

UNITED



NATIONS

OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE SECOND SESSION OF  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SUPPLEMENT No. 11

---

UNITED NATIONS  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
ON PALESTINE

---

REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

VOLUME III

ANNEX A:

ORAL EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT PUBLIC MEETINGS

Lake Success

New York

1947

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION .....	III	2. Hearing of representatives of the Jewish Women's Organizations of Palestine .....	138
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 17 June 1947 at 4 p.m.		VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-NINTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 13 July 1947 at 9:30 a.m.	
1. Reception of factual information relating to conditions in Palestine from the representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine .....	1	1. Hearing of representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine .....	143
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 17 June 1947 at 4 p.m.	1	VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 14 July 1947 at 9 a.m.	
1. Hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency .....	8	1. Hearing of representatives of Ihud .....	164
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 6 July 1947 at 9 a.m.		VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SECOND MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 15 July 1947 at 11.25 a.m.	
1. Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency .....	34	1. Hearing of representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine Central Committee .....	188
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 7 July 1947 at 9 a.m.		2. Hearing of representatives of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation .....	192
1. Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency .....	48	VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 16 July 1947 at 9 a.m.	
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 8 July 1947 at 9 a.m.		1. Hearing of representatives of the Council (Waad Hair) of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community .....	206
1. Hearing of Dr. Weizmann .....	72	2. Hearing of representatives of the General Federation of Jewish Labour .....	209
2. Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency .....	86	3. Hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine .....	218
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 9 July 1947 at 9 a.m.		VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 17 July 1947 at 9.30 a.m.	
1. Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency .....	94	1. Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine .....	227
2. Hearing of representatives of the Vaad Leumi .....	104	2. Hearing of representatives of the Palestine Communist Union .....	234
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 10 July 1947 at 9 a.m.		VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 22 July 1947 at 11 a.m., at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Beirut, Lebanon.	
1. Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Vaad Leumi .....	118	1. Statements by the representatives of the Arab countries .....	240
2. Hearing of representatives of the Chief Rabbinate .....	122	LIST OF HEARINGS IN PUBLIC MEETINGS .....	246
3. Hearing of representatives of Agudath Israel .....	130		
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING (PUBLIC) held on 11 July 1947 at 11 a.m.			
1. Hearing of representatives of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland .....	135		

<sup>1</sup> All meetings, except the thirty-eighth meeting, were held at the Y.M.C.A. building in Jerusalem.



## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem,  
Tuesday, 17 June 1947, at 4 p.m.*

### *Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. BRILEJ, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

The Chairman called the first public meeting in Palestine to order at 4.20 p.m.

### **Reception of factual information relating to conditions in Palestine from the representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine**

The CHAIRMAN invited Mr. M. Shertok and Mr. D. Horowitz, representatives of the Jewish Agency to take seats at the table and submit observations on the *Survey of Palestine* and other publications received by the Committee from the Government of Palestine.

MR. SHERTOK (Jewish Agency) declared he would make a factual introduction to the subject under inquiry from the standpoint of the Jewish Agency.

After a few words of welcome to the Committee, Mr. Shertok opened his statement with a brief reference to the map of Palestine stressing the considerable variety of geography and climate. He pointed out that Palestine had never been so small a country as it was today. Before the first World War, Palestine extended on both sides of the Jordan, and a little to the north of its present northern boundary in the east and the west. Moreover, the eastern and greater part of Palestine had been detached, and was now a separate country, the Arab kingdom of Trans-Jordan.

Mr. Shertok next described the five distinct geographical zones of Palestine, giving for each zone the number of Jewish agricultural settlements. He said that the Negeb, which comprised forty per cent of the country's area, was today mostly Arab populated and arable. The northern section of the Negeb contained good soil which could be turned into an area of very extensive agricultural development. In this zone there were only seventeen Jewish settlements, mostly established within the last couple of years.

Officially, however, the country had a different system of zones, namely, by reference to whether and to what extent Jews were free or not free to acquire land. In 63 per cent of the country's area the Jews were completely prohibited from buy-

ing land. In 32 per cent every transaction between Jew and non-Jew required the special permission of the Government. In only 5 per cent of Palestine were the Jews free to buy land.

The prohibition was in inverse ratio to Jewish landholdings. Where they had bought a large proportion of the land they could buy the remainder; where they had bought very little they were completely prohibited from buying anything.

Mr. Shertok stressed that Jewish agricultural settlements had not resulted in the creation of a class of landless Arabs. Where land had been purchased from absentee landlords, Arab tenants, when they had to be removed, were in every case resettled elsewhere. Not a single Arab village had disappeared from the map of Palestine. It was not easy to find an instance in the history of colonization where a large-scale settlement scheme had been conducted with so much respect for the interests of the existing population.

Palestine owed its existence as a distinct country to the fact that it was the birth-place of the Jewish people and because, in Palestine, the Jewish people had been able to make their contribution to the cultural and spiritual treasury of mankind.

In every century and in every generation the Jews had attempted to return to Palestine. Despite expulsions and prohibitions the Jews had striven very hard to maintain their hold of Palestine. The present phase of Jewish resettlement in Palestine, which had begun in 1881, was but a link in the chain of Jewish attempts to return. The Jews, driven by suffering and peril to seek refuge elsewhere, had been drawn to Palestine, because this was the only country where they could hope to rebuild their lives on secure foundations and become a nation again.

Mr. Shertok then described the successive waves of immigration which brought Jews to Palestine after the 1870's.

As a result of the first World War, Palestine had changed hands. The British Government issued the Balfour Declaration, and the Mandate had been approved on that basis.

Jewish immigration now became the dominant feature of the country's life and the prime agent of its progress. A very large number of Jews came to Palestine and this large immigration, far from carrying any economic dislocation had caused a marked shortage of labour, due to the demand for food and services that the immigrants made.

In 1939, with the issue of the White Paper, British policy had turned a complete somersault. Jewish immigration had been severely limited and many tens of thousands of Jews who might otherwise have been saved by escaping to Palestine in time had been trapped in Europe and doomed. In a different setting the same story now went on. Only 1,500 were permitted to enter Palestine per month but many more were trying to escape from the D.P. camps in Europe.

The process of Jewish immigration taken as a whole had been a mass return numerically

as well as geographically. Fifty-two countries claimed immigrants as coming from them.

One notable feature of Jewish immigration in the last decade had been the bringing over of children and adolescents who received education and training in agricultural settlements or in special institutions. The Jewish Agency had brought over nearly 18,000 children.

As a national movement, the Jewish Agency was against Jews assimilating with the nations of the world and losing their distinct identity. In Palestine, however, the Jewish Agency welcomed the process of assimilation, because the Jews were assimilating among themselves and emerging as a people re-united and rebuilt. Of the 640,000 Jews living in Palestine today, 230,000 were Palestinian born, mostly the children of immigrants.

The Jews now in Palestine did not regard themselves as a stable and stationary population but rather as a vanguard preparing the ground for the absorption of more to come.

Economically and socially speaking the Jews in Palestine were a new society which was being built up by a process of immigration and settlement. They took away no livelihood from others; they created their own. Palestine had absorbed a considerable number of newcomers because they brought with them their means of livelihood, their capital, initiative, productive capacity, a certain amount of adaptability and ingenuity, and above all, a determination to make good and to discover latent possibilities of production by which they could live.

Mr. Shertok emphasized that it was the deliberate aim of the Jews in Palestine to create their own economy in order to be able to live an independent Jewish life, independent in the real sense of the term.

One of the outstanding features of Jewish colonization was the territorial compactness of Jewish settlements. This was to be observed not only in villages but in the urban zones as well. There was room in Palestine for many more Jewish settlements, both in the zones already colonized by Jews and in the parts of Palestine which were today uniformly Arab.

"We believe," said Mr. Shertok, "that we cannot make good by uniting as individuals with the mass of the Arab population in the economic and territorial sense, as we do, perforce in all other countries, with the population of those countries. Such a process, if applied in Palestine, would have defeated our purpose. It is our purpose to build up a self-contained national system resting on its own foundations. It is the only way in which we can hope to settle in large numbers and to feel economically secure and nationally independent."

