to time there has been reference in the public press to these development schemes. Dr. Loudermilk's book has been widely read and commented upon. Preliminary reports of engineers have appeared. I do not doubt that that work has already had a beneficial and stimulating effect upon neighboring Arab countries who are anxious to follow out every suit and to do what can be done for the improvement and development of their lands.

It is, gentlemen, on this plane, on the plane of a widespread effort for raising the general level throughout the Near East, on this plane of considering the interest of the masses rather than the interest and ambitions of the ruling groups, it is on this plane of promoting the development of a modern progressive society which could finally take its place, eventually its rightful place, in civilization, it is on this plane that ultimately the problem may be solved.

I think that our best effort should be directed henceforth all over to promote the solution of the problems. Personally I believe in the possibility. I believe that Jews and Arabs can and will live amicably together in Palestine. So far as the Zionist organization is concerned,

it has repeatedly gone on record and have pronouncements have indicated its desire to promote such a development in Palestine, socially, political, as will assure to each of the people living there the fullest measure of cultural, linguistic, religious autonomy, and the fullest opportunity for development along their own lines.

That is the spirit in which we approach the problem. In that spirit we believe it is possible of solution.

I must thank you for your very great indulgence and for the great patience with which you have listened to my too lengthy remarks.

Judge Hutcheson: I think Mr. Crick has one question.

Mr. Crick: This one question, Dr. Neumann, relates not to the past but to the future. I am quite sure the committee is most anxious to get the mind of your organization as to the future.

Now, it is clearly and unmistakably laid down that the Zionists' case envisages the establishment of an autonomous, self-governing government in Palestine. I find on page 5 of the small blue document from the American-Jewish Conference a series of what are called essential prerequisites for the attainment of this objective.

I assume from that that we may regard that objective as being, so to speak, the deferred though firmly the final objective, and not a demand that ought to be immediately filled.

Now, what I would like to know is, what kind of interim arrangement do you suggest for the government of Palestine and for what period do you think that interim arrangement would have to be carried on?

Dr. Neumann: May I say, in the first place, sir, that the authoritative reply to that question should come, and I am sure will come in due course, and I think it is a very necessary and pertinent question, I think the authoritative reply will have to come from the Jewish Agency. What I may say meanwhile on this subject will be personal purely.

Mr. Crick: Personal as distinguished from the Zionist organization?

Dr. Neumann: Yes. I would like to make some personal observations with regard to that.

Mr. Crick: Yes.

Dr. Neumann: I think you are quite right in saying that the Zionist organization has not been pressing for the immediate establishment today of this commonwealth or declaring a Jewish government today. I think it is true that it envisages some arrangement which will create the necessary conditions. But what I think it also feels is that merely going ahead as we have in the past, this ambling pace, will endanger the whole policy, that something new is required, that some new arrangement would be necessary in order to facilitate the transfer rapidly of the largest number of

people, of Jews, from Europe to Palestine, in the shortest possible time, and all other arrangements required, economic arrangements, and the rest.

Therefore, some special provision would have to be made now with a view to the rapid achievement of the objective.

I don't know whether I have answered you to your satisfaction, sir.

Mr. Crick: Not quite. I would like to go a little bit further.

Do you envisage some arrangement under the United Nations Organization, or just what have you in mind?

Dr. Neumann: As I understand, it is assumed generally, although I am not necessarily in the know, that the present Mandate, it will be sought to convert the present Mandate into a United Nations trusteeship in some form under the new Trusteeship Council.

7

Personally I don't think this problem ought to wait or can wait even this long. It will at best take time before the United Nations Organization really functions. We don't know what shape the Council will take. Further time will be required to negotiate agreements in accordance with the terms of the charter, agreements in which the Mandatory will agree to turn over its Mandate to the Trusteeship Council, and so forth.

I don't think we can wait. I don't think we should.

g24

Personally I would envisage, even while this inquiry continues, if we really want action, I would envisage something quite different, and there is a precedent for that. I would envisage immediate action for beginning the large-scale transfer of Jews from Europe to Palestine. There has been a great precedent for this, with which you are probably familiar. That is the resettlement of the Greeks from Anatolia to the Greek homeland in 1924-1925 under the supervision of the League. A million and a half Greeks were transferred under international supervision in the space of 18 months. It was done under the auspices of an international commission headed by an American, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Sr. The operation was eminently successful. A million and a half Greeks were resettled in Greece from Asia Minor, and thereby a fruitful source of international strife was removed.

I would envisage the establishment of an international commission for facilitating the transfer of Jews to Palestine, with all that is involved in that, but I should think that if it is to be successful it would be necessary, it would be essential, that on such a commission the Jewish Agency for Palestine should have a representation commensurate with the overwhelming stake which the Jewish people would have in that operation and with the heavy responsibilities that they would have to shoulder. I think that such an international commission, so constituted, with such instructions, with the

help and backing of the United Nations, could begin this operation in the shortest possible time.

Mr. Crick: Would you envisage all that as coming under the terms of the Mandate or requiring any obligation or modification of the Mandate?

