



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
109

Box
38

Folder
461b

Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, 1949 January 10.

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:00 p.m.

The Chairman: You may proceed.

Mr. Rood: Mr. Lessing Rosenwald.

STATEMENT OF LESSING G. ROSENWALD -- Resumed

Judge Hutcheson: Mr. McDonald..

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like, as I said, to follow Sir John's example and ask the witness for help.

I would like to preface the few questions I have by a sentence or two. Ever since I was a young Professor of History, ages and ages ago, I have been interested in the history of the Arab people and their culture, but only recently have I begun to read Jewish history. I find the essential thesis of the Council so strange in the light of my reading of Jewish history that I am coming to the witness for help.

But first, if I might, Mr. Rosenwald, I wonder if you would tell me how representative the Council is. I mean, how many members does it have?

Mr. Rosenwald: Between 10,000 and 11,000 members.

Mr. McDonald: Then it is not as yet a mass movement but perhaps a leadership movement?

Mr. Rosenwald: Sir, you can judge that from the numbers.

Mr. McDonald: Then may I ask, since you emphasize the religious element in Judaism, might I ask how many of the American rabbis are associated with the Council? Approximately.

Mr. Rosenwald: I wouldn't be able to give you an accurate figure but I should say somewhere in the neighborhood of 75.

Mr. McDonald: Out of a total of about what?

Mr. Rosenwald: I don't remember the exact number.

Mr. McDonald: Is it a thousand?

Mr. Rosenwald: It is a large number.

It is a small percentage.

Mr. McDonald: These rabbis who are members -- and this has a purpose, Mr. Chairman, I will make the connection later -- into which group would they fall?

Mr. Rosenwald: They would mostly fall in the reform group. I think they would all fall in the reform group.

Mr. McDonald: Then I come to another matter.

I suppose you and your associates have been close students of Jewish history, as I think all of us, Jews or non-Jews, ought to be, and would you suppose that among the Jewish historians the two greatest of Jewish historians were Graetz and Dubnov?

Mr. Rosenwald: I wouldn't be qualified to tell you that, sir.

Mr. McDonald: Neither is a modern historian. Graetz, as I understand it, is the greatest of the Jewish historians, and his great six volumes were written about the middle of the last century, and Dubnov's work perhaps the beginning of

this century.

The reason I asked the question was that during recent months I have had the thrilling experience of reading Graetz, one of the greatest experiences I have had. Graetz, of course, was not a Zionist, because Zionism in the modern form was not known then.

Now, I notice that Graetz uses the phrases "The Jewish people", "Jewish national", "Jewish folk", quite commonly, as if it were the accepted conclusion of this great historian that that use was justified.

Now, I wondered whether Graetz was wrong and whether he should have spoken only of "Jews", or "people of Jewish faith".

I ask you that because, as I understand it, the substance, what you might call the philosophical basis of the Council is the contention that Judaism is a religion, not a nationality, not a folk, not a people.

Mr. Rosenwald: I would say this, sir: I am not going to attempt to say whether your historian is right or wrong. I am not qualified to do that. I can say this in justification for our position, that we feel that ever since the principles were laid down of equality of rights and the equality of responsibilities of the individual citizen in the nation of which he is a citizen, which I believe was first enunciated in France and then spread to other countries starting in about 1791, we have felt that the future of the Jews

is their integration into the countries and the nations of which they are a part, that we do not constitute a separate people. There are people living in widely different parts of the world, all over the world, various colors and various races, various nationalities, and we believe that the Jews have a definite religion. That religion, although it has certain sects within it, is common to Judaism all over the world. Members can adopt a religion but their whole future and their whole present, under modern society and modern concept, is believing themselves to be in fact as well as theory adhering to a certain religion, being nationals of the country of which they are citizens.

Mr. McDonald: In what sense do you suppose historians such as Dubnov and Graetz used, not once but it is the recurring expression, "Jewish people", "Jewish folk", what do you suppose they meant?

(2)

Mr. Rosenwald: I imagine in the times when the Ghetto was the commonly accepted means of living in Central Europe and people were treated as an inferior group that they were classified as a people or a folk simply because they enjoyed, or did not enjoy, inferior status in those countries, and that they were a people in that they had suffered the same discriminations, the same oppressions, simply because of their religion, and, therefore, had a common bond in common suffering. More than that I can't go, sir. I am not qualified

to answer any better than that.

Mr. McDonald: I would just like to say that the historians were not writing merely about the Ghetto. They were writing about the biblical period and the period following the so-called emancipation under the leadership of Joseph Mendelssohn and others.

One other question. There is implicit in several of the documents contained herein a very fundamental contingent which I should like to ask you if you really seriously hold, to-wit, that Zionism is inconsistent with national patriotism in countries where Zionism has a place, where Zionists happen to live.

Mr. Rosenwald: May I state it another way, sir?

Mr. McDonald: Certainly.

Mr. Rosenwald: Do you mean to say, do I believe that the fundamental theories of Zionism raise the question of dual allegiance to citizens of countries where they now enjoy complete citizenship?

Mr. McDonald: If you would like to answer that, yes.

Mr. Rosenwald: Is that the same question?

Mr. McDonald: It isn't quite the same question, no.

Mr. Rosenwald: I think it does.

Mr. McDonald: You think it does?

Mr. Rosenwald: I do.

Mr. McDonald: Well, do you agree then that men like

Lloyd George and Churchill and Wilson were friends of the Jewish people?

Mr. Rosenwald: I have no doubt of it.

Mr. McDonald: Well, would you think that was rather inconsistent then for them to have at various times interpreted the Jewish aspiration in Palestine in terms of the Jewish state?

I don't say that I think there should be a Jewish state or commonwealth. I am merely addressing myself to your underlying thesis.

My question is do you think it likely these great statesmen would have lent themselves to a program which would have implied even remotely divided loyalty?

Mr. Rosenwald: My own belief is that they probably did not understand all of the implications that there were in Zionism.

Mr. McDonald: I am through, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Hutcheson: I would like to ask you a question or two, following the line of Mr. McDonald's inquiries.

I haven't the knowledge of history nor the ability to classify historians which my friend enjoys and I am not able to say why historians at a certain time speak of people in one way and at another time in another way.

Now, I myself know very little about my genealogy in a thorough way as perhaps I would know if I was a genealogist.

I know that I have a good deal of Scottish blood and a good deal of English blood, in the sense that we are talking here, when my ancestors came here 300 years ago. I suppose that blood has gotten pretty well thinned out now, and I suppose I am a through and through American.

And there was, perhaps, a little Huguenot blood. No German, so far as I know. But that is all right, I know some very fine German people in this country.

But when I call myself an American citizen I don't call myself a Scotchman or an Englishman. I suppose that you mean to say that you as an American citizen say, I don't know what my racial stock is, I don't go back, but you feel that you ought to be classified as an American citizen and let the question of your having come down from a Jewish line not determine your nationality. Is that about what it is?

Mr. Rosenwald: That is right, sir. I feel that I am an American citizen of Jewish faith. Much as you would consider yourself an American citizen of whatever faith you adhere to.

Judge Hutcheson: Let me ask you this question. I suppose the difference is that persecution or compression, or what not, has not made it necessary for Scottish people or Englishers in other places to draw together, and so I don't have any common race or ancestry. But you are saying that whatever is the case as to years gone by, that in countries where now

full rights are given, you feel that there is a danger of, at least, of some incompatibility between the insistence that you are a Jew first and an American second as a matter of race, you think you have one citizenship, that is American, and one religion, and that is Jew.

I can see that point of view and I can see the point of view of the other people. But is it essential in the development of the theory that you go on that the Palestinian question and the refugee question are two questions? That is, the future of Palestine is one thing and the refugee question is another. Is it essential, the disturbing point that maybe you are saying they are not good Americans if they are strong Zionists, is that essential in the position you are taking?

Mr. Rosenwald: I don't believe I have said that.

Judge Hutcheson: No, but that is the implication that someone may draw. Is there some way to make the point clearer than you have made it?

Mr. Rosenwald: May I try, sir.

Judge Hutcheson: You might give us a brief statement of why you ~~feel that way~~ ^{are from the standpoint of yourself} and others like you, as an American citizen, and particularly from the standpoint of the future of Palestine, the emphasis on Palestine's statehood rather than the emphasis on Palestine as a place where Jewish people may go.

What is the cardinal point?

(3) Mr. Rosenwald: We first start with the fact that no matter how many people go to Palestine, that could be millions, as much as Palestine could accommodate, Palestine will always be, as far as anybody can see, a minority, will contain a minority of the Jews of the world.

Most of the Jews are living as citizens of countries other than Palestine and always will be. Most of the Jews now in the world are citizens of countries where they have equal rights as citizens with their co-nationals. That applies to this country, applies to Great Britain, France, Russia, if you please. They have equal rights with their co-nationals.

Now, one of the fundamental tenets of Zionism is that Palestine should be a national home where a man can go as of right and not as of sufferance. Any Jew can go as of right and not as of sufferance. That is one of the underlying concepts, as I understand it, of a Jewish national home.

Now, what does that mean? As an American citizen I have the right to come to one country and one country only as an American citizen. That country is the United States. I have no right any place else in the world to go.

Now, as soon as the Jewish state is set up I have a right to go to the United States as a citizen and I have the right under the Zionist philosophy to go to Palestine as of right as a Jew.

Therefore, there are two places, two countries, two separate countries in this world where I have the right to go without anybody questioning me. That puts me in a category different from any other citizen or group of citizens in this country and puts every other Jew in a separate category from any other citizen. He has two countries that he has rights to.

Furthermore, to my way of thinking, that immediately sets up this one question. Where does my allegiance lie, primarily? As a citizen of the United States, whereby I have my citizenship, or have I some other allegiance, to some other country by reason of my religion?

I for one want only one allegiance and I think any citizen can only have one allegiance. That is to the country of which he is a citizen. Anything which sets up a separate state where a citizen of one country automatically has some attachment or some loyalty other than the country to which he is a citizen immediately raises the question as to whether, where that allegiance is strongest, and it also raises the question that there is more than one allegiance and I can't believe that is compatible with our way of thinking.

Have I made it any clearer?

Judge Hutcheson: Yes.

It takes out the suggestion of an invidious shaft. You are stating a legal situation from which certain deductions

flow and spiritual consequences will probably follow.

There is one other thing. Is it also the feeling of your organization -- well, let me ask you first this question.

Mr. McDonald asked you how many members you had. I would like to ask you how old your organization is.

Mr. Rosenwald: We have been in existence about two and a half years.

Judge Hutcheson: Two and a half years.

Mr. Rosenwald: We started in with zero about September 1, 1943. As you may have gathered there is considerable opposition to a point of view such as we hold. Therefore it is not always easy to gain membership who come flatly and say they adhere to the principles which are really contrary to a very large number.

That is, the Zionist organization is one which has been active for some 50 years and particularly active for 25 years.

Nevertheless, starting as a new organization and recruiting members, with the pressures that are brought against them and the accusations that sometimes flow, it isn't always easy to gain adherents.

While I should like to see a greater number I am not discouraged that up to the present time we have received only that number of active members.

Judge Hutcheson: I will say that I have no personal

interest in the numbers. I don't think this question is going to be decided by a show of hands either on the part of Jews or Arabs. It has to be decided by a more definite understanding of the principles.

I am not going into the question of numbers except to perhaps explain the apparent discrepancy between the numbers and the assumption that you have been an organization of long standing.