Pioneering on the land, reclaiming the land from age-old neglect and building up a new society from the very foundations had become the highest ideal of the Jewish youth. Today only nineteen per cent of Jews actually lived on the land—the same percentage as in the United States of America. Jewish immigration had been

and agriculture. In the Jewish secondary schools there are societies of youth whose ambition was not to go to universities but to pioneer in agriculture. Every *dunum* of land possessed by Jews in Palestine had had to be bought and reclaimed at their own expense. They had received no help in that regard from the Mandatory. Even in regard to state domain, in spite of the very express provision of the Mandate to place suitable land at the disposal of the Jews, they had obtained practically nothing. They had received some areas of land, though entirely uncultivable, merely for individual and housing purposes, but nothing for agriculture.

Today the Jews possessed just over 6 per cent of the land area of Palestine. About 40 to 45 per cent of this was nationally owned land of the Jewish National Fund, controlled by the Zionist Organization. The rest was privately owned or held as concessions.

Mr. Shertok expressed the wish that the members of the Committee, during their visit, should look not merely at what the Jews had achieved in the agricultural field but also to gauge the wide margin of undeveloped potentialities.

The Jewish Agency, in its colonization program, had followed, from the social as distinct from the agricultural standpoint, two main principles—self-government of the settlers from the beginning, and self-determination of the settlers in regard to the particular social form which they chose for their collective work and living. Thus the burden of responsibility was thrown completely on the settlers themselves.

Mr. Shertok then dealt at some length with the results obtained by the co-operation and mutual help between the Jewish agricultural settlers, and with the so-called Zionist system of colonization.

Mr. Shertok next turned to the place which Jewish industry occupies in the economic life of Palestine. Eighty per cent of the industry of Palestine, which was entirely new, was in Jewish hands. The transition from war-time to peacetime economy had been a fairly smooth one and the Jewish industrial structure had shown quite a remarkable degree of stability and resilience in its readaptation to new conditions.

Industrial development had been the backbone of the Jewish urban development. Urban development had also been expressed in municipal self-government. There were in Palestine three types of municipalities—the purely Arab municipalities, the mixed municipalities, and the purely Jewish municipalities. The difference between the three could be seen in the level of the services performed, in the taxes raised and in the degree of democratic self-government. In the purely Jewish municipalities, women had the vote, and the rate-paying qualification for electing and being elected was fairly low. In the mixed it was higher. In the Arab municipalities it was still higher.

The Jewish labour movement played a very distinct role in the sphere of agriculture and industry. The main Jewish labour organization,

the *Histadrut* had taken over a large number of industries. There was also a great deal of co-operative activity within the frame of the labour federation and outside it.

All this activity called for a certain amount of organization. The organization of Jewish people in Palestine operated on two levels—the organization of Palestine Jews and the Jewish Agency Organization.

The former—the Palestine Jewish Community—was recognized as a corporate body: they had their general elections based on universal suffrage, and they had their central authority.

The latter—the Jewish Agency Organization—spoke for Jews throughout the world interested in the building up of Palestine as a Jewish National Home. There was co-ordination and division of functions between the Agency and the *Vaad Leumi*. The departments of the *Vaad Leumi* catered for the needs of the existing population; those of the Jewish Agency looked after the needs of people who came to Palestine and the development of new potentials. During the war, the Jewish Agency and the *Vaad Leumi* had jointly organized the war effort of the Jewish community, as a result of which 33,000 men and women, of whom 26,000 were army, navy, air force responded to the call for armed service. Palestinian Jews had fought in the war as a distinct entity, later recognized in the Jewish Brigade Corps which had fought in Italy.

Mr. Shertok concluded his statement by emphasizing that the Jewish community was a nation in the making. There was a national economy already in existence. A great deal of the present crisis arose from the fact that there was a discrepancy or a conflict between the actual position of the Jewish people and the Jewish economy in Palestine, the status which today it enjoyed, and the instruments of collective action which it lacked and the opportunities of economic and political self-defence which it had not got.

Members of the Committee then sought information from Mr. Shertok on points arising from his statement. The questions and answers during this part of the meeting are reproduced for the most part *in extenso*, as follows.

CHAIRMAN: You mentioned the number of Jewish inhabitants here as being 640,000.

Mr. SHERTOK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It would be interesting to compare that figure with your estimate of the total population.

Mr. SHERTOK: The total population is just over 1,900,000.

CHAIRMAN: Does that include also the nomads?

Mr. SHERTOK: I believe so.

CHAIRMAN: Does the term *Negeb* refer to a well-defined territory, or is it only a vague terminology applied to a land in a certain direction?

Mr. SHERTOK: I appreciate the point. To avoid any vagueness, we now, in referring to the *Negeb*, mean to cover the Beersheba Sub-District. We take the *Negeb* as being practically

identical with the Beersheba Sub-District, which is a quite definite unit or area. It is an area of about 12 million *dunums*.

CHAIRMAN: Is that the exact use of the term, or is there another use of it?

Mr. SHERTOK: Well, you always take care, when somebody else uses the term, to put to him the question which you have just put to me. In our literature—if I may use that term—that is the significance of the term "*Negeb*".

CHAIRMAN: Might I also ask you about the percentage of Jews settled on the land in the rural districts?

Mr. SHERTOK: I said nineteen per cent in the rural areas.

CHAIRMAN: You said the women had the right to vote in Jewish communities.

Mr. SHERTOK: In the Jewish municipalities and local councils.

CHAIRMAN: How is it with the Moslems?

Mr. SHERTOK: The women have no right. I believe the only Moslem women who vote in Palestine are the members of the few Arab families who happen to be included in the area of Tel Aviv.

CHAIRMAN: Do you make a distinction between the actual use of the vote and the right to vote?

Mr. SHERTOK: What I am referring to is the right to vote, not the actual use of the vote. They have no right to vote. Suffrage in the purely Arab and Moslem areas is restricted to males. May I point out that in Haifa and Jerusalem Jewish women—not only Arab, but also Jewish women—have no right to vote in municipal elections. In Tel Aviv they have.

CHAIRMAN: Does any member of the Committee wish to ask a question on the statement? I intend to proceed later about the subject matter.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I am not quite sure whether this question is within the scope of the statement at this stage. What I would like to ask is how does the co-operation of the Palestine Administration with the Jewish Agency work in practice? How is this co-operation organized in practice?

Mr. SHERTOK: I am afraid I am in a bit of difficulty in answering this question because the present position is not normal. I could refer to the period before 1939. In the period before 1939 there was a fairly frequent contact between the Jewish Agency and the Palestine Government—both the central organs; that is to say, the High Commissioner and the Secretariat, its Departments of Public Health, Public Works, Immigration, etc., the Police, and the District Administration. More often perhaps, in other questions, it was the Jewish Agency who took the initiative in approaching the Government and making representations in writing or orally, drawing attention to certain matters, asking for redress of certain grievances, making proposals, or criticizing proposals of the Government. But fairly often the Jewish Agency would be called in by the Government for advice on something or in order to an expression of the Government's

views on the Jewish Agency's policy and what was happening in the Jewish community. There has been particularly close co-operation between us and the Government in the field of public security. When the Government would appoint committees consisting of or including representatives of the public, they would invariably consult us before they appointed the Jewish members of the committees.

In immigration there was close co-operation, not merely by our giving our views on the various immigration laws and regulations, but also by our taking over from the Government the distribution of a large number of immigration permits—all the permits that went to the so-called labour category.

Today the position, as compared with that, is abnormal because the cornerstone of the co-operation between us and the Government has been knocked out by the White Paper policy. We hold that by the White Paper of 1939 the Government has violated the Mandate, and after all it is the Mandate that is the basis of co-operation. We hold that not only is the Mandate inoperative today in its main provision, but also that the policy which is actually being enforced is in direct opposition to the terms of the Mandate. It does not prevent contact between us and the Government, but I would describe it as more haphazard, less systematic than it used to be. And I must say it is unfortunate, but a fact, that relations are extremely strained.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I have one more question on the same line. It is a legal question. Who is considered by the Jewish Agency as legally a Jew? Is it religion, or race, or what is the criterion? For instance, is the non-Jewish wife of a Jew a Jewess, or is she not?

Mr. SHERTOK: I would say technically and in terms of Palestine legislation, the Jewish religion is essential. What is essential is that a person should not go over to other religions. He need not necessarily be actively an observant Jew. He is still considered a Jew, but if he becomes converted to another religion he can no longer claim to be considered as a Jew. The religious test is decisive.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): What about the non-Jewish wife of a Jew?

Mr. SHERTOK: A non-Jewish wife, unless she becomes a Jewess—and there is a certain formula for her to go through in that case—is considered a non-Jewess.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): It is not a question of a woman. How can a non-Jew become a Jew?