Dr. Neumann: In my opinion -- and I don't want now to pose as the ultimate authority on the legal aspects of the Mandate -- but I should say that it would be entirely consistent with the terms of the Mandate to do that. It would require no real change.

In other words, this idea that I have just advanced would, of course, be carried out through closest cooperation with the Mandatory Power and the Government of Palestine and the Jewish Agency and the United States if it is willing to do more than inquire, but to help.

Mr. Crick: Thank you.

Judge Hutcheson: Although we could perhaps get some interesting ideas on subjects on which you say you do not speak authoritatively, I think we had probably better go on to the subject-matter where you speak with some authority. Unless some other member of the committee wishes to ask a question, that will be all.

Did you want to ask a question?

Lord Morrison: Yes. I would like to ask Dr. Neumann two questions, the first of which I hope he will not consider

.... me, in asking it, too sensitive.

This morning I gathered that you said that six million Jews had lost their lives, had been murdered, that if Palestine had been open, many thousands would be alive. I wonder if you would care to modify that in the light of certain circumstances that obtained during a considerable part of that time, the circumstances being that France was out, Germany had not yet declared war on Russia, Germany had not yet declared war on the United States, Britain was standing alone against the full force of Germany and Italy. The German and Italian armies were almost on the frontiers of Egypt, and, as you said this afternoon when dealing with another phase, the whole Near East was a quagmire of treachery.

May I remind you of the statement at that time of Dr. Goebbels, who said, "The British are beaten but they haven't sense enough to understand it." That was the opinion not only of Dr. Goebbels but of most thinking people outside of Britain.

Well, now, does it occur to you that perhaps you might modify the statement you made a little, because there was a real danger at that time that if any difficulty had taken place with the Arabs, and Great Britain had been standing alone against the whole lot, that the ultimate result would probably have been that Britain would have lost the war, and the final fate of the Jewish population would have been even

worse?

Dr. Neumann: I fully appreciate that point of view and I think it should be given due weight in any final appraisal, certainly, sir.

I would say this, that by the time the pincers movement was on against the Near East through the Russian Caucasus and the Mediterranean, by that time both Russia and I think the United States -- or at least the United States was on its way in.

I still doubt, of course, that, as a matter of political judgment, whether the influx of Jews into Palestine at that time would have resulted in worse conditions in the Arab world than we already had. They couldn't have been much worse than they were. The objective fact certainly remains that if the doors of Palestine had been open, objectively speaking, Jews who are now dead would be alive.

Judge Hutcheson: I think you are on a good basis. Objectively and subjectively. You are quite satisfied and he is satisfied.

Dr. Neumann: I appreciate the point you have raised, sir, about the difficulties Great Britain faced.

Lord Morrison: I was going to ask you to appreciate that some of us are sensitive on this point after what we had to experience.

Dr. Neumann: I think, sir, that the people of this

country -- and the Jews no less than any other Americans, and I think even more so -- appreciate very deeply, very keenly, the position that England occupied for a year or two standing alone.

I would like to add, if I may, to me personally it is a very painful experience to find ourselves as a Jewish community in controversy and in conflict, as it were, with Britain, over all countries of the world. Britain has been the one country that was first to recognize the aspirations of the Jews and was one of the first to provide an emancipation of the Jews, and its whole civilization and culture are charged and freighted with Biblical and Hebraic values. It is the last nation in the world with which we would like to have any difficulties. I hope you will believe me, sir, that this is how I feel.

Lord Morrison: Certainly.

Dr. Neumann: Nevertheless, I am under the necessity of defending and advocating the position of the Jewish people.

Lord Morrison: Yes. May I ask you the further question, and which has been slightly indicated by my colleague, Mr. Crick: I take it that you have read the advance copy of Mr. Nathan's book?

Dr. Neumann: Not all of it. I haven't had time.

Lord Morrison: I find two passages in his book which I would like to read to you at this time. He says:

"If judgment is to be given in favor of facilities for Jews to establish a Palestinian commonwealth with a Jewish majority, the judgment must be given against the clearly expressed desires of the Arab world."

At page 77 he says:

"No responsible government can undertake to carry out in Palestine a program substantially different from that of Arab nationalism without preparing for the repression that such a program will necessarily entail."

What I was going to ask was as to whether any representative of your organization is prepared to give us any evidence, to submit any statement or give any indication, of their views, apart from the personal expressions you have given in reply to Mr. Crick, whether there is any material that might be made available to this committee on that particular point.

In other words, if Mr. Nathan is right, that there may be some difficulty in carrying it out from the point of view of the Arabs, who is going to undertake the repression?

If you could give us some information along that line, I think it would be appreciated. Perhaps the answer would be the answer that you have just given to Mr. Crick, that you thought probably the Jewish Agency might supply that. I would like to know whether any information on that point is likely to be available.

Dr. Neumann: I would like to speak to that point.

Mr. Nathan uses the word "repression." Of course there is no government in the world anywhere that is not prepared and that is not obliged to be prepared at all times to maintain law and order and to repress violence, unlawful violence. At the present instant, the Mandatory Government finds it necessary to repress Jews and Palestine. You are aware of that.