Mr. Rosenwald: That is right.

Judge Hutcheson: Mr. Proskauer talked yesterday. He doesn't belong to your organization or to the others, either?

Mr. Rosenwald: He doesn't belong to the Zionists. He doesn't belong to ours.

(4) Judge Hutcheson: And then there is a sort of middle organization between the two of you?

Mr. Rosenwald: I would characterize it that way. The Zionists are on one side. Our organization is on the other side. Mr. Proskauer's organization has a membership of both Zionists and anti-Zionists and so-called non-Zionists. These are people that don't take any position one way or the other. And his organization, the American Jewish Committee, has members of both anti-Zionists and pro-Zionists and non-Zionists. I don't believe there are any non-Zionists, but that is what they call themselves.

Judge Hutcheson: These hearings are held in order to get

shades of American opinion, including Arab opinion. I don't know whether we are going to have only American Arabs or some others who are not Americans, but the Arab side will be presented here. We are trying to get, of course, as full a view as we can of the American-Jewish side.

Is your organization concerned only with, was it organized only or concerned only with the question of opposing what you think is a wrong direction toward the use of Palestine, has it other objectives besides that?

Mr. Rosenwald: The other objectives are one of the points that I mentioned this morning. We are trying to do everything within our power to create conditions in all countries of the world where they do not exist at present of equal rights and responsibilities for all of their citizenry, and in countries where it is only partially so to see that every support is given to those countries to the end that they may grant equal rights in every respect to all of their citizens.

Judge Hutcheson: Does your organization have this other function: I know there are some organizations in this country, of Jewish and Christian membership, which are undertaking to go far beyond tolerance by law, to get tolerance altogether, to get away from talking about the Jew showing tolerance to a Christian or the Christian showing tolerance to a Jew, but to get to the point where we accept American citizens as

American citizens without emphasizing the Jew over the Gentile; is your organization interested in that phase?

Mr. Rosenwald: Very much. Not so much as it applies to America perse, because by and large we have obtained, at least by law in this country, such equality.

But there are many countries that have not even attained that status yet which we would like to see obtained.

For example, I mentioned this morning Poland. Poland is one of them. The government there is anxious to eliminate these discrepancies and this oppression, but so far they have not been able to make that an actual fact.

In the Balkan states, such as Hungary and Rumania, it is not yet apparent that that is even being considered as yet. At least there is no indication of it as a government policy.

We would like to do everything within our power. We have a word for it. It is implicit in the difference in our two ideologies. We believe that the future for the Jews lies in their integration into the countries in which they live as opposed to a larger extent the ideologies of the Zionists that we are a nation unto ourselves and must have a national home for that nation.

Judge Hutcheson: One other question. As far as I have gathered it isn't germane, of course, to our reference to consider the relations in the United States and Great Britain between people of Jewish faith, as you call it, or Jewish folk,

as it is otherwise called, and others, the question of whether there is much or little anti-Semitism in these countries.

As I understand it, Zionism is not concerning itself, I mean, its prime and complete function is to develop the idea that Palestine is the home for the Jew, to take him there, and there is not implicit in its movement any effort to say, well, in other places the Jew is a separate people, he must be a separate people everywhere. They are concentrating on the question of having a Jewish state more than they are on the question of separating the Jew from his integration in other states.

They have no program, have they, of emphasizing the fact that a Jew should not integrate himself into the life of his country?

Mr. Rosenwald: I must say this, I am not a spokesman for Zionism, and my viewpoint there, therefore, must be colored.

Judge Hutcheson: I didn't quite finish.

Mr. Rosenwald: I am sorry.

Judge Hutcheson: So that the question won't sound invidious let me say this. I mean as between Zionism, which is a single standard, we might say, of getting people to Palestine, and as between your organization, which wants to get them into Palestine and is emphasizing integration, there

need be no conflict, since you say one is trying to do one thing and one job only, and you think you are trying to do both, integrate as well as get them to Palestine.

(5)

Mr. Rosenwald: With the qualifications that I gave before let me try and say this as fairly as I know how, and it will be open to question on the part of the Zionists.

I should say that the Zionists' theory about that is that they believe that if a state, a Jewish state is set up and established with all of its concomitants, such as embassies and all that, there will be a much better opportunity to eradicate such anti-Semitic feeling.

On our part we feel that close integration of the country in which we are citizens is of paramount importance and we believe that the having of a separate Jewish state as such would hamper rather than help such integration.

As I see it, and, as I say, it is open to question by the Zionists, there is a radical departure in the two points of view.

Judge Hutcheson: But you do think that Zionism has something more in it than merely establishing a state in Palestine, they think through that the plight of the Jews in all other lands will be better?

Mr. Rosenwald: Certainly, I believe that.

Judge Hitcheson: They think Zionism is not only a way to get the Jew back to Palestine but it is a means to the

ultimate complete emancipation of the Jew from wrongs everywhere.

Mr. Rosenwald: I think they think that. I don't agree but I think they think that.

Judge Hutcheson: You think that that is not the right method to produce this integration which has got to take place because the great majority of the Jews are elsewhere, you think their method will not help but hinder that situation?

Mr. Rosenwald: It is more than a difference of methods. It is a difference of method but there are basic differences in our viewpoint. I am sure that it would only go into a long, long discussion and a long argument if we tried to get those real fundamentals expressed on both sides, and I don't think it pertains over and above what has been said or may be, on both sides of the question, to your particular province to go into the various ideologies in minute detail.

Judge Hutcheson: I see.

Mr. Buxton: Mr. Chairman, one question.

Judge Hutcheson: Yes.

Mr. Buxton: Your organization has been critical of the white paper?

Mr. Rosenwald: Our organization has been critical of the first two points of the white paper, the immigration and the land purchase. And the reason we have been critical of it has been because it discriminates against us as Jews.

Now, in our belief, as Judaism is a religion, we believe that sets up a very bad precedent, an extremely bad precedent, if that was the only difficulty, for other countries' immigration laws. If that were accepted as a proper and just way of establishing immigration quotas, it could lead to a very disastrous result.

And primarily we are opposed to both of them on the basis of being discriminatory against a religious group.

Mr. Buxton: You are on common ground then with the Zionists organization?

Mr. Rosenwald: No, I wouldn't say even there. We are not on common ground in very many places at all.

Mr. Buxton: Each of you favors a more liberal policy of immigration.

Mr. Rosenwald: Yes. I think Jews almost universally are in favor of a modification or a cancellation of the first two provisions of the white paper, not on the same ground always, but for one reason or another we almost all believe the same thing in regard to those first two points.

Mr. Buxton: Each of you believes that liberalization of the present land policy is necessary?

Mr. Rosenwald: The immigration and the land policy.

Now, of course, the Zionists include the third provision, which we do not.

Sir Frederick Leggett: May I ask one question.

I take it that your view with regard to the liberalization of the land policy and other policies would apply to all countries and not only to Palestine?

Mr. Rosenwald: It would certainly apply to all countries but in the case of Palestine it is specific as militating against Jews as Jews. You see, in the immigration laws and also in the land purchase laws, it is the Jews, which I consider a religious group, which are discriminated against specifically, and that is why specifically I am against it in the white paper.

Mr. Buxton: One other question.

Do I gather that your position is partly due to a fear for the future, that at a time when as a result of the war we expect that in every country every individual will be given free citizen rights, you feel that the setting up of a Jewish state would tend to assist those who would like to discriminate against Jews in other countries?

Mr. Rosenwald: I don't like to put it that way. Those who would discriminate against the Jews would do so whether they had a valid reason or not. Therefore I don't put it in quite the same terms.

What I would like to do is to have all Jews enabled to the best of their ability to integrate their lives with the lives of their fellow citizens and I believe that the Zionist principles do not lend themselves to a concept of integration

as I see it and probably would hinder such a problem of integration. For that reason I am opposed to it.

I wouldn't say that the question of fear enters into it in any form. It is simply a belief that in this modern day and age the spirit of the world being what it is and what it might be, I should like to seize that advantage by the forelock and take the greatest possible advantage of the world situation today in making this policy of having each and every individual sacrosanct as to his right in the country in which he lives. Anything which prevents that I would eschew.

(7)



1 Mr. McDonald: May I ask one question, Mr. Chairman?

2 Judge Hutcheson: Yes.

3 Mr. McDonald: I think one of the first statements that
4 Council issued contained a clause to the effect - I haven't
5 read it in some time; I read it when you sent it to me some
6 months ago - that no special provision, I think that was the
7 word, need be made for Jews; is that the language, approxi-
8 mately?

9 Mr. Rosenwald: Something to that effect.

10 Mr. McDonald: Yes. The argument was that you were asking
11 Jews, as you have now said, you were arguing for equality of
12 rights everywhere through the world, and that in the light of
13 that no express provision need be made for Jews.

14 Mr. Rosenwald: Yes.

15 Mr. McDonald: Now, my question is whether you think that
16 is quite realistic in the light of the unparalleled tragedy
17 which has come to the Jewish, I won't say Jewish people, I
18 will say to the Jews; I don't want to be invidious.

19 Mr. Rosenwald: I thank you for saying that I have made
20 such an impression upon you, sir.

21 Mr. McDonald: I was quoting, I think, the two great
22 historians, rather than quoting a modest member of this
23 Committee.

24 My question is whether in the light of the tragedy and
25 the existing tragedy whether you do now think that no special

provision need be made for Jews?

One might almost imply if you said yes to that question that this Committee is a work of supererogation because it is set up especially to deal with the Jewish victims of Nazis and Fascist persecution in European countries.

Judge Hutcheson: Are you asking the question and answering it?

Mr. McDonald: No, I am not answering it. I am saying what would be implied if the witness answered "yes" to my question.

Mr. Rosenwald: May I just take a moment.

Mr. McDonald: Have you the document to which I referred?

Mr. Rosenwald: No, I am not sure I have, but I have another here.

It is perfectly true that where certain Jews have suffered enormously, which is putting it very mildly, but they have suffered beyond all help. Everything is lost. I think as a temporary measure, at any rate where assistance is given, as it has been given to all refugees, or many refugees in foreign countries, that something additional will have to be given as temporary assistance to Jews, those who have lost everything as compared to those who have not lost everything in this holocaust. What we have suggested is that help should be given, assistance, immediate assistance, in proportion to the damage suffered.

In other words, while it is perfectly reasonable to say we want equality, and so on, we know that in certain instances, where the Jews have lost everything, in order to bring them up to that equality it means that some supplemental help has to be given before they are even on an equal status.

Now, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just one more thing about this equality of rights, because it has been mentioned here several times. It also has a bearing on this subject. It seems to me that Jews throughout the world are on a perfectly tenable basis if they demand equal rights everywhere with the right to practice their own religion as they see fit, taken by itself, but once you set up a situation where you say we want to get the special privileges in one part of the world, Palestine, where we have control of immigration, where we have a State of our own, and everything necessary to build up that State to a place where there is a Jewish majority, and where that has to be done more or less artificially, if it ever is done, if you ask for special privileges in one part of the world how can you justify equal status in all other parts of the world?

To that extent it seems to me that Zionism does hamper this idea of equality of rights and privileges for all people, regardless of where they live.

Major Maningham-Buller: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Judge Hutcheson: Yes.

Major Maningham-Buller: I think, Mr. Rosenwald, you said in part of your evidence, at the beginning, that your concept of Palestine in the future was that those who immigrated to Palestine should become Palestinians?

Mr. Rosenwald: Right, sir.