Mr. SHERTOK: In the case of a man there is a certain rite, which is usually performed soon after his birth, which is essential. But I should like to point out that Jewish religious authorities discourage conversion to Judaism, and when a person comes and says "I want to become a Jew," he is first of all preached a very discouraging sermon to warn him against that step, and only those who insist and show great seriousness of purpose are accepted into the fold.

CHAIRMAN: On the same line I should like to put a question. What do you intend to do with regard to future immigration?

Mr. SHERTOK: Generally we accept as Jews all who say they are Jews. All who come and say they are conscious of being Jews are accepted. The technical question may arise in the case of one appearing before the Rabbinical Court and having to produce certain papers, or when it comes to light that one is not actually a Jew. Then the problem may arise. Otherwise, anyone who appears and says he is a Jew is accepted as a Jew.

CHAIRMAN: You mean it is not a question of practical importance?

Mr. SHERTOK: No, in actual practice we have had no difficulty of that sort.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): May I know how many conversions there have been in fact in the last ten years to Judaism?

Mr. SHERTOK: I will undertake to supply the figures. I cannot give the reply offhand, but it is negligible.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Consisting of hundreds—thousands—tens?

Mr. SHERTOK: I think tens. I will check up.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): The representative of the Jewish Agency spoke about prohibited zones. This is not quite clear to me. Is the purchase of land prohibited to immigrating Jews only, or also to Jews who are citizens of Palestine? If that is so, can you tell us some other examples of discrimination?

Mr. SHERTOK: It definitely applies to Jews who are citizens of Palestine. There is no distinction at all between citizens, resident Jews or newcomers. The law says that in a prohibited zone a Palestine Arab may sell land only to a Palestine Arab and to no other, and that excludes all Jews. There is a moot point as to who is or is not an Arab. The High Commissioner decides. Moot points arise also in regard to other people.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are you aware that in other parts of the world there is similar legislation restraining persons from alienating or purchasing land from certain persons?

Mr. SHERTOK: Here it is on racial lines. We have had in Palestine and we have today, protective measures of a purely social character applying to classes, irrespective of race or origin. But here we have a distinct racial measure.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are you aware that in India, for example in the Punjab, a Shaikh cannot purchase property only because he is a Shaikh?

Mr. SHERTOK: I know. I should like to say that a sheik is a person holding a certain social position.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The Shaikh in the Punjab is something different from the sheik that you have. In the same way other communities are not entitled to purchase land or sell land. There are protective legislations in other parts of the world.

Mr. SHERTOK: With regard to Palestine two points arise. First, there is a distinct provision in

the Mandate prohibiting the passing of any legislative measure of a discriminatory character on racial grounds. The second point is that there is an express injunction in the Mandate to encourage close settlement of Jews on the land, and this measure to which we have been referring is in diametrical opposition to both these provisions.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I hope to have the pleasure of putting some questions in the future, but just now, since we did not know most of the facts which have been related by the witness, we should like to have time for studying them.

CHAIRMAN: We shall have time to come back to the subject. Our object is to get background for our inspection tour. The Yugoslav member also asked if there were other discriminations of a similar kind.

Mr. SHERTOK: Nothing occurs to me at the moment.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): For our Committee, the question of co-operation between Jews and Arabs is of great importance. Can you tell us some characteristic examples of such co-operation? I mean co-operation in the economic field.

Mr. SHERTOK: It is a question of producing instances and not embarking on generalisations, and I can give three instances. One is the Municipal Council of Haifa, where Jews and Arabs co-operate in the Municipal Council and in the Police Force fairly smoothly. Jews have worked many years under and for an Arab Mayor and Arabs are now working under a Jewish Mayor. That is an instance in one field: municipal Palestine activity.

Another instance is the co-operation between Jewish and Arab orange-growers. I have referred to the fact that this is an industry which is shared in almost equal parts by Jews and Arabs. There is a governing Board—the Citrus Control Board—presided over by an official of the Government and consisting of Jewish and Arab representatives of the trade concerned in equal numbers, and their co-operation is very smooth. Also there is an independent undertaking from time to time by Jewish orange-growers with which Arab orange-growers co-operate, such as delegations abroad discovering new markets, negotiating trade agreements in regard to the sale of oranges, etc., purchase of packing material, etc.

The third instance is joint strikes of Jewish and Arab employees where they work together and more or less on the same terms. There was a strike of Government employees about a year and a half ago which embraced a large number of Jews and Arabs and which, from the point of view of racial relations—I was not there and I cannot say how it ended—went off remarkably well and smoothly. Also, recently there was a strike of Jewish and Arab post office and various military work employees—they struck together.

CHAIRMAN: May I ask whether these strikes were of an economic character?

Mr. SHERTOK: Purely economic.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I should like to ask a question about educational life in Palestine. What is the trend of illiteracy in the country?

Mr. SHERTOK: I had it in mind to say something about education, but I saw that I had been a little too long. I left it out. There is in Palestine a Jewish school system organized and administered by the *Vaad Leumi* under the supervision of the Palestine Government. It is run by the community on autonomous lines. It consists largely of elementary schools, but it also contains a number of secondary schools and a few teacher-training colleges and industrial schools. There is also a considerable number of private schools, some of which are affiliated and partly supervised by the Jewish public school system, and some are not. There is a large number of secondary schools which are private or controlled by semi-public bodies. At the top of the educational system there are two institutions of higher studies—the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the Hebrew Technical Institute in Haifa, both of which are under boards constituted to ensure their public character and which have their own sources of income, large their own endowments. The Hebrew school system receives a block grant from the Government as part of the Government's education budget, which is calculated on a proportionate basis between the total of Jewish and Arab children. It is a rather intricate formula, but I am sure when the representatives appear before you they will be glad to initiate you.

CHAIRMAN: What about the Arab side of education?

Mr. SHERTOK: There is a Government school system which is completely Arab. It serves the needs of the Arab population. Its teachers, with a few exceptions who are British, are Arab and the language of instruction is Arabic. In the Jewish schools the language of instruction is Hebrew. Both English and Arabic are taught in Jewish schools. In the Government schools, which are for practical purposes Arab, Arabic is the instrument of tuition and English is taught fairly extensively. Hebrew is not taught.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Is the infant mortality in Palestine decreasing over the last year?

Mr. SHERTOK: It is, I believe. I think Mr. Horowitz has the facts.

CHAIRMAN: You have studied the *Survey*, I suppose. There are certain tables given there. Do you think those tables are accurate?

Mr. SHERTOK: I can produce for the time being figures for Moslem mortality, and my colleague is looking for the Jewish figures. In the years 1922–23 Moslem infant mortality was 186.37. In the years 1944–46 it was 99.9—a very considerable drop.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran): I should like to ask Mr. Shertok a question in French because I understand he speaks French as well as English. I had not thought of asking him the question I

am going to ask until I heard the answer he gave to the member from Yugoslavia on the subject of collaboration between Jews and Arabs. Mr. Shertok gave three examples of collaboration which seemed very encouraging, and I should like to have his opinion as to whether or not this experience of co-operation between Jews and Arabs will not prove fruitful if, as and when Palestine is made an independent country.

Mr. SHERTOK: Although I have been paid such a high compliment, I believe I shall make my reply in English. I am afraid Mr. Entezam's conclusion, although well-intentioned, is not fully warranted. I have referred to instances of co-operation between Jews and Arabs who are in Palestine on the plane of their day to day interests in walks of life where they rub shoulders together as common residents and citizens of the country, and they are indeed encouraging because I believe they show there is nothing which is inherent in the nature of either Jew or Arab which prevents them from rubbing shoulders and pulling together in matters where their common interest is self-evident. This does not mean that in the event of the establishment of Palestine as a united independent state, things will run smoothly. I am afraid they will not. Why? Because the paramount issue of the problem of this country is Jewish immigration: whether the Jewish settlement in Palestine is to be crystallised at the level of one-third, as decreed by the White Paper, or whether Jewish immigration is to proceed further to the full measure of this country's capacity to absorb immigrants without displacing others and without harming others. On this issue the attitude of both sides is clear and for the time being it is mutually antagonistic. I would refer Mr. Entezam to the attitude of the Jewish community and the expressed attitude of the Arab leadership. The Arab leadership is uncompromisingly opposed to any Jewish immigration. They have said they believe there are already too many Jews in Palestine. I do not know what practical conclusion they will draw from this basic premise in the event of their gaining control by virtue of two-thirds majority, but anyhow they are opposed to any Jewish immigration. This is the paramount issue and the Jews naturally feel that they have been left in the lurch at the mercy of a hostile Arab majority; hostile on a point which is the most vital point to the Jewish population, to its future, to its well-being, and to the fate of its brethren outside.