Lord Morrison: Yes.

Dr. Neumann: That is involved in the exercise of administrative authority and control. That is the other side of the picture.

Now, I should say, ordinarily speaking, that as long as there is a Mandatory, it is the obligation of the Mandatory to maintain law and order, provided that it does so in the interest of a proper and lawful policy. Then it has full moral and legal justification. If and when the Mandatory should be succeeded by another administration, it would be the duty of that administration, obviously. Generally I think that what concerns administrators over there is not so much the question of repression in Palestine. There have been instances of riots and violence many times there. But I think what they have in mind can be expressed in one word -- repercussions. Repercussions in the Arab world. Repercussions even in the Moslem world. The danger of Arab uprisings. The

danger of Moslem uprisings.

It has been pointed out to us that there are hundreds of millions of Moslems and they extend from Casablanca across North Africa through India to Indonesia. That is true. The Christian world is equally extensive and more numerous. Yet no one would say that the Christian world is a unit. I think we all know better. Neither is the Moslem world. We can all agree, I think, upon geography and mathematics. The distance from the Mediterranean to Indonesia is precisely the same mathematically as the distance from Indonesia to the Mediterranean. There is conflict in Indonesia today. There is armed conflict in Java. Forty millions of its population are Moslems. What repercussions has it aroused in the Near East? What difficulties has it evoked in the Near East? So far as I know at the moment, none whatsoever. I think that these dangers are exceedingly exaggerated.

I understand that to carry out any policy in a complicated situation would require firmness and the resources with which to carry it out. You have it in Germany, in Japan, in the Balkans, in Indonesia. You have it wherever you turn.

Judge Hutcheson: May I sum the discussion up in this way: You say that we have no government without force, no force without the duty to use it, to support what seem to be proper governmental measures.

Dr. Neumann: To maintain law and order.

Judge Hutcheson: It is the business of those in charge to figure out the proper measures, and their business to enforce them. Some figure it will cause more trouble. Some think it will cause less. I believe that is where it stands.

Is there anything more?

Major Manningham-Buller: May I ask a question?

Judge Hutcheson: Yes, go ahead.

Major Manningham-Buller: Dr. Neumann, I am interested in what you have said with regard to the Arabs, that you believe the Jews and Arabs can and will live amicably in Palestine. Do you regard it as vital to the prosperity, permanence, and security of the Jewish commonwealth that they should live in amity?

Dr. Neumann: I think it is certainly very necessary and highly desirable, of course.

Major Manningham-Buller: I wasn't quite clear as to how you thought that amity could be achieved. It doesn't exist at the present moment, does it?

Dr. Neumann: I would like to explain that -- and I hope that when you get over there you will see for yourself. I think it is of the most importance.

Major Manningham-Buller: You spoke of that.

Dr. Neumann: I think you will find when you get there that a sharp distinction must be made between political strife,

political differences in intentions, which exist all the time, and in which the participants are chiefly a limited stratum of Arab society, the top, higher, and the ordinary human relations between Arabs and Arabs and Jews and Jews. Those are two planes. I have lived in Palestine during the time of the greatest tension, during the years 1936, '37, and '38, when the riots were going on. I was engaged in business. I was interested in certain companies in which we had Jewish directors, Christian directors, and Arab directors. It didn't prevent us from meeting and going on with our business.

In Haifa, there is a municipality -- the population of Haifa is just about equally divided between Jews and Arabs, and it therefore has a mixed municipal council. It has carried on in a most efficient manner during the worst period of the riots. They had an Arab mayor and a Jewish mayor, that is, at different times. I should say that the administration of Haifa was carried on in exemplary fashion, efficiently and honestly, as well as any municipality here -- and I am a New Yorker -- certainly better than it was before Fiorello LaGuardia became mayor. That is a matter of fact.

There is no racial hostility between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. There is no animosity on that level. It is a political tension, which will have to be resolved.

But I foresee no difficulty, in the long run, in the living together of the two peoples, in the creation of a dual

cultural commonwealth, just as Belgium is dual culturally in respect of the Flemish and Walloon elements, as South Africa is, as I think, between the English and the Boers. Certainly Canada is a perfect example. There is a great analogy there and I found it referred to in some of the speeches in the House of Commons.

Canada began, as you know, with a preponderance of French population. They were French and Catholic. Then came the conquest and the great influx of English settlers, who were largely Protestant and English. Of course, there was resistance and resentment on the part of the French Canadians. In the course of time you had a new situation, an English majority, English and Protestant as against the French Catholic natives. But careful provisions were made, constitutional provisions, under special statutes, and you know more about them than I do, guaranteeing the French Canadians their autonomy in respect of religion, their educational system, their language, and the rest.

10

So that you have the Dominion of Canada, which is predominantly English, a Dominion with a French Canadian population which is well integrated, flourishing, autonomous in all essential regards, prosperous and quite happy.

Major Manningham-Buller: Thank you very much. There is one other matter. I wasn't quite clear, when you were dealing with the population outside Palestine, whether you

were or were not suggesting that in the course of time some of the Arab population within Palestine might move or be moved outside.