Major Maningham-Buller: I suppose you assume equally that the Arabs who are in Palestine or come in there should also submerge their Arab nationality to becoming Palestinians?

Mr. Rosenwald: Right, sir.

Major Maningham-Buller: On that there are two passages in the Peel report, which no doubt you are familiar with, one on page 119, the other on page 132. I was wondering whether you could put forward to assist us any suggestions whereby this intensity of national feeling in Palestine might be reduced and whether you think that it is really within practical politics to secure the merger of the Jew and Arab in Palestine?

Mr. Rosenwald: I am not sure at all what can be done if an attempt is made. I think, and it seems to me, sir, obvious, that as long as you have these two intense nationalisms on the one hand for a Jewish nationalism and on the other hand are for an Arab nationalism you cannot possibly get a situation in Palestine where the people will be harmonious. The only thing that it would seem to me that was within the realm of practical politics today, not when the Peel report was made, because

there have been many changes, there has been a good deal of water gone over the dam since that report was made, good as it is, it seems to me that today, with independence granted to certain Arab countries, such as Iraq, and so on, as an independent country, that the Arabs might feel differently about Palestine as an independent State where all the citizens were equal, Arab and Jew alike. On the other hand, the Zionists, from their point of view, I could well see, would reject such a proposal. But if I may add this, if there is a possibility of that, and through such a possibility of establishing an independent Palestinian State, that would not be Jewish nor Moslem nor Christian, but would be a Palestinian State, I think that there would be greater possibility of aiding in the rescue of this 100,000 Jews than is possible today under present circumstances.

I think the resistance today is perfectly terrific, and I believe that the only possibility of getting such a grant, if you want to put it that way, or such a possibility of absorbing any substantial part of the 100,000 which was mentioned, it would have to be under the edict of a free and independent Palestinian State. If it can't be done that way I think the likelihood of it being done anyway is going to be difficult, if not impossible.

Major Maingham-Buller: Do you take the view that no matter which nationality is in the majority the future of

Palestine depends on the closest collaboration between Arab and Jew in Palestine and the submerging of their separate nationalities?

Mr. Rosenwald: If you are going to have a real democracy there is no such thing as a permanent majority or a permanent minority. There is only such things as a majority and a minority at a special moment. They change constantly.

Therefore, I can't see why that question should loom so big if it is to be a truly democratic state. According to my concept of a democratic state each person is truly represented, each person is equal under the rights of law, majorities and minorities will vary as circumstances demand, and by so doing these Arabs and Jews will merge their interests very much better if it can be brought about than under either an Arab State or under a Jewish State.

Major Maningham-Buller: Thank you.

Mr. Crum: Mr. Rosenwald, taking your point of view for the moment, which I understand is that the Jews constitute a faith, a religious faith, and assume for the moment that there be immigration on such a basis that ultimately, whether by race or by religion, the majority of persons inhabiting Palestine are Jews, would it then be your opinion that there should not be set up a state, a democratic state?

Mr. Rosenwald: May I answer that in two parts?

Mr. Crum: Please.

Mr. Rosenwald: Feeling as I do that a democratic state should be set up in Palestine, I think it would be a mistake to wait for such a time as a Jewish majority could be established, if ever, or if ever within practical limits. A number of years would undoubtedly be--

Mr. Crum: May I halt you there for a moment?

Mr. Rosenwald: Yes.

Mr. Crum: Because, as I understand your answer to Mr. Maningham-Buller's question, you felt that even 100,000 persons going into Palestine would be an extremely difficult task to accomplish peacefully--

Mr. Rosenwald: I do.

Mr. Crum: Well, would it be your view that if we were to set up, if an independent state were set up along the lines you suggest, that that state could better maintain peace than say the British Government?

Mr. Rosenwald: Not at once. Not until it had been functioning for long enough to operate as an independent state.

Mr. Crum: Well, so that I will understand, would it be your view that there should be no immigration into Palestine?

Mr. Rosenwald: No.

Mr. Crum: Until a state is created there?

Mr. Rosenwald: No, but I think that if it was at least created in concept that these people, if they would go there, would go as Palestinian citizens with the understanding that

they would be citizens of a Palestinian state. There would be more likelihood of being able to get them into Palestine now than if they came in as members of a Jewish state.

Mr. Crum: Is there any group in Jewry, and I have not been able to find it in writing, which suggests the setting up of any state other than a democratic state, in which the rights of all citizens in that particular area are fully protected?

Mr. Rosenwald: Well, that is a little difficult to answer, because I just don't believe that if you are going to set up a democratic state only when you get a Jewish majority and only doing that by artificial means, that you can possibly expect to come out with a truly democratic state, in spite of the good intentions of those who believe it to day. I just don't believe that is the way to build a democratic state.

Mr. McDonald: What constitutes artificial means, Mr. Rosenwald?

Mr. Rosenwald: I wonder if I may defer that question for just one moment?

Mr. McDonald: Certainly.

Mr. Rosenwald: Until I am finished with Mr. Crum's question.

Mr. McDonald: Yes.

Mr. Rosenwald: Shall I proceed?

Mr. Crum: Please proceed.

Mr. Rosenwald: The second thing is that I believe the

formation of a national Jewish state in Palestine, or anywhere else, would not be in the best interest. I think it would be in the bad interests of the Jews living outside Palestine throughout the world, as I undertook to indicate to Judge Hutoheson's question.

Mr. Crum: Let me see if I can get at it this way: Supposing the word "Jewish" were eliminated but suppose also that immigration of Jews into Palestine were permitted and that some time in the future a majority of the persons there residing were Jewish, either on your theory, by faith, or on the Zionist position, by race and faith, I assume, would it then be your position that there would be anything wrong with such a state?

Mr. Rosenwald: Anything wrong with such a state? It would be a Palestinian state.

Mr. Crum: So that it comes down to the matter of the word?

Mr. Rosenwald: No, I don't think so.

Mr. Crum: No?

Mr. Rosenwald: I think this: I think, first of all, you talk about a Jewish majority, and this gets back to Mr. McDonald's question as well, you say what do you mean by artificial means. I say artificial means of getting that Jewish majority is taking people from one country or another, Europe, the United States, or wherever they be, just so long

as they are Jews, and putting them into Palestine, and probably at the same time restricting immigration of Arabs, although that is not necessarily inherent, but it would be much quicker if it was done that way, that is an artificial building up of a population within a state from without the state as well as within the state.

Therefore, I don't believe that is a way of building up a democratic state. I believe that if you are going to build up people you should say these people have rights of immigration according to certain qualifications, just as we do by nationality, or any other thing, just so it doesn't get down to a religious selection. If you will do that, so that immigration is not, to use a bad word, but it expresses it a little bit better, manipulated, so as to bring about a certain condition, I think a state could be established that would be a truly democratic state in time.

If artificial means you try and build up one segment of the population by such artificial means you will have extreme difficulty in establishing a truly democratic state when, as, and if that time is reached.

Have I answered that at all?

Mr. Crum: You have answered it, but it seems to me that your position is slightly inconsistent, shall I say, with the Balfor declaration.

Mr. Rosenwald: Oh, well, that wouldn't bother me at all.

Mr. Crum, I thought I made it clear in my testimony this morning that if it was found necessary to--if you will just give me a moment I will give you that one sentence again--

Judge Hutcheson: As I remember it, you said it was necessary to alter--

Mr. Rosenwald: Alter or amend any existing commitments. At least I am consistent with my testimony even if I am not with the Balfor declaration.

Mr. Crum: That is all.

Judge Hutcheson: I would like to ask you one other question.

There may have been a possibility, when I was asking you about the difference between the Zionist's point of view and the point of view of your organization, paramounting on the one hand the Jewish race as against religion, and the question of the two citizenships, it may have been the basis for creating an implication that you were, in espousing the view you took, were in some way reflecting on the want of patriotism on the part of the Zionists, and I am sure that was not your intention.

Mr. Rosenwald: I might think that but I didn't say it?

Judge Hutcheson: No, but there might have been an implication in someone's mind, not in yours or mine, that you were intending to reflect that, and I just wanted to give you an opportunity to say that you had no intention.

Mr. Rosenwald: No, I had no intention of reflecting on

anybody.

Mr. Singleton: I think you hold a different view on what is right for the Jewish people as a whole from others, and you have expressed that view.

Mr. Rosenwald: I thank you, sir. That is exactly right.

Mr. Singleton: Whether one is right or the other is right is a matter on which we shall have to deliberate.

Lord Morrison: May I ask a question?

Judge Hutcheson: Yes.

Lord Morrison: Mr. Rosenwald, is your organization limited to the United States of America, or does it extend or, rather, are there similar organizations in other countries?

Mr. Rosenwald: We only have U. S. citizens of Jewish faith in our organization, Americans of Jewish faith. There is a very new organization in Great Britain that is called the Jewish Fellowship, which has principles many of which are similar to those held by the American Council for Judaism. They are not identical but in many respects they are parallel with what we believe. I wrote to that organization when I submitted my brief that they might know what we had submitted here, and I have encouraged them to testify before your Committee when it sits in London.

Lord Morrison: Thank you.

Judge Hutcheson: I think that is all, unless someone else has other questions.

Thank you, Mr. Rosenwald.

Mr. Rosenwald: I thank you very much.

Rabbi Wise: Mr. Chairman--

Judge Hutcheson: The Committee has not met in response to your request. I thought that Mr. Rosenwald's statement, that he meant no reflection on anybody, should be sufficient. That is the way it seems to me. We have other people waiting to testify.

Rabbi Wise: I should require only two minutes, or less, in order to cancel the defamation of the dead and the libel upon the living.

Judge Hutcheson: All right, I will clock you to two minutes.

Rabbi Wise: Clock me to two minutes.

I shall read the word of a gentleman who most of the American members know. Yourself, for example, Dr. McDonald, Mr. Buxton, and former Ambassador Phillips, Justice Brandeis. May I read a word of his? I have no word of my own to add. I owe it to his memory to read these words:

"Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with American patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his state and his city, for being loyal to his family, profession, or trade, for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irishman

who contributed towards advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifices he made.

"Every Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feel that neither he nor his dependents will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so. There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and experience, is essentially modern and essentially American. Not since the destruction of the temple have the Jews in spirit and ideal been so fully in harmony with the country in which they live. Indeed, loyalty to American demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist for only through the effect of his striving can we develop what is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance. The Jewish spirit, so long preserved, the character developed by so many centuries of sacrifice, should be preserved and developed further so that in America, as elsewhere, the sons of the Jewish race may in the future live lives and do deeds worthy of American citizens."

Your charity, Mr. Chairman, your kindness, to the witness of a moment ago does not cover up or cancel the defsmation of the dead involving his basic utterance that Justice Brandeis and Justice Cordoza, among the dead, were, and I and Justice Frankfurter, among the living, and my associates, that we are guilty of double allegiance.

In the name of 5,000,000 American Jews I resent that defamation of the dead and the living alike.

Judge Hutcheson: I knew Mr. Justice Brandeis. He was a temperate man and a man who had the utmost respect for the views of others. I had the pleasure of calling him my friend. I have been to his home. I have dined there. I respected him. I think his outstanding characteristic was that he respected the opinions of others though they differed with us.

Mr. Rood: The next witness will be Joseph Beck, of the National Refugee Service.

Judge Hutcheson: You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH E. BECK
National Refugee Service

Mr. Beck: The National Refugee Service is only a welfare organization engaged only in social service activities. It operates in the United States primarily concerned with people who have come from abroad and was set up particularly to deal with the situation that grew up after 1933. I, as its technical director, really speak as a social service worker in the American field of refugee work.