While it is definitely encouraging to see signs of practical co-operation, this does not yet mean that the two sides are ready to compose political difficulties and pull together within the structure of one State without harming each others fundamental independence.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran): I have no more questions. I think we can come back to this question later. If I understand Mr. Shertok, he says this question of co-operation is conditional upon immigration, but for the time being I will not press it further. We can come back to it.

Mr. SHERTOK: May I explain that the practical co-operation is not conditional on the satisfactory solution of the immigration problem purely. There are other problems too.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): May I put one question in that connection? Would you like the laws of immigration to disappear from all the other States in the world?

Mr. SHERTOK: I have no opinion with regard to immigration to other States of the world.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am asking would you like, as a point of principle, all the laws of immigration to disappear?

Mr. SHERTOK: I would not go that far.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You would like the laws of immigration to remain in other States as they are now?

Mr. SHERTOK: I have no opinion on that.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): According to the documents I have read I am under the impression that the greatest number of villages in Palestine are either wholly Jewish or wholly Arab. Is that a fact?

Mr. SHERTOK: That is so. With regard to villages they are either wholly Arab or wholly Jewish. There are no mixed villages. There are mixed towns, but no mixed villages.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): What part of the taxes collected by the Palestine Administration is paid by the Jewish people? Do you have the figure? In what amount are those taxes invested again to the benefit of the Jewish people?

Mr. SHERTOK: May I ask Mr. Horowitz to answer?

Mr. HOROWITZ: About two-thirds of the revenue of the Palestine Government is derived from Jewish sources. It is more difficult to estimate the benefits because many of the services are for the country as a whole, and I would not take it upon myself to calculate the expenditure. It is predominantly for the Arab population. No doubt the bulk of the expenditure is to the benefit of the Arab population, but as to the revenue, the nearest estimate which is agreed upon by the Government is that something about two-thirds of the revenue is derived from the Jewish population, which forms about one-third of the population.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else wish to ask a question? I have a couple of questions which have occurred to me.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I have a question—on facts only. How much money does the Jewish population outside Palestine send to Palestine every year?

Mr. HOROWITZ: I cannot tell you for every year but I can give you the global figure for the whole period of time of Jewish colonization since the first World War. We estimate the imported Jewish capital at something like 150 million pounds brought into the country. I should like to emphasize that a considerable



proportion of this capital is percolating, naturally, into the Arab community and the adjacent Arab countries.

Mr. SHERTOK: I should like to supplement this. Money that is being sent by Jews abroad to Palestine is not being sent simply to subsidize living in Palestine. It is sent in order to enable Palestine to absorb new Jews who arrive and to develop the country's potentialities. The Jewish community of Palestine as such is self-supporting; it is not only self-supporting, but it also contributes fairly considerable amounts for Jewish national purposes, for help and rescue of Jews abroad.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How much money has been made by the Potash Co. ever since the concession was granted to it?

Mr. SHERTOK: I could try to give the figures in case the Potash Co. will agree to open its ledgers. It holds a concession from the Government and the Government no doubt are fully aware of its figures.

CHAIRMAN: We are going to see the Potash Co. later and we might then have the figures.

One of the questions I want to put concerns the nationality question. When a Jew immigrates here, is his acquisition of Palestine nationality dependent upon his renouncing his original nationality?

Mr. SHERTOK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: He has no double nationality?

Mr. SHERTOK: No double nationality. It is not a question of Palestine legislation. It depends on the legislation of the various States from which he originates. With regard to the United Kingdom there is a clause which states that if an Englishman living abroad adopts the nationality of his country of domicile he does not thereby lose his British nationality. But I believe that is an exception to the general rule that by adopting new nationality one has to relinquish his former one. That applies to most Jews who come here.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The question remains whether the persons coming from other countries, other parts of Europe besides England, relinquish their former nationality.

Mr. SHERTOK: They do not enjoy double nationality.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Those who remain in Palestine are no longer subject to the nationality of the country where they have come from?

Mr. SHERTOK: They have to apply for and receive Palestine nationality. The one condition is two years' continuous residence in Palestine before they can apply. Another condition is a knowledge of at least one of the three official languages of the country. There may be other conditions as to desirability.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): May I ask you how many of the persons who have come during the last two decades became domiciled according to the law of Palestine?

Mr. SHERTOK: We have figures only up to the

middle of 1945. From 1925-45, 100,000 Jews—that is heads of families—applied for naturalization.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): I should like to know to what authority the applications for nationality must be made.

Mr. SHERTOK: The Palestine Government—technically to the Immigration Department on behalf of the High Commissioner. The passport is issued under the authority of the High Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN: I have one more question and, I am afraid, a major one, and I do not want an exhaustive answer. You touched, in your statement, upon the possibility of Palestine receiving more immigrants. That brings us to the absorptive economic capacity of Palestine. How would you estimate that capacity?

Mr. SHERTOK: The absorptive economic capacity of a country can be estimated only in relation to a certain given period. It cannot be estimated in absolute terms with regard to all eternity. We then venture into the realm of the unforeseeable. But with regard to a definite period a more or less reasonable estimate can be formed.

In the olden days before the hapless year of 1937 the procedure was that once in six months the Jewish Agency presented to the Government an estimate of the absorptive economic capacity for workers alone—that did not affect other categories. Then there was an argument between us and the Government as to whether our figures were correct, and the Government usually cut our figures down very liberally and gave us what they said they thought was the absorptive economic capacity of Palestine. They used to call it EACOP—Economic Absorptive Capacity of Palestine—in those days. But if you ask me with regard to the total absorptive economic capacity, we could—and I think we shall—present you with an estimate of the possibility of economic absorptive capacity during the coming years, during a period of twelve months. We shall say, this is what we think it is.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose the question depends also on the capital you want to invest.

Mr. SHERTOK: Naturally that has to be considered.

CHAIRMAN: It is a question which will be interesting to us.

Mr. SHERTOK: May I say I refer only *en passant* to our hope that there will be considerable Jewish immigration. I did not deal with the subject.

CHAIRMAN: Just as little as my question indicates an inclination for a certain solution.

Mr. SHERTOK: May I say that to us economic capacity and the adoption of that principle means freedom to create economic capacity. It does not merely mean ability to estimate, but freedom to create it.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): With a view to the future work of the Committee, would Mr. Shertok indicate broadly how his Organization would contemplate the presentation and development of the case it wishes to put before the Committee

both by way of written material and also oral statements, to the extent to which the Committee desire to hear? In particular, I have before me now a volume entitled *The Jewish Case* as presented before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry of last year. In particular it will be helpful, I think, to know whether we are to take this as still the substantial basis of the case which will be before this Committee, or whether we may expect supplementary documentation to bring the volume up to date.

Mr. SHERTOK: In the covering letter to the volume to which Mr. Hood has referred, addressed, I believe, to you, Sir, it was made clear by our Chairman that we present this volume to you with a view to its being regarded by you as a basis for the presentation of our case to this Committee. At the same time our Chairman said that we intended to supplement the material contained in this volume by a series—a short one, I hope—of memoranda and notes bringing certain information up to date and filling certain gaps left by our case as contained in this volume. We intend to do it within the coming weeks of your inquiry in Palestine. We hope to complete this before you leave the country.

With regard to oral evidence we take it that we shall be given opportunity to make our representations orally before this table after—as I understand from your Secretariat—you have completed your tour of Palestine. I would suggest that this question may be gone into between our liaison officer and the Secretary of the Committee with regard to arrangement of details as to dates and who is to appear.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose at the oral hearing you are going also to give the outline of what is stated in the written statement.

Mr. SHERTOK: It will mean generally covering the same ground.

At this point, the CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Shertok and Mr. Horowitz for their contribution and the Committee passed to the next item on the agenda.

#### *Itinerary of Tour*

The Committee proceeded to examine the report of its sub-committee on this question.

#### *Decisions*

1. It was decided to adopt the recommendation of the sub-committee regarding visits to Haifa (Thursday) and the Palestine Potash Works, the Jordan and Jericho (Friday).