Dr. Neumann: No, sir. I made no such suggestion.

Major Manningham-Buller: I wasn't sure.

Dr. Neumann: I took pains to make it clear, when I referred to the existence of possibilities in Iraq. We have never, the Zionist movement has never, suggested the displacement of a single Arab from Palestine. There is no need for it. And we would under no circumstances base the creation of a Jewish policy upon the forced removal of people who have lived there for centuries and who have every right to continue to live there with full autonomy.

I would only like to say to you, sir, that the suggestion regarding that idea was made by the British Labour Party, as you probably know.

Major Manningham-Buller: I am not fully acquainted, I am afraid, with all the party has said.

One further question. You said that the land laws in Palestine were the vestigial remains of the Nuernberg legislation.

Dr. Neumann: That was a manner of speech. I meant by that that it reflects the kind of thing which in my opinion would not have been possible before Hitlerism. We have gotten accustomed--

Major Manningham-Buller: May I put this to you. You are not suggesting for one moment, in view of the explanatory notes attached to those regulations, that they were made with any such object, are you? At least I hope not.

Dr. Neumann: They were made with the object of preventing Jews from acquiring land or interest in land. No doubt about that.

Major Manningham-Buller: And they were made in 1940?

Dr. Neumann: Yes, sir.

Major Manningham-Buller: I was wondering whether you might draw a comparison. I was wondering if there was any suggestion of imitating German legislation.

Dr. Neumann: No, I don't mean that. I mean to say the Jews of Palestine look upon that piece of legislation as an outrageous thing, as a discrimination against the Jews in their homeland. It is that. You can't get away from it. It is awful to contemplate, but there it is.

Judge Hutcheson: I think, unless you feel that we have unduly limited you, I think we would like to get along to the next witness if we may. Every time you have been asked a question, you have answered it, you have done your duty.

Dr. Neumann: Thank you, sir.

Judge Hutcheson: You may proceed, Mrs. Epstein.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JUDITH EPSTEIN, REPRESENTING
HADASSAH, THE WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF
AMERICA.

Mrs. Epstein: I am speaking as president of the Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America, an organization of 160,000 American-Jewish women, significantly the largest Jewish women's organization in the country, organized throughout the United States in large and small communities. With its various affiliates, Hadassah numbers around 180,000 women.

It carries forward its Zionist program on two fronts. In America it fosters Zionist education and knowledge, and takes its place side by side with all other Zionist groups in this country in working for the attainment of our political objectives. In Palestine it has from its beginning carried on a very specific and practical program.

Now, it may be that because men have said that woman's place is in the home, they have been trained to do as good a job as they know how with that very important task. At any rate, if there is a question of building up a home, women think in terms of specific things to do to make that home habitable and a place that will give an opportunity for a full and rich life.

Not pertinent to the purposes of this inquiry but in passing, I should like to say that Hadassah, which comprises such a large group of American women, also is enormously

interested in the American scene, and both in wartime and in this postwar period it is interested in making its women as good citizens as possible.

Now, Hadassah was organized in 1912. It is an interesting fact that its first project, of sending American-trained nurses to Palestine, took place just one year after the organization of Hadassah. I want you to notice that it was not an organization brought into being because Hitler had come to power, and not even an organization brought into existence after the Balfour Declaration. It was organized before there was, before England had entered the scene at all, when Palestine was part of the Turkish Empire, when the modern Zionist movement was only 15 years old.

11

Dr. Wise has given the background of Dr. Hertzl and the first Zionist Congress, and Dr. Neumann has talked of the program which Hadassah in 1914 accepted as its program for a publicly secured, legally assured home for the Jewish people.

Hadassah was organized because of a very remarkable American-Jewish woman whose name may be known to you, Henrietta Szold. She was born in Baltimore just one year before the outbreak of the Civil War. She had in her and through her life exemplified an amalgam of the very best of Jewish and American civilization and values. In Baltimore she came into contact with Jews fleeing from the Russian pogrom. She was one of the first to help immigrants adjust

hl
fls
gib

themselves to the American scene. Through them she learned what Zionism meant to the Jews of Eastern Europe. How even at a time when the doors of America were open, Jews felt that they must find for themselves a permanent home in a land where their historic roots lived, and this at a time when there was no organized movement, really strong movement behind them, and no international guarantees.

She learned something else. She learned Zionism had a great solace for the terrible humiliations, degradations to which Jews in many parts of the world had been subjected. That it really bound up their spiritual wounds.

In 1919, because she had become that kind of a Zionist, she went to Palestine, and there she saw the kind of incredible diseases and filth and dirt which Westernized peoples are not accustomed to, and being the kind of woman and person that is very rare -- somebody who can keep his head with the plow, and feet on the ground, she decided, something had to be done about it.

She, therefore, came back and organized this very small group of 12 women to see what could be done to make a beginning.

Most people would have been aghast at such a program, to go into that kind of an undertaking with so little means at ones disposal, but she said if we are going to make this land a Jewish national home then it must be a healthy land,

and we will start in a very small way.