In January, 1944, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a letter to National Refugee Service said:

"By maintaining its tradition of asylum for the oppressed in a decade when the world was infested with group hatred and persecution our country has done itself honor. The neighborly

assistance and guidance offered by public spirited organizations and individuals to those who have found haven here has helped them to adjust more rapidly to our American life, to contribute to the enrichment of our economy and culture, and to participate in our struggle for national survival."



hl
fls
Bis

Continuing the quote:

"You will recall that three years ago I suggested that the program of the National Refugee Service might provide a model of constructive absorption of immigrants into American life. The record of accomplishment since then under stress of war conditions has confirmed that view.

"It is heartening to know that due to the efforts of high-minded men and women our country is prepared to continue the well-conceived and effective program for aiding newcomers to fulfill their hope of becoming good Americans."

The program to which President Roosevelt referred is that which we have described in our memorandum to the committee. It is our major purpose in placing this information before you to give you a picture of the part that was played by this program in promoting the adjustment of victims of Nazi persecution in the United States just prior and during the war.

I also hope to leave with you some information as to the method by which this was accomplished, ~~since~~ we believe that the process operated so effectively that few people realize that as large a number as a quarter of a million refugees did enter this country on permanent visas during the ten year period 1934 to 1944.

Judge Hutcheson: That is interesting. It is an

h2

unknown fact to me. Do you mean that all of these were Jewish refugees?

Mr. Beck: All of them Jewish? No, sir.

Judge Hutcheson: You are interested not only in Jewish refugees, but refugees generally?

Mr. Beck: The National Refugee Service is primarily interested in Jewish refugees. It has certain special divisions, such as the refugee division committee, with its aid to scholars and so forth, which has been totally non-sectarian; there has been the Catholic and Christian committee which has done work in that sphere.

Mr. McDonald: Could you tell us what percentage of a quarter of a million were not Jews, approximately?

Mr. Beck: Were not?

Mr. McDonald: Yes.

Mr. Beck: About 33 percent. The estimate that I believe was made, on which you will get testimony from Dr. Davie, was about 67 percent Jewish.

There were three basic factors which govern the treatment of these newcomers to our country. One, that these persons should not become a public charge during the period of time required by them to achieve economic adjustment. That is, to a new country.

Two, that insofar as it was possible, there should not be large assemblies in ports of entry but that they should

h3

be helped to distribute themselves throughout the states, and three, that there should be developed neighborly responsibility to assist this new group to adjust to new world culture, that this should be done by creating responsible self-supporting committees in hundreds of large and small communities throughout our country.

The results of these programs and these efforts will be covered by Professor Maurice R. Davie, a distinguished scholar who is just completing an inquiry into the adjustment of refugee immigrants in the United States.

While much detailed information could be submitted by us, it is felt that the independent testimony of Dr. Davie will probably be better evidence.

Mr. Justice Singleton: May I ask, is your evidence directed to that which has been done, or to possibilities for the future?

Mr. Beck: This is directed to a process that has been done and a process that is still open for possibility in the future.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Thank you.

Mr. Beck: It is a method of operation which still exists. I will explain how it exists in dealing with the Oswego group, and how it can continue to exist to the extent that may be desired.

Judge Hutcheson: May I ask, so that we may gauge our

h4

time, how much time will you require?

Mr. Beck: Well, I have only about five or six minutes here.

Judge Hutcheson: I see. So your whole presentation will probably be inside of an hour, for your group.

Mr. Beck: Without question, I would say it will be much shorter.

Mr. Justice Singleton: It is directed to showing us what has been done and what still can be done in the United States of America?

Mr. Beck: It is directed to showing you what has been done in the United States, the process, what has been done within our law, and what might continue to be done.

Judge Hutcheson: Go ahead.

Mr. Beck: May I repeat again that although we have been the largest agency in America, that the Catholic refugee committee and the American Christian committee have been substantial organizations in the same field.

Mr. McDonald: Operating in much the same way?

Mr. Beck: Yes, sir.

In considering the results of the program, it should be borne in mind many of the people involved arrived in the United States in a period of internal depression. People of high culture and professional attainments found it necessary to fit into our society and economy at levels far

h5

below those they had formerly occupied and were able to do this to an amazing degree. Ultimately, with the tremendous manpower demands, they did find their way into various pursuits for which their earlier training fitted them better and made very substantial contributions to America in the Armed Forces, in science and in industry.

c12

The National Refugee Variety of Welfare Service has been described in the brief memorandum which we have given you. One of the important methods of operation is what we call the resettlement process within the United States and the immediate current situation at Oswego gives me an opportunity of giving you a concrete illustration of how that would operate in the case of a boat entering a port and they went into a temporary shelter.

You will recall that the recent directive of the President provided for the admission of certain people from Europe, and also set up a process for admission of 924 refugees who, for the past 18 months have been housed at Fort Ontario.

Immigration and Public Health officials are this week processing persons at the shelter. Within a week or ten days they will proceed to Niagara Falls, Canada to be admitted by the United Council there.

Simultaneously with the work carried on by Government officials, an experienced staff of social workers from the

h 6

United States is interviewing people in the shelter to ascertain their ability, desire to learn, which of them have friends or relatives in the United States.

Local welfare agencies in every community where relatives live are now being contacted to obtain assurances of their willingness and ability to provide housing and otherwise assist their kin.

We have also been in touch with a considerable number of communities where there are well organized local welfare services. They are asked to assume responsibility for small groups who have no relatives.

We have assurances that a large number will be accepted for care.

Realizing that many refugees are unfamiliar with the opportunity for adjustment in America outside of New York and other metropolitan centers, an expert describes the resources and advantages of the various parts of the United States, and encourages widespread resettlement.

The examples of successful adjustment made by many earlier refugee immigrants in villages and cities all over the country served as potent arguments.

It is our expectation, that groups of people as they come in from Niagara will have their destination in the United States already determined for them.

Provision will be made for care, for transportation, for

h7

relatives and friends or organizations to care for them.

With minor variations, this has been the pattern.

When a ship reaches port, temporary group shelter is the first step, followed by resettlement processes which I have described. On a national level there is a continuance of advice and assistance, which may occur in the local communities.

It is the success of this program to which President Roosevelt referred in his earlier message which I quoted.

I have attempted to briefly describe the American method for handling the newcomers.

There are certain basic truths on which this method is founded. We believe they hold good under any circumstances.

First is the importance of concern for the personality and culture of the individual.

Second is the need to have the immigrant play a part in the process, through education and discussion, rather than forcing decisions on them.

We believe the process can continue to have a successful operation. There is adequate evidence that America has benefited from the presence of the refugees. Even if the evidence were less convincing the saving of thousands of American lives by the scientific contributions of some of these people, such as their research on the atomic energy, is ample repayment for what has been done and should encourage

h8

maintaining America's traditional role as a haven of refuge.

Judge Hutcheson: I have no questions.

Mr. Justice Singleton: The witness told me earlier that he was saying what could be done within the law. What does it come to precisely?

Mr. Beck: Pardon me, I don't get your question.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I am not sure. You haven't dealt with numbers or figures at all, have you, except what has been done in the last ten years.

Mr. Beck: We have dealt with what has been done because it has been done within the quota laws of the United States, which are the same as they have been during the past.

Mr. McDonald: Perhaps I can clarify what is in Sir John's mind.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: If I might put a question.

Mr. Justice Singleton: You understand me better.

Mr. McDonald: I was a sort of godfather of this National Refugee Service.

With respect to what you read, isn't this what you tried to say to the committee: During this past ten years the National Refugee Service organization in this country, working alongside of Catholic and Christian committees,

h9

have been agencies to help integrate this quarter of a million immigrants into American life?

Mr. Beck: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: That is what you have been describing. And is it also true you have been, on the basis of that record, saying to the committee that the National Refugee Service is prepared to continue that work of integration in proportion as immigrants are allowed under the laws to come in?

Mr. Beck: That is correct.

Judge Hutcheson: I think you made the further point that to the extent that the committee can do it, the committee can rely upon the fact that any recommendations they might make as to easing up on immigration into the United States, it would not be bad because their experience shows that these immigrants are properly and thoroughly absorbed.

Mr. Beck: I am only privileged to speak within the legal requirements at this moment, sir.

Mr. Crick: May I ask one question?

In this memorandum there is a sentence which interests me very much with relation to a problem raised the other day. I am speaking from page 4. Can you tell us what territories that central tracing bureau of UNRRA covers and whether there are any big gaps in the organization of

h10

the tracing system?

Mr. Beck: I don't believe that the total thing has been a completed operation yet, and I am sorry I can't answer that question in detail. The correlation between UNRRA and the American Central Location Index has been recently completed and its operation is still in the initial process.

Mr. Crick: That is something that came into the operation since Mr. Earl Harrison made his report?

Mr. Beck: So far as timing was concerned, but there was no particular association between the two. The index has been in existence for a much longer period of time.

Judge Hutcheson: All right.

Call the next witness.

Mr. Rood: Maurice Davie.

STATEMENT OF MAURICE F. DAVIE

COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF RECENT IMMIGRATION

FROM EUROPE

Mr. Davie: Mr. Chairman, speaking very briefly regarding the experience of the United States with refugee immigration since 1933, I represent the committee for the study of recent immigration from Europe, which is a body of private citizens which was set up for the sole purpose of making a factual objective impartial study of this movement, and of presenting the findings to the public.

h11

This committee, the initiative in establishing the committee and its support has come from the five national refugee service organizations, the National Refugee Service, which Mr. Beck represents, and in addition the American Christian Committee for Refugees, the Catholic Committee for Refugees, the American Friends Service Committee, and the United States Committee for the Care of European Children.

We have carried on a nationwide study in which we have had the cooperation of over 200 organizations throughout the country.

In addition to consulting immigration statistics, and Government documents, and reading thousands of case records of the agencies that have dealt with the refugees, we have gathered a good deal of new material, consisting primarily of a questionnaire return.

We have something over 11,000 returns, which would represent, roughly, a 5 percent sample.

Then in addition we had another special questionnaire study on the adjustment of refugees positions, because that group more than any other had experienced an unfavorable reaction within the profession.

We gathered a good many life stories, some 200 of them, from refugees, to get their reactions.

We made community surveys in some 50 communities and interviewed a great many refugees.

h12

The main question put up to the committee was to find answers to such questions as how many refugees have come to the United States; how has our immigration been administered in this period; what have been the characteristics of these refugees; where have they settled; what effect have they had on American society, and how well have they adjusted.

In regard to the matter of number of refugees, this must be an estimate because our immigration laws do not have any classification "refugees." All aliens are admitted either as immigrants for permanent residence, or as non-immigrants, or visitors.

From the point of view of the immigrant effect on a country, it is the immigrants admitted for permanent residents who become important.

The only basis of estimating refugees is to select certain countries for certain periods, and assume that all or most of the immigrants admitted from these countries during these times were refugees.

On that basis, we arrived at the estimate of approximately 250,000 refugee immigrants admitted to the United States during the period from 1933 to 1944, both years inclusive, and these are, incidentally, fiscal years, ending June 30.

The total immigration from Europe during this period

h13 1933 to 1944 was 365,000 in round numbers, and that from all countries was 528,000.

The estimated number of refugees would be about 45 percent of the total immigrating, that America has had during this period, and 70 percent of European immigration.