2. A decision concerning a Saturday excursion was deferred pending further consideration by the sub-committee.

3. The CHAIRMAN announced there would not be any trips made on Sunday (22 June) or Monday by the Committee.

4. It was agreed that the party would travel together during the trips on Thursday and Friday.

5. It was agreed that the Liaison Officers should accompany the Committee.

*The meeting adjourned at 6.50 p.m.*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem, Palestine, Friday, 4 July 1947, at 9.30 a.m.*

#### *Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

#### *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I declare the Sixteenth Meeting open.

### **Adoption of the Agenda**

CHAIRMAN: The only point on the agenda is the public hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency. I think we can adopt this agenda.

Will you come to the table here, Mr. Ben Gurion?

### **Continuation of Hearing of Representatives of the Jewish Agency**

*(Mr. Ben Gurion, (representative of the Jewish Agency), took a seat at the table.)*

I recognize Mr. Ben Gurion.

MR. BEN GURION (Representative of the Jewish Agency): Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, first of all I wish to congratulate your Committee on the procedure you have adopted in conducting your inquiry, of seeing things for yourselves before hearing oral evidence. While the limited time may have prevented you from seeing more, I believe that direct contact with realities in Palestine will help you more than anything else to understand at least a part of the problem which you have to study. On behalf of the Jewish people I wish to express our sincerest wish that your mission may be successful in reaching the full truth of the problem you have been set and a maximum of justice in its solution.

We have had a rather long and disappointing experience of numerous commissions of enquiry which were sent to Palestine by the Mandatory Government to enquire into things perfectly well-known to everybody and to make recommendations which remained on paper. This explains why many people here are rather sceptical about the value of all these enquiries. We are still baffled by what happened to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry last year, which was publicised beforehand as a tremendous achievement by the present Government in London, and whose unanimous recommendations



were later shelved contemptuously by the same Government. And if, in spite of all that, we heartily welcome this new inquiry, it is not because we have any reason to believe that on this occasion the Mandatory Government will respect your views any more than those of your predecessors. The official statements made by spokesmen of the Mandatory Power whether in the House of Commons or in the Special Assembly of the United Nations in May this year, do not encourage such a belief overmuch.

We welcome this inquiry committee because it has been sent by the United Nations. It is fitting that this highest international forum in the world should deal with those twin problems of the Jews and Palestine, as they both are international in their character. There is hardly a country in the world, perhaps with the exception of the countries in the Far East from India to Japan, which has no direct concern with the Jewish problem and Palestine is certainly not a matter for England alone, which is here only as temporary trustee to carry out an international mandate under specific conditions and with a specific purpose. The settlement of these twin problems is perhaps the supreme test of the United Nations, a test both of their freedom and ability to deal with an issue involving as it does a conflict between a small, weak people and a powerful world empire; to deal with it not as a matter of power politics and political expediency, but as a question of justice and equity, as far as these are attainable in human affairs, and in accordance with the merits of the case.

The United Nations in our view embody the most ardent hope and the most vital needs of the peoples of the world—a hope and a need for peace, stable and lasting peace, which is possible only if based on justice, equality and co-operation between nations great and small; a hope and a need for a comprehensive international system establishing relations between peoples, on the rule of right instead of might, on mutual help instead of competition, on freedom, equality and good will instead of oppression, discrimination and exploitation; The Jewish people, no less than any other people in the world, is deeply anxious for these ideals to prevail, and that for two reasons—because of our spiritual heritage and tradition, and because of our unique position in the world.

The gospel of lasting peace, brotherhood and justice as between nations was proclaimed thousands of years ago by the Jewish prophets in this country, perhaps in this very city, the eternal city in which you are now holding your inquiry. More than 3,300 years ago, when our ancestors were on their way from the house of bondage in Egypt to the Promised Land they were taught by our lawgiver and the greatest of our prophets, the supreme command for men on earth—"thou shalt love thy fellow-men as thyself," and that if "a stranger sojourn with you in your land . . . that stranger shall be unto you as one home-born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself, for we were strangers in the land of Egypt."

The prophets who followed Moses—Isaiah, Hosea, Micah and others—proclaimed the gospel of social justice and international brotherhood and peace. They left us the vision of a future when the people "shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

The teachings and ideals of our prophets together with the peculiar nature of our country, the uniqueness of its structure and its geographical position, all shaped the character of our people and its civilization, and made us perhaps the most exclusive and the most universal of nations, since ancient times up to the present. When we were still living independently in our country we clashed with the civilizations of great and powerful neighbours, first Egypt and Babylon, then Greece and Rome, who tried to crush our individuality and assimilate us among them. (With an indomitable obstinacy we always preserved our identity.) Our entire history is a history of continuous resistance to superior physical forces which tried to wipe out our Jewish image and to uproot our connections with our country and with the teaching of our prophets. We did not surrender, we never surrender to sheer physical force deprived of moral validity. We paid a dear price for our resistance. We lost our independence. We were dispossessed of our homeland. We were exiled to strange lands. The pressure against us in the Diaspora was even stronger and still we persevered.

In almost every country of our dispersion and in every generation our forefathers gave their lives for "Kiddush Hashem," which literally translated means "The Sanctification of the Name." They gave their lives out of fidelity to their religious, national and human ideals. In this resistance the soul of our people was forged, and this gave us strength to survive until now. There were two main things which enabled us to survive all these persecutions—our faith in Zion, faith in our national revival, and our faith in the vision of our prophets for the future, and our faith in a new world of justice and peace. That is why we are so anxious for the success of the United Nations. But it is not only our spiritual heritage, but also our peculiar position in the world which makes us attach so much value to the United Nations and its aims and aspirations.

We are a small, weak, defenceless people, and we know that there can be no security for us, either as individuals nor as a people, neither in the Diaspora nor in our Homeland, even after we become an independent nation in our own state, as long as the whole human family is not united in peace and good will.

The case before you is rather a complicated one. It involves, first, relations between Jews and Gentiles; second, relations between the Jewish national home and the Mandatory Power; third, relations between Jews and Arabs.

On the first point I shall confine myself to a few remarks. You are faced with a tragic prob-

lem, perhaps the tragic problem of our time and of many generations, of a people which was twice forcibly driven out of its country and which never acquiesced in its dispossession, and although it was its bitter destiny to wander in exile for many centuries it always remained attached with all its heart and soul to its historic homeland. It is a unique fact in world history, but it is a real, living, incontestable fact.

During your short visit in this country you have seen, I believe, some manifestations of this deep attachment. You have seen Jews from all parts of the world—the call of the homeland brought them here—who with passionate devotion to the soil of their ancestors are endeavoring to regenerate a people and a land. An unbroken tie between our people and our land has persisted through all these centuries in full force because of two fundamental historical facts: first, this country has remained largely desolate and waste while possessing great potentialities of development, given the need, skill, means and devotion for their realization. Second, Jewish homelessness and insecurity in the Diaspora, which is the underlying cause of all Jewish suffering and persecution. Jewish misery may vary from time to time, it may become more or less acute, but it never ceases. Jewish insecurity originates in three fundamental disabilities of Jews throughout the world; they are deprived of statehood, they are homeless and they are in a minority position everywhere. Unless and until these three disabilities are completely and lastingly remedied, there is no hope for the Jewish people, nor can there be justice in the world.

The homelessness and minority position make the Jews always dependent on the mercy of others. The "others" may be good and may be bad, and the Jews may some time be treated more or less decently, but they are never masters of their own destiny, they are entirely defenceless when the majority of people turn against them. What happened to our people in this war is merely a climax to uninterrupted persecution to which we have been subjected for centuries by almost all the Christian and Moslem peoples in the old world.

There were and there are many Jews who could not stand it, and they deserted us. They could not stand the massacres and expulsions, the humiliation and discrimination, and they gave it up in despair. But the Jewish people as a whole did not give way, did not despair or renounce its hope and faith in a better future, national as well as universal.

And here we are, not only we the Jews of Palestine, but the Jews throughout the world—the small remnant of European Jewry and Jews in other countries.<sup>1</sup> We claim our rightful place under the sun as human beings and as a people, the same right as other human beings and peoples possess,<sup>2</sup> the right to security, freedom, equality, statehood and membership in the United Nations.<sup>3</sup> No individual Jew can be really free, secure and equal anywhere in the world as long as the Jewish people as a people is not

again rooted in its own country as an equal and independent nation.