Children should not have to suffer from trachoma when it is perfectly simple to cure it. If it means a doctor, a nurse, and daily care that is what we will provide. There is no reason for the mothers to die in childbirth when there have been scientists who have shown how it is possible to avoid it.

So 20 nurses went out, which I wish to emphasize, started institutions which were open to all sections of the population.

Then came World War No. 1, which brought tremendous changes to the whole world, and which brought tremendous changes to the Jewish people and to the Zionist movement.

Hadassah had been asked to organize a unit to go to Palestine to undertake first aid for the civilian population, with which the military government could not cope.

While this unit was being drawn up, and prepared, the Balfour Declaration was issued. You have heard it many times here today and you will probably hear it again. Again, what a tremendous effect this Balfour Declaration had upon the Jews of the world, and, from my own experience, I can say upon the Jews of America.

Third, by this promise, which was the promise of a great Empire, which, as has been said, recognized the relationship of the Jewish people to Palestine, the historic

relationship, and went further, was prepared to implement that recognition in a legal and international effort, women flocked to the banner of Hadassah and helped not only to equip a unit, but gave it the support that would make it possible to get a real extensive health system.

Mrs. Szold said we started out with a unit and when we got to Palestine we found we could lay the foundation for a department of health.

While that may sound a little pretentious for what Hadassah is, it nevertheless did find its way into all parts of the land and has influenced enormously the development of the country.

Hadassah started with its hospitals. I don't want to repeat what is here in the printed documents. I want only to interpret and highlight the significance of what has been done.

There were hospitals in the three principal cities. They were not adequate. They were the best that could be done in the light of inadequate buildings. But I wish to emphasize that the personnel, some of which came from America, some of which was trained there, was able to make up for the deficiencies through a tremendous devotion, and through knowledge and science which was brought from this country.

It was possible, within a reasonable time, to do what

we had always wanted to do. Make Hadassah something of a standard bearer. And we feel, and felt, very keenly, being an association of women in America, which has enjoyed tremendous advantages, which is in the forefront of scientific advancement, it was a great opportunity for us to carry over from the West to the East those standards.

I said before that we were interested in what kind of a home it was to be. Were we going to accept the level of the surrounding countries or would we try to bring into it this 20th century of which we were a part.

For us there could be no question of choice. So the one hospital in Jerusalem became something of our center.

In 1933 Germany and later Austria spewed out their medical men who had helped create their medical reputation, and many of them came to Palestine. So that in 1934 we broke ground for our medical center on Mount Scopus. It is quite interesting that during the war period American soldiers, both non-Jewish and Jewish, who were in that part of the world all came up to see this hospital, which was something that was part of America.

In the hall there is a large map that has on it all the names of the cities from which contributions came, and it was for them a close tie with home.

The hospital during the war served a very interesting purpose. The medical corps of all the countries involved

with the Allies in the war came up to the hospital for consultation and courses that would help them with the diseases that were indigenous to that part of the country. And I should like to point out to you that there was a vast difference between the scene in 1918 when the army was able to cope with the civil population and had to ask for help, and this situation where the country had been made at least healthy enough to provide a great furlough center and to be free from the malaria of that part of the world.

That hospital is not only a center of healing but a center of research and teaching. And the next logical step which has been taken is to create the first under-graduate medical school in that part of the world.

Now, I come to the second facet of the program, which is of utmost importance, I think, not only to the Jews of Palestine, but to that part of the world of which it is a part. That is the work with the child.

The cultural level of a country, I suppose, can be measured as much by the approach to the care of children as in any other way.

When we came into the country, I think it is no exaggeration to say that the level was the level of the 13th century. In one generation it has been possible to jump that level from the 13th to the 20th century.

I had a personal experience in Palestine many years

ago, in 1933. I went with one of the nurses from the health center through the old city of Jerusalem. It is a fascinating city if you are interested in the picturesque and in history that is crowded into it, as are all of the communities of the Near East, but if you are interested in modern health and sanitation, it is a very distressing sight, because you have to combat all of the ignorance and superstition of what I will call the 13th century.

I went with one of the nurses to a home where there was a new-born babe which had to be cared for. I never saw a sight that was so disheartening. There was just nothing that we connect with sanitation.

By the time the nurse left it looked like a fairly well ordered nursery.

This was the third time that this woman had had a child. It was a Persian family. The mother-in-law was still the one who ruled the roost. The mother-in-law had said something to the nurse. I said to the nurse, did the mother-in-law say that she had brought up her babies without baths? The nurse said, "How did you know? That was exactly what she said." I said, "What hope do you have of educating these people?" The nurse said, "When the oldest child marries and has children, the war will be won."

Since then we have had an opportunity to test those words. Children of children born in the Hadassah hospital

are now just normally and in a routine fashion the patients of the child welfare centers, and in that one generation there has been bridged an enormous span of raising the level.

There is one other thing that I would like to speak about before I speak of another facet.

Mr. Nathan yesterday talked about industrial civilization, and the necessity for "know-how," and he said that many of the men and women who were coming into the land were bringing skills with them from the Western world. That is one way of bringing know-how into a country.