Mr. McDonald: Will you repeat those figures?

Mr. Davie: It is estimated that the refugees constituted 45 percent of the total immigration in the United States and 70 percent of the European immigration to the United States in the period 1933 to 1944.

Mr. McDonald: The total immigration during this period is about 600,000?

Mr. Davie: No. 528,000 from all countries. This total immigration, by the way, was comparatively small, according to the entry of American immigration.

As a matter of fact you would have to go back 100 years to find a volume of immigration as small as the volume we had during this period 1933 to 1944.

The main reason, of course, was the economic depression and the war, both of which operated to reduce the number of immigrants.

I should like further to point out that only 15.8 percent of the quota was utilized during this period; only 42.1 percent of the quota allotted to countries of refugee immigration was utilized during this period.

h14

Now, in addition to these refugee immigrants, a number of refugees were undoubtedly included among the visitors admitted for temporary stay.

Official reports indicate that only about 15,000 refugees remain here today on visitors visas. These are mainly persons who were granted the extension under their permits because they were unable to return to their homeland.

In addition, practically 1,000 refugees were admitted in 1944 outside of the regular immigration procedure. That was a group that was placed in the emergency shelter at Oswego. American immigration laws were not altered during this period. The entry of refugees, as of other immigrants, was limited first by the public charge ruling during the depression, that is, that no person might be admitted if liable to be a public charge, later by our wartime regulations in 1941.

On the other hand, it was facilitated, the entry of refugees was facilitated by some administrative measures, such as the admission of unaccompanied children under corporate affidavit, and by giving preference under the quota to those able to escape so as to make full use of the places available. By which the immigration of some 2,000 political refugees was facilitated.

All of this under the quota.

h15

The total number of Jewish immigrants admitted during 1933-1944 was 168,128, of whom 160,718 were born in Europe. Of the total Jewish immigration, which was 168,000, from all countries, 160,000 came from Europe. Only 8,000 Jews came from elsewhere than Europe during this period.

I pointed out this period is from 1933 to 1943. There are no figures after 1943 on the Jewish immigration that is because the term "Hebrew" which has appeared in our immigration statistics where they are classified by races or peoples was dropped after the year 1943.

Mr. McDonald: What proportion of that 168,000 were from Germany and Austria?

Mr. Davie: From Germany practically 60 percent. 57.9 percent. As the country of birth. That was Austria too. Approaching 60 percent were from Germany.

Mr. McDonald: Most were from Eastern Europe, I suppose?

Mr. Davie: From Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, would come next, France, then some of the other countries.

I should like to point out that this number of Jewish immigrants was about one-half the number that we admitted into this country during the 20's and was only about one-eighth of the number admitted in the decade preceding the first world war.

h16

Mr. Justice Singleton: One-eighth?

Mr. Davie: Yes.

This total body of Jewish immigrants admitted in this recent period was small compared to other Jewish movements of Jewish immigrants to this country.

In the 20's, the total number was twice this number, over 300,000.

Then going back to the days of the great immigration in the United States before the first World War when we were receiving practically a million immigrants a year, the number of Jewish immigrants coming in that period was eight times the number we got in this last period.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Can you tell me approximately when you ceased to receive large numbers?

Mr. Davie: Well, immigration restriction was adopted as a permanent basis in America in 1924.

Mr. Justice Singleton: There was a change in the law?

Mr. Davie: The adoption of a new policy of putting a limitation on the numbers of immigrants who might come to the United States.

Judge Hutcheson: Is that only since 1924?

Mr. Davie: It was tried out first -- we had the temporary quota act in 1921, and then the Immigration Act of 1924 was passed as a permanent measure.

hl7

Judge Hutcheson: President Wilson vetoed the first one; and the Johnson Act, when was that passed?

Mr. Crum: I think in 1924.

Mr. Davie: So, from the point of view of history of American immigration we had this tremendous immigration, probably the largest on record in any country in that period just before the first World War.

cl6

Mr. Crossman: What was the number of Jews admitted say in 1900 to 1914? You gave us a percentage?

Mr. McDonald: You said eight times.

Mr. Davie: I said roughly 8 times the number that was admitted. Let me put it this way.

All immigration in the United States has fallen off because of restriction of immigration. The Immigration Law of 1924, put a numerical limitation on the numbers. Then came the depression and the war, and immigration was put down because of those facts to a point where it was almost to the vanishing point compared to what it had been.

So that the whole history of immigration in the United States has been on a downward trend.

Mr. Crossman: I would be right in saying then, that from 1900 to say 1914, there was a gigantic Jewish immigration?

Mr. Davie: That is right. We received in that period, I don't know, a million or more.

118

Mr. Justice Singleton: I think perhaps we ought to have a table on that. I ought to know something of the law of the United States, but I am not familiar with it.

Mr. Davie: Following the first World War there was a good deal of restrictive immigration legislation passed in which the United States took the lead.

There has been a tendency, following the first World War to shut the doors tighter.

Mr. Phillips: Let me ask you, isn't it true that following the first World War and until the legislation went into effect, there was a rapid increase?

Mr. Davie: Yes, a very rapid increase following the end of the first World War and the resumption of transportation facilities.

Immigration began to climb at such a rate that it was thought that it might produce this huge volume that existed before and then the sentiment of Congress became strongly in favor of restricting immigration beginning with 1921.

With regard to the Jewish immigration, in addition to these 60-odd thousand admitted as immigrants during this period, I might point out that 43,944, exclusive of Government officials, and returning residents, were admitted as visitors.

Now, if all the Jewish immigrants and visitors from 1933 through 1943 were refugees, which is unlikely, I think

h19

undoubtedly the majority were, but not all, but they all -- if they all were, the total would be 212,072.

A word about the characteristics of the refugee immigrants, and they contrast sharply with other and earlier immigrants.

The refugees are essentially a group of people who would not normally have immigrated, but who left their homelands because of actual or anticipated persecution.

In the days of mass immigration, the typical immigrant was an unattached young adult male of the laborer, artisan, or servant class.

Recent immigrations, especially refugees, show a more even distribution of the sexes, a larger proportion of persons over 45 years of age, a larger proportion of married persons, and hence of family groups, and a larger proportion of professional, commercial, and skilled workers, and of persons with no occupation; the latter group comprising housewives, children, and old people who have retired.

By far, most of the adult refugees had gone beyond the elementary school level, and nearly half had attended college or graduate schools.

They are primarily a city group with a cosmopolitan outlook, many of them having come from the larger cities of the continent.

A considerable number of them had traveled widely, and

h20

knew languages other than their own.

The distribution of refugees throughout the United States corresponds closely to that of the total foreign born population, with a concentration in the East, particularly New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts.

In the Middle West, especially Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin and Michigan; and the far West, especially California.

They have settled mostly in the larger cities, although a good many live in small towns and rural areas.

In no city do they constitute as much as one percent of the total population. The largest center is New York City where their number is estimated at 70 to 80 thousand.

The distribution of refugees throughout the country has been determined largely by the location of their friends and relatives, job opportunities, and the resettlement program of the various service agencies.

With regard to occupational adjustment, the refugees have tended to follow the same type of occupation here they had engaged in abroad, mainly in business, the professions, clerical work, and in skilled labor, in that ranking order.

Although many at first were forced to accept menial jobs, the great majority are now in the same occupational category for which they were trained.

That is, those who were not professional. The transferability of skill has been most marked in the case of skilled

h21

workers and of some of the professions.

At the time of the questionnaire study, practically all were gainfully employed, well over 90 percent, although often it was not in the specific field for which they were trained abroad.

Practically all were self-supporting and the great majority were dependent on their earnings. Only a small minority having in addition income from savings or investments.

The typical weekly wage was \$20 to \$40 for women and \$50 to \$75 for men. Only a tiny percentage had failed to make an economic adjustment and were dependent. These were mainly cases of old people, the sick, and broken families.

Some of the refugees brought over capital with them and established business enterprises. While they give employment to some refugees, they employ a much greater number of native Americans. A special study which we made shows their employees run about 80 percent American to 20 percent refugees.

The capital investment again in this special study we have made of several hundred business enterprises established by refugees in the New York area, showed that the capital investment varies from under \$100,000 to over a million dollars.

b22

In numerous instances they have brought with them, or developed here new processes, and started the manufacture of products heretofore unknown here or imported, such as scientific instruments, precision tools and synthetic products.

Many manufacturers have produced articles essential to the war effort. Some are carrying on here an export import business which they had previously developed in Europe.

In regard to their social and cultural adjustment, the refugees have adjusted to a much greater extent and in a shorter period of time than was the case of other immigrants of earlier decades. This has been facilitated or prompted by their small numbers, relative to the total population of the country, their wide distribution, their superior educational and cultural background and their desire to become assimilated.

They tend to live in American neighborhoods than in immigrant colonies, to associate more with native Americans than with their own group, or other recent immigrants and to belong primarily to organizations with a predominantly American membership.

They have intermarried with native Americans to a greater extent than is usually the case of a foreign born group here a short time. It is safe to say that no other non-English

h23

speaking immigrant group has learned English so rapidly and so well in a comparative period of time.

Many reasons account for this, including the superior educational background of the refugees, their cosmopolitan outlook, their feeling for language, and the high value they place upon it, and their desire to become assimilated.

They read mainly English language newspapers, and English is the language commonly spoken in the home. The only exception is very old people.

Fifty percent of the refugees who replied to the questionnaire have already obtained citizenship. The number who have not applied is negligible.

Of those eligible to meet the citizenship requirements by being over 21 years of age, and resident in this country for five years or more, 82.7 percent have attained citizenship, and the rest are in various stages of attaining it.

The refugee community proved itself to be overwhelmingly on the side of democracy and aided in the war effort in every way. The Selective Training and Service Act made aliens as fully liable to service as citizens.

Eligible refugees, aliens and citizens alike, therefore, entered the armed forces to the same extent as native Americans.

According to the report of the Director of Selective Service, aliens comprised one percent of the inductees,

h24

which was practically the same as the proportion they constituted of the total population of that age group, 1.02 percent.

According to a study conducted by the National Jewish Welfare Board in 27 widely scattered cities, the percentage, 34 percent, of male refugees of military age serving in the armed forces was almost exactly the same as that for the total number of men in the armed forces in the United States.

According to the questionnaire returns of the Study Committee, 33 percent of the male respondents of military age were in the armed forces.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the rest of the committee are as dumb as I about understanding figures when they are read off seriatim. Of course, you two judges I am sure, can follow it.

I am wondering if it wouldn't be more effective if the witness submitted that as part of his memorandum, the statistical data, so that it would be within the comprehension of the more limited members of the committee.

Judge Hutcheson: I supposed he was going to submit it. But those percentages are pretty revealing. Are you going to submit a memorandum?

Mr. McDonald: I was overwhelmed by the figures, that is all.

h25

Mr. Davie: I will make it less statistical.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I think the main figures could quite easily be put on a table.

Judge Hutcheson: Aren't you submitting something in connection with your testimony?

Mr. Davie: Well, we are in the process of writing up the findings of our study.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I think it would be much more convenient for us were we to have it in writing.

I can't carry all of the figures.

Mr. Davie: We did get out this little pamphlet hitting some of the highlights. But we will have a manuscript of our final report, which we will be glad to submit to your committee; our published report will not be out until June or July.

Mr. Justice Singleton: If we could have the highlights. I think that would help.

Mr. Davie: I will be glad to submit it.

Judge Hutcheson: Yes.