An international undertaking was given to the Jewish people some thirty years ago in the Balfour Declaration and in the Mandate for Palestine, to reconstitute our national home in our ancient homeland. This undertaking originated with the British people and the British Government. It was supported and confirmed by 52 nations and embodied in an international instrument known as the Mandate for Palestine. The Charter of the United Nations seeks to maintain "justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law." Is it too presumptuous on our part to expect that the United Nations will see that obligations to the Jewish people too are respected and faithfully carried out in the spirit and the letter?

This brings me to the second phase of the problem, the conflict between the Mandatory power and the Jewish people. It is a very sad and very painful conflict for us. It is a conflict of two unequal parties.

On the one hand a great world power, possessing tremendous military, economic, territorial and political resources, linked in a community of interest and alliance with a great number of large and small peoples, enjoying, deservedly, great moral prestige for the heroic part it played in the last war, wielding unlimited power in this country, backed as it is by large military forces on land, at sea and in the air.

On the other hand, a stateless, homeless, defenceless, small people with nothing but the graves of six million dead, hundreds of thousands of homeless and displaced persons, having to rely only on its own constructive will and creative effort, on the justice of its case and the intrinsic value of its work, on its natural and historic right to its ancient homeland, where the first foundations have already been laid for a regenerated Jewish Commonwealth.<sup>4</sup> What is the nature of the conflict?

Palestine is not a part of the British Empire. Great Britain is here as a mandatory to give effect to the internationally guaranteed pledges given to the Jewish people in the Balfour Declaration.

It will be to the everlasting credit of the British people that it was the first in modern times to undertake the restoration of Palestine to the Jewish people. Jews in England were and are treated as equals. A British Jew can be and has been a member of the Cabinet, a Chief Justice, a Viceroy, and can occupy any other place in the political and economic life of the country. Only those who in such a way could respect the rights of Jews as individuals could also recognize the rights of Jews as a people. The Balfour Declaration was in the first place a public recognition of the Jews as a people, in the second place a recognition of the Jewish people's right to a national home; in the third place, of a national home not merely for Jews, but for the Jewish people in its entirety.

The Balfour Declaration did not come out of the blue, British statesmen and thinkers had long taken a great interest in the national revival of the Jews in Palestine. In 1902, the British Government set up a Royal Commission to enquire into the question of aliens in England. Dr. Herzl, whose book on "The Jewish State as the only solution of the Jewish problem" was epoch-making in our history and who became the founder of modern Zionism, was invited by His Majesty's Government to give evidence before that Commission. His statement at the hearings that "the solution of the Jewish difficulty is the recognition of the Jews as a people and the finding by them of a legally-recognized home, to which Jews in those parts of the world where they are oppressed would naturally migrate" fell on fertile soil, and met with deep sympathy in the British Government. Palestine was then still part of the Ottoman Empire, so Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, offered Uganda to the Jews. While our people was deeply grateful for such an unprecedented offer, it was rejected by us for the simple reason that it was not our historic homeland, it was not the Land of Israel. It was Russian and East European Jews who were mainly responsible for the rejection, in spite of the fact that the plight of our people in many countries and especially in Czarist Russia was at that time desperate. The British Government offered then the Zionists an alternative, a large area on the border of Palestine known as El Arish, which had been detached from Ottoman rule. This plan, too, came to nothing because of lack of water, and it was only the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in the first world war which gave the British an opportunity to restore Palestine to the Jews.

The Balfour Declaration was not the first of its kind, just as this is not our first return. After the destruction of our first commonwealth by the Assyrians and Babylonians, the Persian King Cyrus the Great in the year 538 B.C. made the first "Balfour Declaration," as we are told in the Book of Ezra:

"In the first year of Cyrus King of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus King of Persia, that he made a proclamation to the Jews throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, 'Thus saith Cyrus King of Persia: All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord, the God of heaven, given me; and He hath charged me to build Him a house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whosoever there is among you of all His people—his God be with him—let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord.' The Iranian representative will excuse me for using the word "Persia" but that was the use in the Bible.

2,455 years after the Cyrus Declaration, another one was issued by Mr. Balfour on behalf of His Majesty's Government on November 2, 1917. I can safely assume that all of you are acquainted with the text of that document, but

I must draw your attention to the first and last sentences, which are sometimes omitted when that document is quoted. The opening is this: "Dear Lord Rothschild, I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet." And the last sentence reads: "I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation." The text of this declaration had been submitted to President Wilson and had been approved by him before its publication. The first people after Britain and America to associate itself with this declaration was Yugoslavia, or as it was then called, Serbia. Then came the confirmation of France, Italy, China and many others. Emir Feisal representing the Arabs at the Peace Conference on behalf of his father, the Sherif of Mecca, gave it his blessing.)

"The field in which the Jewish National Home was to be established was understood at the time of the Balfour Declaration to be the whole of historic Palestine," stated the Royal Commission for Palestine of 1937. That is to say it included Transjordan. The meaning of the national home was at that time made abundantly clear by the authors of the Declaration. Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister at the time, testified: "The idea was, that a Jewish State was not to be set up immediately by the Peace Treaty . . . it was contemplated that . . . if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth." The Royal Commission for Palestine, which examined the records bearing upon the question, stated in its report that "His Majesty's Government evidently realized that a Jewish State might in course of time be established, but it was not in a position to say that this would happen, still less to bring it about of its own motion." The Commission goes on to cite the authors of the Declaration. President Wilson, Lord Robert Cecil, General Smuts and Sir Herbert Samuel and others spoke or wrote in terms that could only mean that they contemplated the eventual establishment of a Jewish State.

There are also records pointing to the numerical size of the National Home. George Adam Smith, a great scholar whose book the "Historical Geography of the Holy Land" is a classic on the subject and as far as I know is the best book on Palestine in any language, published in 1918, when the first world war was still in progress, a pamphlet on "Syria and the Holy Land." Discussing (on page 46) the nature of the Jewish desire to return to Palestine he wrote:

"Towards the fulfilment of a national restoration Zionists reckon, not without reason, on the migration of millions of Jews to Palestine. However Jewry may be divided in opinion as to the shape which that restoration should take, there is little doubt that, given freedom to return and possess land under their own laws, Jews would

resort to Palestine in sufficient number to form a nation. Moreover, there is room for them in the country; from what we have seen, its capacity to support them is not to be denied, nor, as their colonies have shown, can we doubt their ability to develop this."

Mr. Winston Churchill, in a statement published on the 8th of February, 1920, said:

"If, as may well happen, there should be created in our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred in the history of the world which would from every point of view be beneficial, and would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire."

And what is perhaps especially significant in this respect is the agreement concluded between the Emir Feisal and Dr. Weizmann on January 3, 1919. Article 4 of the agreement lays down that:

"All necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale, and as quickly as possible to settle Jewish immigrants upon the land through closer settlement and intensive cultivation of the soil."

In 1922, before the Mandate for Palestine had been approved by the League of Nations, the first White Paper on Palestine, the so-called Churchill White Paper (Command Paper No. 700) was published. It contains correspondence between His Majesty's Government, the Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organization and a statement on policy in Palestine. In a letter to the Arab Delegation dated March 1, 1922, it is stated, "The position is that His Majesty's Government are bound by a pledge (the Balfour Declaration) which is antecedent to the Covenant of the League of Nations, and they cannot allow a constitutional position to develop in a country for which they have accepted responsibility to the Principal Allied Powers, which may make it impracticable to carry into effect a solemn undertaking given by themselves and their Allies."

The statement points out that the Jewish National Home in Palestine does not mean "the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing community with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world . . . in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish National Home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognized to rest upon ancient historic connexion . . ."

The Royal Commission, in examining that statement, declared,

"This definition of the National Home has sometimes been taken to preclude the establishment of a Jewish State. But, though the phraseology was clearly intended to conciliate, as far as might be, Arab antagonism to the National Home, there is nothing in it to prohibit the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State, and Mr. Churchill himself has told us in evidence that no such prohibition was intended."

On July the 24th, 1922, the Mandate for Palestine was confirmed by the Council of the League of Nations. The Mandate embodied the Balfour Declaration and it added a meaningful amplification. After citing in a preamble the text of the declaration it added, "recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish People with Palestine and to the ground for reconstituting—'not constituting'—their national home in that country."

In commenting on the Mandate, the Royal Commission made the following observation:

" . . . Unquestionably, the primary purpose of the Mandate as expressed in its preamble and its articles, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home."