Another way is to educate the youth growing up in those skills which are essential if a land is to be an industrial land.

There is some vocational education in the country. I don't say that Hadassah is the first to show the way. In the name of Louis D. Brandeis, through the Brandeis center we have opened a secondary vocational highschool for girls, and we have brought within the compound many of the vocational trends which we have learned here in American.

Vocational guidance and apprenticeship and continuation classes. There is no compulsory attendance law in Palestine. For the very poor and underprivileged, the problem of making a living is a very pressing one. So children leave school very early because they must earn a living which

means that for the rest of their lives they are condemned pretty much except in extraordinary cases, to a very low standard.

We have tempted them to stay in school longer by offering the chance of skills which will fit them for a much more decent and self-respecting life, and that is something that will be an interesting development for the future.

Again, it is small, but again, it is something that points the way.

I want to pick up something else that Mr. Nathan said yesterday. He said, very rightly, that a country that would have to live only on moneys that come from the outside would not make for healthy economic growth.

From our own experience, I want to confirm what he said of not only the willingness and readiness, but the ability of the Jewish community to take over that which is brought in. We started with four hospitals. In a reasonable time, three had been taken over by communities, and only one gets a subsidy from us.

We started a feeding program. Not only for malnutrition, not soup kitchens, but a program that would teach people coming from the northern climes and southern climes how to use foods of the country. Children brought back to their homes the kind of dietetic knowledge and nutritional values which couldn't have been taught effectively in any

other way. We started giving 100 percent of that. Now, Hadassah gives only 16 percent. It means that the community has understood and seized the opportunity of making, as part of its own development, these things we were able to bring from a civilization of the 20th century and the Western world.

The patient's fees in the hospital have made it possible for us to be relieved of certain responsibilities and to go forward looking for new opportunity to bring up constantly the level of the country, make it possible for this country to absorb others who are coming.

Now, I want to touch on something with which we are deeply concerned, and with which I think the whole world is deeply concerned. That is the plight of the Jewish children of Europe of whom Dr. Schwartz spoke yesterday. He told you of those children in Europe. Let me tell you something of what happens to them when they get to Palestine.

Almost 17,000 of them are now in Palestine. They have been coming since 1934. They came originally almost exclusively from Germany. At first they came at the ages of 15 to 17. They were carefully selected. We really received the cream. They were well educated young children, well fed.

As shades of Nazism spread over Europe, we began to take children not nearly so well selected until during the

war period, and in this terrible postwar period we have opened our doors to any child who can enter the country.

Perhaps you will understand what has happened to Jewish children in Europe when I say the children who came in 1934 were well educated and the child who comes today may never have had a chance to have any education at all; has lived in the woods, has lived by his wits.

One of the workers said she brought a pad and pencil to one of the children. The child cried and he said, "This is the first pencil I have ever held in my hand." The desire for knowledge is very strong; it dies very hard with the Jewish people.

Now, Palestine has done a very wonderful job on rehabilitating these young children, and I don't mean only putting flesh on their bones.

As a matter of fact, one little boy who came on the last transport held out his arms and said, "This is American flesh on my bones. The American soldiers gave me food."

That, of course, we are ready to do, but the job is infinitely harder than that. What has happened to the children of Palestine is awfully hard for us to understand.

As I come in contact with it, I find myself horrified afresh at the evidences of brutality that man can show to man.

For instance, in one of the cooperative colonies, the

dinner bell rang on this particular day. It was a cooperative colony in which there was a group of children. You know a dinner bell is a very cheery sound. But when that bell rang the children screamed.

They jumped over the stone wall to run away, and one child became seriously ill, frothing at the mouth, very ill. The doctor managed to gather the children and by dint of great patience, learned the story.

At this camp from which the children had been liberated a bell rang from the death-house every day at noon. They all lined up to be picked out, those who should go to the death-house and those who should escape. There was no system. It was completely chaotic there. The child who had fallen down ill had been on that line 30 times.

That calls for a kind of mental and physical and psychological rehabilitation that I believe only Palestine can give because the whole Jewish community is geared for that task, to rehabilitate those children.

Those children are the ward of the whole Jewish people, not one colony, not one kind-hearted family, not one good woman, but they are the wards of the whole Jewish community and the Jewish community, the whole Jewish community stands completely for doing what it can.

There is one other thing that is of utmost importance in the rehabilitation. That is that in Palestine they

remain not only self-respecting but a useful person, which feeling they need desperately to build them up.

I remember this story which is illustrative of this.

The nurse insisted in the education of these children, that there must be four hours in the classroom and four hours work on the farm. She was afraid that there might be a temptation for exploitation of this new manpower.

Well, the oranges had to be picked, and there was insufficient hands. One of the nearby colonies asked for some of the children. Mrs. Szold said firmly "no." They wrote her pleading with her to give up this order. She said "no." Don't you know what it means to us to be wanted?

Here they say they need us to save the crop. We need that more than we need food and shelter.