Mr. Davie: I was just giving some evidence of the degree of adjustment of the group. It does not need to be quantified.

Judge Hutcheson: I understood you were not trying to make a point of precise figures. You were making a point of the effect of those figures, and I thought I got it pretty

h26

well.

The quantitative figures are not very important are they?

Mr. Davie: No, they can very well be submitted.

Judge Hutcheson: You may proceed.

Mr. Davie: I would like to mention one figure though. It is quite interesting, I think.

The refugees were already geared to the necessity of fighting for a democratic way of life and some of them had a special and personal reason for fighting Nazism. Many of them rendered special services because of their intimate knowledge of the languages, culture, psychology, industries, public utilities, and geography of enemy country. Those who remained at home contributed generously to the various war activities on the home front. Nine-tenths of them having bought war bonds, and one-third having made blood donations to mention just the more striking contributions or services.

Important contributions were made by scientists and highly trained technicians, including work on the atomic bomb, either in Government services, or in private industries.

The vast majority of the refugees in the United States have no intention of returning to Europe. They are content to remain here and are grateful for the freedom and opportunity that this country provides. Their hopes, especially

h27

for their children are now centered here.

The break with the past is definite and final. This was the reaction of 96.5 percent of those who replied to the questionnaire. This extraordinarily high indication of permanency is characteristic of the refugee type of immigration.

Throughout our history immigrants who came here to escape persecution and oppression have remained to a much greater extent than have immigrants whose motive in coming was to improve their economic condition.

The refugees comprise an utterly negligible proportion of the total population of this country. They have not offered serious competition to Americans nor endangered their way of life. On the contrary, they have had a beneficial influence upon this country out of proportion to their numbers.

This derives from the fact that it has been primarily a quality type of immigration. If I may cite one fact:

It is significant that despite the short time they have been here, at least 100 of them have attained the recognition of being listed in Who's Who in America and some 225 in American Men of Science.

This is more than double the number they should have in the same ratio to general population that applies to native Americans were to be applied to them. The refugees

.h28

have had a stimulating effect upon the economic and the cultural life of the United States.

In business they have started new types of enterprise, stimulated existing ones, and developed new markets.

In industry they have introduced new processes and produced articles heretofore unknown or not manufactured here. Moreover, in both these fields they have brought in capital and created job opportunities for Americans.

A considerable number of refugees, being highly skilled workers have contributed their skill towards the advancement of various American industries, notably those producing diamonds, jewelry, plastics, textiles, furs, leather goods, and food specialties.

In the field of arts and letters, they have introduced new forms of expression and significant works; in drama they have created many outstanding and essential plays and motion pictures.

In scholarship, they have extended the bounds of knowledge, and in science they have made important discoveries.

Judge Hutchison: Any questions?

Mr. Crick: I have a question.

Mr. Davie, on page 6 I am mystified by some figures where you give the number of refugees admitted at one time or another into the most important refugee receiving areas. That is page 6 of your booklet. What period are you speaking

h29

of there?

Mr. Davie: That would be varying times. They were culled from a great variety of sources and reports.

For example, let's take Great Britain. These are all very rough. Nearly every estimate I have seen has been different. At one time or another the total number of refugees admitted to Great Britain was 140,000.

In Great Britain there has not been at any one time 140,000.

Mr. Crick: That is what I wanted to get at. These are largely transit figures?

Mr. Davie: Yes.

Mr. Crick: These are transit figures, and may be taken as relating to the period of, let us say, post-Hitler, or is it to the entire Christian era, or what?

Mr. Davie: It is all since 1933.

Mr. Crick: All since 1933?

Mr. Davie: I have forgotten for the moment the sources of these. Some came from official reports. I think we got some from the League of Nation reports, and the like.

Mr. Crick: One other question, and which is a much more difficult one, because it is not so much a question of fact, but I think your findings might help the committee.

On the top of page 27, you speak of "the extent of anti-Semitism in this country." On page 21 you speak of

h39

various discriminations against refugees, notably the medical profession, but also by other professions.

I would like to know what your finding is as to the basis of that discrimination. Are the discriminations exercised primarily and predominantly against refugees or against foreigners, or against Jews as Jews?

Mr. Davie: You get some of all of it. I mean, all of those factors come in.

Some of it is definitely anti-Semitic. Some arises from professional competition. Just a dislike of outsiders. It ties in with general anti-alien and anti-competitor, and anti-Jewish, and anti-anything else, whatever ones particular animosities may be.

They are all mingled in there. We have, for example, in our replies to questionnaires, something as to whether they experience discrimination, and we broke that down into the connection, in connection with finding a job, in your relations with your fellow-employees, in finding a place to live, how did you experience discrimination.

We find not only the Jewish refugees, but the Christian refugees, about the same percentage meeting with some discrimination and prejudice.

Taking a little different form in one case and another. It is part of the picture of animosity or fear, distrust, or anything like that, dislike of a stranger coming in and

h31

competing with them.

There has always been a certain amount of that sentiment concomitant with immigration.

Mr. Crossman: Mr. Davie, it has been alleged that if a further group of Jewish refugees were permitted to enter America, it would prejudice the position of the Jewish communities here.

Would your report on the basis of your report, would you think that was so?

Mr. Davie: I would say that the factor of numbers would be very important in it. I would say that to admit a great number of any group into this country or any other country, would cause difficulty. The number that is admissible under our laws as they are now, wouldn't look for any specific difficulty.

Mr. Crossman: Would that partly depend on the dispersal you made?

Mr. Davie: Oh, yes, I think that is a very important and again a factor of numbers.

Any undue concentration of any foreign group in the country, any country, always produces special difficulties and relations are definitely improved as the minority group, the newcomers are spread much more evenly over the country.

The resettlement program, I think, is very important and is doing valuable work along that line. That is, largely

h32

settling the refugees away from New York, where nine-tenths of them land, and more than half of them would tend to remain, and would remain if they weren't assisted into getting out into other sections.

Mr. Crossman: Supposing that in the next four years the quotas available from Europe were almost entirely used for persons of the Jewish race. Would that in your view endanger the likelihood of anti-Semitism in this country?

Mr. Davie: It, of course, would be made a great deal of by certain groups and organizations in this country.

I would say it certainly, for strategic and other reasons should not be announced as a policy of permitting only Jews.

Mr. McDonald: Would it be possible, under the law, 27,000 out of 39,000 mentioned in President Truman's directive being the German quota -- isn't that right?

Mr. Davie: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: That means people born in Germany. So I don't think it is conceivable that you would have 27,000.

I will ask the witness whether it would be conceivable that you could have 27,000 people of German birth, Jews and all the rest, over a period of four years, who would come within the category of refugees. That would be more than a hundred thousand of German nationality.

h33

Mr. Davie: No, I would say there are definitely not that many German Jews left in Europe.

Mr. Crossman: Jews of German birth?

Mr. Davie: Yes.

Mr. Crossman: Despite the scattering of them over Europe and Great Britain.

Mr. Davie: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: They are not eligible to use the other quotas.

Mr. Crossman: So that a very substantial percentage of the distressed peoples of Europe could in fact be moved under the existing law?

Mr. Davie: Yes. I forget what the quota would be, you would have to figure up the quotas for all of the countries coming in under the distressed areas.

I forget what it would be but it would be easy to figure that quota out.

Mr. McDonald: I have seen the figure that probably not more than 15,000 would be admitted a year. I mean refugees that quality, of the 39,000 mentioned in the Truman memorandum.

But that I don't put forth as a fact.

Mr. Davie: That is probably referring to the quotas in these other countries. It wouldn't add up to much.

Judge Hutcheson: Is there anything else?

h34

Major Manningham-Buller: I have one question, Mr. Chairman.

I think I understood the figures you mentioned. One was 1934 to 1944, 16.8 percent of the quotas from Europe was utilized.

Mr. Davie: Yes.

Major Manningham-Buller: Then you said 42 percent of the quota allotted to countries of refugee immigration was utilized for refugee immigration.

Mr. Davie: Yes.

Major Manningham-Buller: What was that 58 percent?

Mr. Davie: I don't know that I follow you. Those are two different sets of figures. One is taking all the world into consideration. All of the quotas. Only 16.8 percent of the quotas permissible was actually utilized. If we take the countries of refugee immigration, those countries used 42 percent of their quotas.

Major Manningham-Buller: What does that 42 percent represent in figures?

Mr. Davie: You mean the actual number who came in?

Major Manningham-Buller: Yes.

Mr. Davie: I don't have those figures.

Major Manningham-Buller: Perhaps you could furnish those.

Mr. Davie: Yes. I can furnish those.

h35

Major Manningham-Buller: On your last answer of 16.8 percent, I see in your pamphlet on page 10, it says only 16.8 percent of the total number of all aliens, of the total number of aliens from Europe admissible under our quota law have entered the United States.

Mr. Davie: Yes, it would be just about the same whether you take Europe or not. Europe has practically all of the quotas. Ninety-nine percent of it. The quota doesn't apply to New World countries. It is practically the same thing.

Major Manningham-Buller: You could let us have the figure, the numbers, the actual numbers?

Mr. Davie: Yes, I can give you, if you like the percentage of the quota that was used by each country each year.

Major Manningham-Buller: Not percentages.

Mr. Davie: Actual numbers?

Major Manningham-Buller: Yes.

Mr. Davie: All right.

Judge Hutcheson: Thank you.

Gib fls

gib- 1
cy.20
LaChar.
State
1/18

The next witness.

STATEMENT OF LELAND S. ALBRIGHT, REPRESENTING
FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA.

Judge Hutcheson: You may proceed, Mr. Albright.

Mr. Albright: Mr. Chairman, some months ago the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Home Missions Council of North America, and the Foreign Missions Conference of North America appointed a joint committee to study the Jewish refugee problem in relation to Palestine. We were asked for our opinions and we thought we ought to have some conviction about the matter.

Conferences were held with Zionists, with non-Zionists, and with Arabs in and about New York City. The report which is before you, "The Palestine Question -- a Christian Position," was sent to the parent bodies for their action last August. The statement was adopted by the Home Missions Council subject to its approval by the other two bodies. The Committee of Reference and the Council of Foreign Missions Conference approved the statement and sent copies to constituent members and made it public. The Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches voted to receive the statement and to authorize its publication for the information of its constituent members.

Mr. McDonald: It did not adopt it, did it?

Mr. Albright: No. A digest of the statement appeared in

the Federal Council's bulletin of October 27, 1945.

As a member of the Joint Committee, appointed by the Foreign Missions Conference, I have been asked to supplement the statement with a brief presentation this afternoon. I do so as a Canadian citizen for the Foreign Missions Conference and the International Missionary Council, of which it is an affiliate, in the hope of presenting the general attitude of the Protestant Christian missions as I understand it, and I speak not as an expert but as one expressing a point of view for a group as far as I am able to understand that point of view.

Our right to speak arises from the fact that Protestant Christian missions have been at work in Palestine for over a hundred years.

The last statistics available are as of 1938, but in view of my predecessor's experience and the fact that you are running behind schedule, I omit the statistics and will submit them to the members of the committee for your use. Suffice to say that various societies have been working in Palestine and are listed.

The United Missionary Council of Syria and Palestine was formed in 1919, and the Near East Christian Council, including Egypt and Iran, in 1924, with representatives from 36 foreign societies. This organization is a constituent member of the International Missionary Council.