In 1936 large-scale Arab riots broke out which later received the help of the Axis partners. A Royal Commission was then sent out to "ascertain the underlying cause of the disturbances, to enquire into the manner in which the Mandate is being implemented, and to ascertain whether Arabs and Jews have any legitimate grievances" against "the way the Mandate is being implemented."

The Commission found "that though the Arabs have benefited by the development of the country owing to Jewish immigration, this has had no conciliatory effect. On the contrary, improvement in the economic situation in Palestine has meant deterioration of the political situation" (Report of Palestine Royal Commission, chapter 19, Paragraph 2). The Commission thought that "the obligations Britain undertook towards the Arabs and the Jews some twenty years ago have not lost in moral or legal weight through what has happened since, but the trouble is that these obligations proved to be irreconcilable. The Mandate is unworkable . . ." They reached therefore the conclusion that the only solution lay in the partition of the country into two States, a Jewish and an Arab State.

The main advantages, according to the Royal Commission, of partition to the Arabs are: (1) they will obtain their national independence; (2) they will finally be delivered from the fear of what they call being "swamped" by the Jews. The advantages of partition for the Jews are, in the view of the Commission: (1) it relieves the National Home from the possibility of its being subjected in the future to Arab rule; (2) it enables the Jews in the fullest sense to call their national home their own: for it converts it into a Jewish State. "Its citizens will be able to admit as many Jews into it as they themselves believe can be absorbed. They will attain the primary objective of Zionism—a Jewish na-

tion planted in Palestine, giving its nationals the same status in the world as other nations give theirs."

The Zionist Congress which assembled after the publication of the Royal Commission's report considered its proposals, which had been approved by His Majesty's Government. A considerable minority was for rejecting the plan in principle, as inconsistent with the obligations to the Jewish people, its historic rights, and its vital interests. The majority was opposed to the concrete proposals of the Commission mainly for two reasons: that the Negeb, the unsettled and uncultivated part of Southern Palestine, was excluded, as well as Jerusalem. Everybody admitted that the Holy Places ought to be internationally safeguarded and that the Old City of Jerusalem required a special regime. But there were very grave objections to the exclusion of Jewish Jerusalem from the Jewish State. At the same time the majority decided to empower the Executive to negotiate with the Government, and if a satisfactory plan for a Jewish State emerged it would be submitted to a Congress to be elected for decision. I want to add that last year when the so-called Morrison Plan was discussed, the Jewish Agency Executive decided that it could not accept that plan as a basis for discussion but it was ready to consider an offer for a viable Jewish State in an adequate area of Palestine. The same attitude was maintained last winter after the last Congress in our oral discussion with the Government in London.

Meanwhile Mr. Chamberlain's Government changed its mind and sent out another Commission which reported against partition. A year later, in May 1939, an entirely new policy was inaugurated, which actually scrapped the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate. The policy of the White Paper of 1939 which can be briefly summarized in the following three principles:

1. Jews to remain a permanent minority not to exceed a third of the population.

After the admission of another 75,000 immigrants over the next 5 years, "no further Jewish immigration will be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it."

2. Jews not to be allowed to acquire land and to settle except in a very limited area of Palestine.

3. Within ten years an independent Palestine State to be established in such treaty relations with the United Kingdom as will provide satisfactorily for the commercial and strategic requirements of both countries in the future.

In February, 1940, in pursuance of the new policy a new Land Ordinance was promulgated which established three zones in Palestine: Zone A comprising 6,415 square miles, 63.1 of the total area of Western Palestine, where a Jew is prohibited from acquiring land, water, buildings, trees, or any interest or right over land, water, buildings or trees by purchase, lease, mortgage, charge or any other disposition. Zone B, comprising some 3,225 square miles, 31.8 per cent of the total, is the restricted zone: there

special permission in writing from the High Commissioner, which may at his unfettered discretion grant or refuse, is necessary if a Jew wants to acquire lands, buildings, trees, etc., from an Arab. The third Zone, where the Jews are free to buy land, is only 5 per cent of the area of Palestine.

When the White Paper quota of 75,000 immigrants was exhausted at the end of the war, the present Government fixed a political maximum of 1,500 a month, in keeping with the terms of the White Paper of 1939, that the Jewish population should not exceed approximately a third of the total.

In the memorandum presented to you by the Government of Palestine on the "Administration of Palestine under the Mandate" you are told that the two measures under the White Paper, the prohibition of Jewish settlement on land and the arbitrary limitation of immigration, have been bitterly resented by the Jews who have represented that they are contrary to His Majesty's Government's obligations under the Mandate. This is one of the half-truths in which that document abounds. It is quite true that the Jewish people, as stated by the Jewish Agency on 17 May 1939, the day that the White Paper was issued, "regard this breach of faith as a surrender to Arab terrorism. It delivers Great Britain's friends into the hands of those who are fighting her. It must widen the breach between Jews and Arabs, and undermine the hope of peace in Palestine. It is a policy in which the Jewish people will not acquiesce. The new regime announced in the White Paper will be devoid of any moral basis and contrary to international law. Such a regime can only be set up and maintained by force." But it is not quite accurate, as the memorandum seems to indicate, that it is merely a Jewish assertion that the White Paper violates the Mandate.

The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, the only international institution which was asked by the Mandatory to consider the proposals of the White Paper, declared unanimously that "the policy set out in the White Paper was not in accordance with the interpretation which in agreement with the Mandatory Power and the Council of the League of Nations Commission had always placed upon the Palestine Mandate." The majority of the Commission, the chairman, M. Orts, from Belgium, the vice-chairman, Professor Rappard, from Switzerland, Baron van Asbeck from Holland and Mademoiselle Dannevig from Norway, declared that the very terms of the Mandate and the fundamental intentions of its authors ruled out any conclusion that the policy of the White Paper was in conformity with the Mandate.

But it was not only the Permanent Mandates Commission which condemned the White Paper. In a debate in the House of Commons in May, 1939, Mr. Herbert Morrison, now Lord President of the Council in the Labour Government, declared bluntly on behalf of the Labour Party, "We regard the White Paper and the policy in

it as a cynical breach of pledges given to the Jews and the world, including America." Mr. Clement Attlee, the present Prime Minister said then, "The action of the Government"—of Mr. Chamberlain—"in making themselves the judge of their own case, in taking action contrary to the Permanent Mandates Commission's decision and in disregarding the Council of the League of Nations, will cause very wide feeling that instead of acting on their obligations under the Mandate they are flouting the policy of the League and international law."

The Labour Party at its annual conference in Southport in 1939 accepted a resolution to the same effect. Mr. Winston Churchill was not less outspoken in his criticism of the White Paper. He said: "I regret very much that the pledge of the Balfour Declaration, supported as it has been by successive Governments, and the condition under which we obtained the Mandate have been violated by the Government's proposals." To whom was the pledge of the Balfour Declaration made? It was not made to the Jews of Palestine; it was not made to those who were actually living in Palestine. It was made to world Jewry and in particular to the Zionist associations.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords pointed out that the White Paper imposed a minority status on the Jews in Palestine. "They"—the Jews—he said, "shall return in their National Home to that minority status which has been their lot through long centuries in every part of the world . . . Whatever a National Home may have meant . . . it surely cannot have meant that."

When the Land Regulation of 1940 was discussed in the House of Commons, Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, the present Secretary of State for Air in the Labour Government, introduced on behalf of the Labour Party a motion which reads as follows:

"That this House regrets that, disregarding the express opinion of the Permanent Mandates Commission that the Policy contained in the White Paper on Palestine was inconsistent with the terms of the Mandate, and without the authority of the Council of the League of Nations, His Majesty's Government have authorized the issue of regulations controlling the transfer of land which discriminates unjustly against one section of the inhabitants of Palestine."

In his speech, Mr. Noel-Baker stated "A year ago, the Arab delegation told the London Conference that there were 19 million dunums of land in Palestine which they could not cultivate. The Jews have already begun to show that they can cultivate it. This will have to stop because it is the prohibited zone." And he gave economic, political and moral reasons against the racial discriminations.