Yesterday somebody asked Dr. Schwartz about vocational opportunity and retraining of children. I can tell you that a most wonderful achievement has been accomplished in retraining in Palestine. For instance, in one cooperative farm there is an opportunity for learning 25 different trades -- carpentry, masonry, farming, husbandry, et cetera. They are trained for a life that has certain values. Manual work on the farm has a distinct ideological value. It works for them effectively, and from the point of view of their spiritual rehabilitation makes them part of a community which is geared to fit them in..

Lastly, they have something in Palestine that I believe no other place can give them.

Again, I can only say it is a purpose that transcends their personal well being.

For instance, a group came in about a year ago. A story was written called "The First Fifty Hours."

The nurse went with a group of 25 from the boat to the colony. I have never read of such a transformation as took place in those fifty hours. When they came over on the boat they were sullen, suspicious, and frightened. They wouldn't give up their dirty rags.

When they came to the colony, they took the food from the table and ran away to hide it like squirrels hide nuts.

When the people protested, they said they didn't know when they would get food again, and for that reason took the food and hid it.

There were cots for them to lie down on. When the woman in charge went in, she found four on one tiny cot. They said, we are used to this for security. We don't lie alone on a cot. They were suspicious of the friendliness of the children.

At the end of 24 hours, they began to track. Then they were taken to another colony in a higher state of development. The women accompanying them thought that perhaps they would not be as well cared for in the new

colony. But during the celebration there was singing. Some of the children were singing a song which means "We build up the land."

On the way home they said, "If we work hard we can make our colony like that one."

Then the women said they began to sing, falteringly at first and then with assurance. They sang the song "We will build up the land," and she said as they sang this she could just feel that the bitterness of their experience was not forgotten but it was transformed into a wonderful impulse, an impulse to build so well that what had happened to them could not happen again to any generation of children anywhere in the world.

I don't know exactly what the limitations on me are as a witness, but I would like to do something that I think is unorthodox, and that is to appeal to you gentlemen who have been given, I think, a very high responsibility and a great privilege, to look carefully into this question of a lost, what would be and what we do not want to be, a lost generation of children. Children mean a great deal to all people. They are the hope of the future. To the Jewish people who have had this frightful debacle, these children who have been saved at the risk of many an adult life, who were carried into the woods and fed by the most devious ways, who have been kept alive because they

were not only children and helpless, but the hope of the future, these children long for a chance to rebuild their lives.

I just want to say this.

Before the war, I once heard somebody speak in behalf of anti-Fascism, a movement designed to bring scholars and intellectuals from Europe and the man who spoke said that every time he said "How do you do" to one of these people who had come into the country, he said to himself, "This is my triumph over Hitler. He wanted to still the pen and tongue of these men, and I have made it impossible for him to achieve his end."

I can only say to save these children, not merely as human beings, but as that generation that is the hope of a continuation of the proud traditions of the Jewish people, in a land where they can merge their own troubles and sorrows in an effort to build a finer land for their own people and for future generations, that would constitute the final defeat of Hitler.

Now, I have two more things, if I haven't taken too much time. One is that Hadassah and its health field has very definite postwar plans.

The postwar, which is hard to believe, is now with us. We brought the director of our medical work overhere last year to plan. We knew that the people who would come and

we hope they will come in the thousands and hundreds of thousands, would bring broken bodies, and we have prepared ourselves to meet that need.

There are very inadequate tuberculosis facilities. We brought to our women at our convention the need of building a tuberculosis hospital that would care for them. What was to have been a two-year program was accomplished in one year. The money was collected. We have trained nurses to take care of the health of immigrants. We are building additional beds in our hospitals. We are prepared, as far as a voluntary organization such as ours can be prepared, to receive these people.

Now, one point that has been touched on by everyone, and I suppose will be throughout the inquiry -- that is, what relationship has this which we have done to the Arab population.

Well, I think that there have been direct and indirect benefits to the Arab population. Direct, because we have made available to the Arabs the advantages of our institutions, to Arabs of all classes and groups. We have actually opened three child welfare centers in neighborhoods which were predominantly Arab with the sole purpose of bringing Arabs into the centers and helping to train them in this which we think is of such tremendous importance.

We have printed our pamphlets in Arabic and distributed

them.

Indirectly, it is much more difficult to evaluate what has been done, but I think it is at least nearly as important if not as important as the direct benefit. That is the effect of a demonstration center in a small, tiny land, where you live no further than the size of the aisle there from your Jewish neighborhoods. It doesn't seem possible to me that an Arab mother who sees a Jewish mother who has a family and brings that family up in health and knows that her family sickens and dies, realizing that the reason one family lives is because it has a certain kind of care, that that mother will continue to be satisfied to say it is the "Will of Allah," that "Allah gave me these children and now takes them away."

It is inevitable that a higher standard of living, that a higher standard of life, in a tiny country, where you can't escape it, will leave untouched that part of the population.