Protestant Christian missions in the Syria-Palestine work along the following lines: evangelistic, educational, medical, and philanthropic. Evangelistic work is by no means confined to a narrow proselytism but aims to strengthen the ancient Eastern Orthodox churches, long indigenous to the country, and to raise up vigorous Protestant Christian churches. In a predominantly Moslem area, progress is of necessity slow. As of 1938 there were in Syria 43 organized churches and 95 other places having regular services, with 7,381 communicant members, and in Trans-Jordan 35 organized churches and 88 other places having regular services, with 7,061 communicant members.

I will forbear reading the statistics.

Similarly, for education, medical work, and philanthropic work, as well as the foreign missionary staff in the field as of 1938.

Now, the above record, which will be taken as read, does not constitute proprietary rights in the Holy Land, but rather moral interest and a spiritual stake in the peace, prosperity, and general welfare of the Bible lands and a legitimate concern that this area should not become a bone of contention, much less the cockpit of the Near East. That this is a real possibility is evident from current events, and I shall return to the matter later.

The primary interest of the International Missionary

Council and of its constituent members is a world evangelism. But that does not mean that Protestant Christian missions are indifferent to questions of humanity and justice, far from it. Conferences on the Christian Approach to the Jews were held in Budapest and Warsaw in 1927. Growing out of the World Missionary Conference at Jerusalem in 1928 and the meeting of the Committee of the International Missionary Council at Williams-town in 1929, a Committee on the Christian Approach to the Jews was organized with Dr. Conrad Hoffmann as director. Further conferences on the Jewish aspect of Christian evangelism were held at Atlantic City in 1931; at Old Jordans, England, in 1935; and at Vienna in 1937. Not only so, but during and after both World Wars this committee has worked for the relief of Jews in various parts of Europe.

In the case of the present European refugee problem it is obvious, though it needs to be repeated often, that of the 10,000,000 or more displaced persons in Europe a relatively small proportion are Jews, possibly 15 percent. But the Jews who have taken refuge in Switzerland, France, Belgium, Holland, Great Britain have been cared for during the war, at considerable sacrifice and danger in many cases, and the assumption should be that they will continue to be aided as required. Of the Jews in central and eastern Europe, Dr. Leo Baeck, Chief Rabbi of Germany, stated at a luncheon in New York on December 28 that from 8,000 to 10,000 remain in Germany, 10,000

to 12,000 in Austria, 80,000 in Poland, 120,000 Polish Jews in Russia, 150,000 in Hungary, and another 150,000 in Romania. Taking the average of the two figures for Germany and Austria, this would give a total of 520,000 or considerably less than the 560,000 in Germany before the war. Moreover, Rabbi Baeck reports that many of the remaining Jews in Europe are old people. This means that they should not be evacuated from Europe, unless they have relatives abroad able to take care of them, and not until contact can be established with these relatives abroad, a process which will take months and even years on the part of the Commission for International Refugees. Undoubtedly a remnant of these old people have no relatives who can be located and they will have to be cared for in old people's homes. In justice this should be at the expense of the governments under which they have been treated so shamefully, but it may be kinder for world Jewry to assume this responsibility.

Again, not all of the remaining able-bodied Jews in Europe will want to leave the lands where they and their forebears have lived so long. True, their memories of the past are by no means uniformly pleasant and their recent experiences have been terrible beyond description. But now, for the first time, there is the possibility of better treatment under more democratic governments and new opportunities for their particular abilities. Of those who feel that they

cannot endure to go on living where they have suffered so much, some will want to join relatives, whether in North or South America or in Palestine, and some will want to go to Palestine whether they have relatives there or not.

President Truman's recent order to expedite the admission of refugees into the United States and the dispatch of officials of the Immigration and Colonization Service, the Passport Division of the State Department, and the Public Health Service, opens a door of hope and sets a splendid example to the governments of other countries. But it will hardly provide an outlet for more than 20,000 by June 30, when further action would be necessary. The opening of unused quotas covering recent years would provide larger relief, but since the quotas normally go by countries, that does not necessarily meet the need where it is greatest. However, any help is worth while.

As for Palestine, that little country of 10,500 square miles has already done its share, and much more, in providing a refuge for over half a million Jews during the last 25 years, including an extra 75,000 for good measure after the application of the policy outlined in the British White Paper in May, 1939. If other countries had done as well in proportion to their area, resources, and existing population, the refugee aspect of the Jewish problem would have been solved ere this.

But, of course, everyone knows that the Jewish problem is not just a refugee problem. It is a question of a home for

a people without a country of their own, a stateless people, in part an uprooted and homeless people. The desire for a national home and a political state is a natural one and legitimate, if it can be achieved without injustice to others and without sowing the seeds of strife to result in further wars. However, it is exceedingly doubtful if a home for the 12,000,000 Jews of the world could be found. It is equally doubtful if any large percentage of the 5,000,000 Jews in the United States or the 450,000 in Great Britain want to leave the countries where they have made their homes to strike their roots in some new land. Obviously they realize that Palestine cannot in any foreseeable future provide such an inclusive home, even if there were no Palestinian population there already.

Palestine is just too small, and it lacks the natural resources to provide such an inclusive Jewish homeland. Moreover, it already has a population which presses hard upon its available resources, a population which is growing at a phenomenal rate, over 66 percent from 1920 to 1940, or about four times that of Egypt (Palestine 1922-35, 50.1 percent; Egypt 1923-35, 13 percent). Meanwhile the Jewish population in Palestine already numbers over one-third of the total. Obviously, if Palestine is to become a Jewish state for even a fraction of the Jewish people and a super-state for all, it follows that:

(1) There must be unlimited and continued immigration, including the recruitment of non-refugees, since the available immigrants among the half-million remaining Jews in central and eastern Europe would not provide and maintain a majority. Thus, in spite of denials, Zionist leaders seek to recruit young Jewish colonists in England and the United States, e.g., Mr. Louis Lipsky at a Zionist rally in New York as reported in The New York Times of January 3, 1946.

(2) There must be increased purchase of land, limited only by the available acres which can be utilized profitably or even unprofitably, requiring large and continuing subsidies from abroad.

(3) This means, on the one hand, disillusionment and resentment on the part of the disinherited Arab peasants, leading to local violence by way of reprisal and appeals to the neighboring Arab states for sympathy and for redress whether by boycott or armed intervention.

(4) On the other hand, the artificial success of a policy of heavily subsidized colonization leads inevitably to the alternative of "expand or explode." The outcome is sure to be a demand on the part of the Jewish national state for still more lebensraum, including ultimately all of the territories included in the old kingdom of David and Solomon.

(5) This would bring the Jewish state up against independent Lebanon and Syria and cause encroachment on the

mandate of Trans-Jordan, ostensibly on its own way to independence.

(6) After Great Britain has surrendered its mandate in Iraq and France her mandate in Syria-Lebanon, for Palestine to try to expand at the expense of her independent neighbors would be an intolerable situation, which would set the whole Arab world aflame.

(7) Of course the United Nations Organization would be expected to prevent such a dangerous outcome, but why allow such a dangerous situation to develop?

(8) Meanwhile, Jews outside of Palestine would have a dual loyalty, likely to encourage anti-Semitism, and would be called upon for material support and political aid to the Jewish national state, with all the lobbying maneuvering, and backstairs politics involved, adding still further to Jewish unpopularity and anti-Semitism.

Whatever the promises made during war or the threat of war, and the misunderstandings of them based on unwarranted assumptions and wishful thinking, the Balfour Declaration and the British White Paper have in general been fulfilled according to the original intention and subsequent interpretations of those who are responsible for them, as far as that has been possible in the complex and disturbed conditions existing since 1917.

Now that the United States has agreed to set up a Joint

Anglo-American Committee to investigate and to report on what is feasible and just today, one hesitates to try to influence the committee in advance. But considerations of justice to the present majority of the population in Palestine, democratic procedures in the evolution of the present mandate uncomplicated by arbitrary decisions regarding unlimited colonization, adherence to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, and recognition of the political responsibilities of the United Nations Organization, as well as long-range humanitarian considerations, would seem to indicate that:

(1) The problem of the relief of European Jews should be solved apart from further demands upon Palestine, through the U.N.O.'s Economic and Social Council.

(2) The existence and the rights of the Arabic Moham-medar majority and of Jewish and Christian minorities should be faced realistically. It is significant that the 126,500 Christians tend to stand with the Arabs rather than the Jews, feeling that on the whole their interests are safer with the former than with the latter in spite of all their assurances of just treatment.

(3) The future government of Palestine should be determined, like that of every other mandate area proceeding to independence, by free elections in which all of the inhabitants regardless of race or religion participate and are eligible for public office, with adequate safeguards for

minorities whether racial or religious. This would permit a purely religious and cultural Jewish home-center of limited proportions in Palestine, as long as it remained a purely religious and cultural center.

(4) The assistance of the United Nations Organization in general, and of the Trusteeship Council in particular, would be available to guarantee the new independent state a fair start and such political, economic, and even police help as it might need to establish itself firmly. The action of New Zealand in offering to surrender its Samoan mandate insures that the Trusteeship Council will not only be established but have work to do. Its good offices in relation to Palestine would insure the Palestinian Jews justice, reassure the Arabs in Palestine and elsewhere, guarantee the rights of the small Christian minority, and satisfy the sense of justice of all but those who have determined in advance that Palestine must become the Jewish national state regardless of everything else.

Given such a good start, there is every reason to expect a gradual harmonization of the Arabic, Jewish, and Christian population and cooperation in developing Palestine for the well-being of all its inhabitants and as a useful trade and communications center in the Near East.

That is my report.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I gather, Mr. Albright, that you represent the International Missionary Council?

Mr. Albright: I am an officer of it, though I served on this committee from the Foreign Missions Conference, which is an affiliate of the International Missionary Council.

Mr. Justice Singleton: You came to speak for the general attitude of the Protestant Christian missions?

Mr. Albright: That is it.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Which, as I remember from my younger days, has missions in Palestine, had them for quite some time.

Mr. Albright: My opinions and convictions have grown out of correspondence with people in Palestine, conversations with people who have come back from Palestine, and then through studies carried on in this Joint Committee, in which we have had conferences with Zionists, with non-Zionists and with Arabs.

I confess I began with a strong prejudice in favor of the Zionist policy, feeling that the logic of the situation was that they too should have a national home and a state of their own, but the more I studied it the more I became convinced that that isn't possible in the present situation.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Your views changed as you regarded the matter, and they have changed?

Mr. Albright: They have, in the last year.

Moreover, I may add, sir, I feel very strongly that the present development of the United Nations Organization changes

everything in regard to this matter.

Mr. Justice Singleton: You are hopeful.

Mr. Albright: I am hopeful.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I notice in the recommendations that you put forth here, that you draw attention to the fact that there are two separate problems or considerations: one, the rescue and rehabilitation of surviving Jews in Europe; and secondly, the question of Palestine. I gather that you think they ought to be looked upon separately.

Mr. Albright: I think the time has come when they must be. I strongly favor the reference of the Jewish problem in toto, not only that of the Jews but of the others, to the United Nations Organization Economic and Social Council, and I think that Palestine's problems should be solved proceeding forthwith to independence.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I notice too that you say that neither Jewish nationalist aspirations nor Arab nationalist objectives should any longer obstruct their rehabilitation.

Mr. Albright: What page is that, sir, of the report?

Mr. Justice Singleton: The bottom of page 6, the first of your recommendations.

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Have you got it?

Mr. Albright: I don't quite see it.

Judge Hutcheson: No. 1.

Mr. Justice Singleton: The first of your recommendations.

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Well, I think that is a danger, that the nationalist rivalries of the Jews and Arabs may obstruct both the solution of the Jewish refugee problem and that of the Arab, by holding out a false hope, and delay the independence of Palestine.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I draw your attention to it for the purpose of asking you a question on it. Can you give us any help as to how it should be done? It is one of those things. easy to say, but not easy to carry out.

Mr. Albright: For instance, Iraq has moved from a mandate to an independent state in very recent times. More recently Syria and Lebanon.

Mr. Justice Singleton: But you are dealing with this, "Neither Jewish nationalist aspirations nor Arab nationalist objectives should any longer obstruct their rehabilitation."

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Do you mean that the Christian churches are saying that someone -- and I suppose the someone would be the men in power -- must exercise force?

Mr. Albright: No.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Well, I didn't think you were, but I was wondering how you would suggest it should be done. so that we may gather help from your recommendation.

Mr. Albright: I don't think that the mandatory power alone

can solve it. It has become too intricate and there is too much feeling.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Then, you say, that means a delay.

Mr. Albright: I am afraid it does.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I think every member of the committee is seeking to find a way to help on this immediate problem without delay, or with as little delay as possible.

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Justice Singleton: That is why I am asking you these questions.

Mr. Albright: My answer would be in two parts, that some organization, whether UNRRA or its successor, must act on behalf of the refugees in the meantime. The Economic and Social Council must challenge the other countries to take their share.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Very well. I follow what you mean. You mean this committee, if we follow your paragraph 1, should recommend UNRRA to help for the moment and should recommend the United Nations Organization to carry on. It is not going to help us much in the immediate picture, is it?

Mr. Albright: At the moment, as I think General Sir Frederick Morgan tried to point out, there is a danger when UNRRA comes to an end that there will be nothing. I want to avoid that.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I was trying to direct your

attention to the time before UNRRA comes to an end. Other witnesses have impressed upon us the desirability that something be done with regard to the displaced Jews.

.....
Mr. Albright: I have no objections, but every support in the Joint Committee, but would urge upon other governments to forthwith remove their barriers or raise their quotas and allow refugees to come in.

23
Mr. Justice Singleton: I am sure, Mr. Albright, that we all appreciate the desire that you have that something be done, but it is easier to say than to get it done.

Mr. Albright: I appreciate that.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I want to take you to the second of your recommendations:

"The primary aim should be the progressive development of understanding and friendly relations among all communities in Palestine and their cooperation, on a basis of personal equality, in the advancement of the whole country's welfare."

You regard that as essential?

Mr. Albright: I do.

Mr. Justice Singleton: That is with regard to the future development.

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Again I would like your help as to what we can do to bring it about. We have been thinking

about it.

Mr. Albright: The Christian churches had missions in Palestine, as you know, for a long time.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Can you tell me of any course of action to bring the Arab and the Jew more closely together?

Mr. Albright: I think that is going on all the time. I think the difficulty is that it is complicated now by the political issue and by the economic issue. The Arab mind is prejudiced against the Jew, his Jewish neighbor, because he fears the Jewish neighbor.

Mr. Justice Singleton: You are speaking of the present time?

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Justice Singleton: As one interested in Christian missions I want to know, if you can tell me, what has been going on, what has been going on to bring these two nationalities or races or faiths closer together.

Mr. Albright: I think you will recognize the difficulty when you have to deal with Mohammedans on the one side and a minority of Jews and of Christians on the other. It is not easy to get--

Mr. Justice Singleton: I quite recognize the difficulty, but this is the advice which you give. I want to know what is the lesson which the church has sent us, and I am sure all of us who are church members will seek to follow it.

Mr. Albright: Quite. But I insist on being negative first, that the difficulty, the obstacle needs to be removed, namely, the Arab's fear that he is going to be overcome, dominated, overwhelmed by immigrants in such numbers that he will lose his country, his state. Now, if that can be done, then I think the present policy, working together and living together, will eventually result in happy relations; apart from this issue they are not unhappy. That is the universal testimony.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I hope you are right, but you came here to advise us as to what we were to do, and I thought you might come to the point in helping us in a little detail.

Do I gather that you come from Canada?

Mr. Albright: Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. Justice Singleton: How did you manage to come to Washington?

Mr. Albright: Well, as I said, sir, I belong to the international organization.

Mr. Justice Singleton: And you represent the international?

Mr. Albright: I am a member of the International Missionary Conference but I am representing the Foreign Missions Conference at their request.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Very well. I am much obliged to you.

Judge Hutcheson: Do you belong to the Presbyterian Church?

Mr. Albright: The United Church of Canada.

Judge Hutcheson: I don't know what that church is. I just know the Presbyterian Church. In this Board of Missions the Presbyterian Church is represented?

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Judge Hutcheson: All the churches?

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Judge Hutcheson: I was confused as to the manner in which you are appearing. I wondered how the Americans let a Canadian come down and represent them without having an American here.

Mr. Albright: That is internationalism.

Judge Hutcheson: I see.

Mr. Albright: The Foreign Missions Conference of North America represents nearly all of the major missions boards of the United States and Canada. There is a similar organization in Great Britain, another in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa; in fact, there are fourteen of these missionary conferences. Then, in the mission lands, there are some thirty-three what are known as Christian councils among the younger churches. Then, over all, the over-all organization is the International Missionary Council. That is the bridge between the Foreign Missions Conferences in the sending countries and

.....

the national Christian council in the receiving country. The international receiving country has twenty offices, one in London, one in New York.

Judge Hutcheson: New York is the home office of these people?

Mr. Albright: That is, of the Foreign Missions Conference, yes.

Judge Hutcheson: And you represent, you are the associate secretary of the International Missionary Council, which is something else than the Foreign Missions?

Mr. Albright: It is the head body, the top organization.

Judge Hutcheson: Your body has elected you to represent it?

Mr. Albright: No, not that. The Foreign Missions Conference has selected me, because I was a member of the Joint Committee.

Judge Hitchenson: I see. So you are speaking, while you are a Canadian, you are speaking not as a Canadian, you are speaking as a North American on that committee?

Mr. Albright: That is right.

Judge Hutcheson: I see. Not the United States.

Mr. Albright: North America.

Mr. Justice Singleton: Have you personally been in Palestine, had experience there?

Mr. Albright: No. I have had experience in the Far

East, not in the Middle East.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I was not seeking to criticize you, but only seeking information.

Mr. Albright: Canon Bridgeman, I believe, if he has not already, will appear.

Mr. Justice Singleton: I didn't know that someone was coming later.

Mr. Crossman: You think the U. N. O. should solve the problem of these refugees in Europe without pressing more immigrants into Palestine?

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Crossman: Your idea would be that the different nations composing U. N. O. should take each its quota?

Mr. Albright: Quite.

Mr. Crossman: How many will this order of Mr. Truman's actually admit to the United States?

Mr. Albright: My estimate is, by next June, not more than 20,000 -- by the time the commissioners get out and get to work.

Mr. Crossman: What would be the feeling in Canada about taking them, would it be easy or difficult?

Mr. Albright: I don't think it is easy anywhere. They have taken some. They could take more.

Mr. Crossman: If some such motion were put under way, would the churches mobilize to urge the different legislatures

to put it through?

Mr. Albright: I believe they would in Canada.

Mr. Crossman: Would they in this country?

Mr. Albright: You see, the fact that the Federal Council of Churches, the Home Missions Council, and the Foreign Missions Conference are vitally interested in the question, I think is an indication that in its organization aspects, at least, the Christian churches of the United States are anxious to help and to find a solution.

Mr. Phillips: May I ask, Mr. Albright, whether you think the churches outside of Palestine, that is, the heads of the three great religions, could exercise any influence on the situation in Palestine? We all realize the difficulties within Palestine itself, but I was wondering whether the heads of the Moslem, heads of the Jewish, and heads of the Christian faiths, operating outside, could exercise their influence outside and get together, and might possibly exercise some influence to bear on the religious situation in Palestine.

Mr. Albright: It is not entirely a religious situation. Until the Zionist situation became acute in Palestine, there doesn't seem to have been friction between Palestinians as Mohammedans or as Jews or as Christians, but, as I have said before, it is the impending fear of large immigration which has caused that concern, that fear, and therefore I think it is asking a great deal of any ecclesiastical heads to try to

allay that fear. That can only be done by political action, by the removing of the cause of the fear.

Mr. Phillips: You think that if that fear, the fear you speak of, were removed somewhat, that the influence which I suggest might be beneficial?

Mr. Albright: I certainly do, and it should be called upon to play its part, but I think it is futile to expect religious leaders to try to secure peace in a situation in which there is no peace.

Major Manningham-Buller: Mr. Albright, I think you said that Palestine should be given its independent?

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Major Manningham-Buller: You did say that?

Mr. Albright: Yes, sir.

Major Manningham-Buller: Is it your view that the sooner it gets its independence, the sooner things will settle down? I was wondering why you put that forth.

Mr. Albright: My hope is that other mandate areas will similarly secure their independence or their developing independence under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization, and I would like to see Palestine included among those independent nations to be.

Mr. Crick: May I ask a question now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Albright, may I call your attention to page 8 of your memorandum, at the end, where you refer to anti-Semitic

feeling in your own country, which I take it to mean Canada.

Mr. Albright: Yes.

Mr. Crick: Would you give the committee some examples of the kind of expression that anti-Semitism takes?

Mr. Albright: I think I would have to repeat what my predecessor stated a little while ago, that it takes economic forms, it takes social forms, it occurs in the matter of residence, living conditions. There are many communities, there are real estate agencies, which simply do not accept Jewish residents. It is not a body. It is a reality, though.

Mr. Crick: Socially it would mean that possibly Jews would not be admitted to certain clubs, is that what you have in mind?

Mr. Albright: I wasn't worried about that; I was thinking more of them having a place to live and work to do.

Mr. Crick: Principally it is economic discrimination?

Mr. Albright: That is perhaps the most important factor, though there are others.

Mr. Crick: May we take it that the churches, Christian bodies, strongly and repeatedly condemn anti-Semitism in this country?

Mr. Albright: Yes, sir.

Mr. Crick: Can you give us any regulations or expressions of condemnation?

Mr. Albright: I haven't them with me but could secure

them for you. The Federal Council of Churches would be glad to supply them.

Mr. Crick: Very well. I would like to ask you what you think should be the content of this more positive and vigorous program to eradicate anti-Semitic feeling of which you speak in your report.

Mr. Albright: I think that is a very large program and will have to be approached from many angles. If you have traveled by subway in New York City you will have noticed an attractive poster of a crowd of people apparently coming out of three buildings in the background, and they are of different racial types but the appeal is, "Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, we are all Americans together," something like that, and in the picture no reference being made to it, but there is a Negro or two. That is the kind of thing that it has done. That has been done by the City of New York as a part of its policy to break down prejudice and to stimulate a higher ideal of citizenship. That is not uncommon nowadays.

So I think schools and churches and municipalities and public organizations of all kinds will have to play their part if such a deep-seated and such a widespread antipathy, unreasonable as it is, is to be overcome.

Mr. Crick: There is no organized anti-Semitism for the purpose of expressing anti-Semitic feeling or action?

Mr. Albright: There have been. Whether there are just

now or not, I am not competent to say.

Mr. Crick: Thank you.

Judge Hutcheson: That is all.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p. m., an adjournment was
taken until Friday, January 11, 1946, at 10:30 a. m.)