Now, I couldn't help asking myself, as I thought over my presentation, questions which you gentlemen put. Does this make for better relations; are people grateful for the fact that the infant mortality is low; that Malcolm MacDonald can say, as he did in 1938:

"The Arabs cannot say that the Jews are driving them out of their country. If not a single Jew had come to

Palestine after 1918, I believe the Arab population today would still have been around about the 600,000 figure -- instead of over 1,000,000 as at present -- at which it had been stable under the Turkish rule. It is because the Jews who have come to Palestine bringing modern health services and other advantages that Arab men and women who would be dead are alive today, that Arab children who would never have drawn breath have been born and grow strong."

There is another quotation which you can read from the Peal Commission which says again what Hadassah services have done.

I don't know whether it does improve relationships. I should say as a mother and a grandmother that it would be very difficult for a woman whose child had been saved at a health center not to be personally grateful. But I don't think that is the all-impelling thing. I know there are other attentions and other strifes which can override it. But I don't think that is the important criterion. What is important, it seems to me, and I am sure must be to all who mean what they say about a one world and a higher standard for all peoples, is what is happening in Palestine as a result of this higher standard.

Is it important, or are we only giving it lip service that people should not have to depend on the "will of Allah" for the lives of their children?

Is it important that we should learn that life can be rich and good for all peoples of all classes at all strata?

I don't mean for a second that the Jews went into Palestine carrying the white man's burden. We went to solve the Jewish problem. But it is the inevitable by-product of it. That, I think, is important to all those well-meaning men and women who believe in this better world for which we fought.

Mr. Crossman spoke yesterday of a social revolution. There is possibly a social evolution that is not imposed by force, but that comes from contact naturally and easily of two peoples living side by side.

Now, just one last word in conclusion.

The result of our years of experience have been that we are confident that we can help physically the people who come to us. We have training. We have the men. We have the body of experience. We have the instruction. There is no question that we have behind us in America an ever-growing body of women who have given us the support necessary to carry through. There is no question that as the American official agency for the movement to transfer children from Europe to Palestine that we can rehabilitate that youth, not only physically, but make of them, instead of human driftwood, the kind of bad children that Russia had after

the war, make them the kind of fine human material with which to build a good civilization.

I want to say only this. That all of this is possible only because American Jewish women have been ignited by the thought of what can be done to solve the Jewish problem in Palestine. I do not make light of the social service urge. I think it is a very important thing in our civilization. That those who are the privileged ones want to help those who are under-privileged.

I do not mind myself the desire, in a shrinking world, to bring the standards of the West to the East.

But over and above all that, and I know this intimately from my contact with women throughout the country who are members, and to some extent are non-Jewish, and who are not members but sympathetic, over and above everything else, this support comes first from the promise made that Palestine would be a national home, a promise made by countries and peoples we have confidence, confidence that they will live up to their promises, and in the words of the Chairman who opened this session of inquiry, these are women who want bold action.

We live in that kind of an age. Most of us have lived through two wars. Have seen husbands and fathers and sons go to war to make a better world. We believe that the Jewish problem is something that has to be solved. They are tired

for themselves and for their children of constantly facing a problem of refugees, of soup kitchens, of transportation from one land to another.

There is a vicarious humiliation in that kind of thing.

American Jewish women have had the benefit of great freedom, freedom to develop themselves as individuals, as mothers, as part of the community. They know very well what freedom is. They have savored it to the full. They are most unwilling that other Jews should be so horribly and abysmally deprived of that freedom. For them, and they are, for the most part, very international-minded, for them it is a measuring rod of the kind of just world that we are going to build on the sacrifices of the sons and fathers and brothers that went through this last war, whether or not the Jewish people are to receive justice.

And for Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, justice translates itself into the Zionist salute.

Judge Hutcheson: Madam, for the committee, I want to say that you have made a gracious presentation, and we will not bother you with questions, because our time for adjournment has come.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Just one thing.

Have you been to Palestine yourself.

Mrs. Epstein: I was in Palestine in 1933 for four

months. Not since, I regret to say.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I would like to say that when I looked at your book last night, I was struck with admiration, great admiration for the charitable work your organization has done.

Mrs. Epstein: Thank you very much.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I hope to have the privilege of visiting your hospital.

Lord Morrison: I was going to ask you if you would permit us when we get there to go and see it.

Mrs. Epstein: We will welcome you.

Major Manningham-Buller: You quoted from the Peal report. May I say I am sorry you didn't put in the next sentence.

Mrs. Epstein: I am sorry.

Major Manningham Buller: (Reading) "It was a real step towards the promotion of good feeling between the two races."

Judge Hutcheson: There are some announcements which must be made.

Our committee will meet in the conference room immediately after adjournment.

Tomorrow morning the program will continue in this order:

Mr. Robert Zole; Dr. Gold; Dr. Greenberg; the American

Jewish Committee, and the American-Jewish Congress.

We will have the last two beginning at 2:30 in the afternoon. I am not sure they will be reached at that time, but we would certainly like you to do as you have been doing, be prompt.

I have had many court proceedings, and I never saw one where the witnesses were so prompt and so ready and so efficient to do their job.

Let's keep it up.

We will now adjourn.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 o'clock p. m., the hearing was adjourned until tomorrow morning, January 9, 1946)