Seven years have passed since then; Hitler has been destroyed and the Nuremberg Laws are abolished in the whole of Europe. Palestine is now the only place in the civilized world where racial discrimination still exists in law. Even if

there were no National Home we should not acquiesce in such discrimination. We should not acquiesce in being deprived of the elementary right of citizens, the right of free movement and settlement in the country in which we live, of being deprived of equality before the law. But this is our National Home. Eighty generations lived and died with the hope of Zion. A great people and the entire civilized world recognized our right to reconstitute our National Home here. And now the same Government that was charged with that sacred trust of promoting the Jewish National Home has put us into a territorial ghetto, condemned us to live as in Czarist Russia in a pale of settlement. In our long history we have suffered many cruel persecutions, but to be locked up in a ghetto in our own country, to be debarred from our own ancestral soil, lying derelict and waste, such cruel torment even we have not hitherto experienced. Is it conceivable that the United Nations should allow those racial laws to exist in the Holy Land for a single day after the matter was referred to them? The Anglo-American Committee headed by two judges, one English and one American, unanimously requested "that the Land Transfers Regulations of 1940 be rescinded." That decision was published on 20 April 1946. The racial land law still exists.

The racial law is not merely a flagrant breach of international obligations under the Mandate. It gravely endangers the status of Jews throughout the world. If the Mandatory Government can enact racial discrimination against Jews in their own homeland, why should not other Governments, who are not bound by such international obligations, be allowed to enact similar racial laws against Jews everywhere? The racial boycott which the Arab League has proclaimed against Jewish goods is not entirely unconnected with the racial land law enacted by the Mandatory Power. And even before an Arab State has been established in Palestine, the Arab Higher Committee and the Arab League have requested that not only should the existing racial land restrictions remain in the new Palestine State, but that the constitution should provide that this discrimination cannot be removed even by a majority in Parliament, but only by a majority of Arab members of the Legislative Assembly. This is the civic education given to the non-Jewish inhabitants in Palestine and to the Arab people in the neighbouring countries by the Mandatory Power.

I shall now turn to the second restriction, that on immigration. When the White Paper was introduced in 1939, Mr. Churchill said that this was a mortal blow to the Jewish people. I am sorry to say, he did not exaggerate. The White Paper, in closing the gates of Palestine to Jews in the hour of the greatest peril, is responsible for the death of tens of thousands, perhaps of hundreds of thousands of Jews who could have been saved from the gas-chambers had Palestine been open to them. Just before the war we applied to the Colonial Secretary for permission to bring over 20,000 Jewish children



from Poland and 10,000 youth from the Balkan countries. Permission was refused and those 20,000 Jewish children and the 10,000 youth were put to death. There were times when Jews could still escape from Nazi-occupied territories, but the gates of their National Home were closed by the Mandatory Power and they were sent to their death in Dachau and Treblinka. I do not know whether you remember the case of the "Struma." It was a small ship which left Roumania at the end of December 1941, with 769 refugees. Roumania was then under Nazi occupation. The position of Jews there, as in other Nazi-occupied countries, was desperate. Jews, old and young, women and children, were herded into goods-trains and dispatched to unknown destinations, which meant death in gas-chambers somewhere in Poland. On many occasions, they were collected in the streets and machine-gunned on the spot. In the city of Jassy alone 8,000 Jews were assembled in the market-place and machine-gunned in cold blood. Whoever could do so tried to escape to the sea. The "Struma" was a cattle-boat which had originally been built for navigation on the Danube. The 769 refugees who managed to reach it did not care very much about the amenities of sea-travel; to get to Palestine or not meant life or death. The trip from the port of embarkation in Roumania to Istanbul took four days. The passengers were not allowed to land in Turkey, as they had no visas either for Turkey or for their final destination. All the efforts of the Jewish Agency to get permission from the Government for them to enter Palestine were of no avail. The Agency was not even allowed to allot certificates in their possession to these unfortunate people, the reason given being that they were enemy subjects. The agony dragged on for more than two months. On 18 February, the Government agreed to allow children below the age of 1 to land, but it was already too late. The boat had to leave Istanbul. On 24 February, the "Struma" went down with 764 passengers. The refugees of the "Struma" were not the only direct victims of the White Paper, nor did all the refugee victims who came in ships die by drowning.

Some of them were killed by His Majesty's Forces. A few were killed on the eve of the war, on September 1, 1939, when the boat "Tiger Hill" reached the shores of Tel-Aviv and was fired on. More recently, in May 1947, three refugees were killed on the ship the "Theodore Herzl" which was intercepted by His Majesty's Navy.

In a debate in the House of Lords on April 23 last, a noble Lord, Lord Altrincham (formerly Sir Edward Grigg), who had been British representative in the Middle East during the war, expressed his horror and disgust at illegal immigration into Palestine. His Lordship called the desperate attempts of refugees in the camps of Europe to reach their homeland "a traffic carried on under conditions which really resemble the old slavetrade across the Atlantic." He knew that "the human cargoes do start out

borne up by hope, but that hope is doomed to end in the most terrible disillusionment." He calls this unauthorized escape to Palestine an "inhuman process, disgusting and disgraceful."

I happened to be in London in the darkest hours of the war for England, when France had collapsed and Belgium surrendered, when England stood alone and the small remnant of the British Army on the Continent was desperately trying to get back through Dunkirk. They did not wait for the luxury of the "Queen Mary" and the "Queen Elizabeth," nor did they care about the seaworthiness of the ramshackle, filthy, little boats which assembled from all parts of England to save that valiant remnant. All the British people were proud of Dunkirk, and rightly so. It was a great military disaster turned into a greater moral triumph. We suffered a greater disaster in Europe than the British Army. Not a few thousands, not tens of thousands, but millions, six millions were put to death. Can anybody realise what that means? What that means to us? Can one realise—a million Jewish babies burned in gas-chambers? A third of our people, almost as many as the whole population of Sweden, murdered.

Not all Jews in Europe were exterminated: out of 9,270,000 Jews who lived in continental Europe in 1939—some 3,000,000 have remained alive (including Jews in U.S.S.R.). Out of 3,250,000 Jews in Poland—150,000, out of 850,000 in Roumania—300,000, out of 360,000 in Czechoslovakia—33,000, and so on. Hundreds of thousands of these survivors are still in camps, in that same Germany, surrounded by the murderers of their people, surrounded by the same hatred as under Hitler. In a Gallup Poll recently taken by the American Military authorities in the American Zone of Germany, 60% of the Germans approached approved of the massacre of the Jews by Hitler, 14% condemned the murders, 26% were "neutral." The Jews do not want to stay where they are. They want to regain their human dignity, their homeland, they want a reunion with their kin in Palestine after having lost their dearest relatives. To them, the countries of their birth are a graveyard of their people. They do not wish to return there and they cannot. They want to go back to their national home, and they use Dunkirk boats. And here, as the noble Lord said in the House of Lords, "their hope is doomed to end in the most terrible disillusionment," as on the seas leading to their land they are hunted by the powerful navy of the Mandatory, and forcibly sent back to live in concentration camps again, this time in Cyprus. And we were told by the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. MacNeil, in the House of Commons on May 5, that "vigorous, extensive and varied measures are being taken" against immigration of Jews into Palestine unauthorised by the White Paper authority, meaning that pressure, economic, military and diplomatic, is being exerted by the British Government on the governments of other countries in Europe and America, to blockade the Jewish victims of

the Nazis in Europe, to close all frontiers against them for transit and exit, to keep them forcibly where they are in order to preserve the sanctity of the White Paper. Even the machinery of the United Nations is used for that inhuman purpose.

Viscount Samuel spoke the mind of the entire Jewish people when, referring to so-called illegal immigration in answer to Lord Altrincham in the House of Lords, he said, "When the noble Lord denounces with so much vehemence the horrible conditions in which these immigrants are coming in and says that we must uphold the law, the governments of the United States and other governments are inclined to ask, 'How dare you shut out these Jews and stop this immigration in defiance of the very spirit of the Mandate which you purport to administer?'" He continued, "The Government says, 'We have passed an ordinance that is the law.' The Zionist Organisation says, 'The law you have passed is itself an infringement of the law, an international law approved by the League of Nations.'"

When the war was over, the war in which a million Jewish soldiers took part in the Allied Armies, including 30,000 volunteers in Jewish units from our country, when the appalling extent of our disaster became known, we made an application for the first 100,000 refugees to be brought to Palestine. There was an acute shortage of labour here. But it soon became clear that peace came not for Jews, and that Hitler had not been defeated—as far as Jews are concerned. He may have perished at the hand of the allied armies, but his venomous doctrines against the Jews still stand. The people of Europe were liberated—but not European Jews. Displaced persons of every nation could go back to their countries, where they found a government of their own people to care for them. But the home of the Jewish displaced person was closed, and strong forces of air, sea and land were mobilised to guard the gates. Then, even the might of the British Navy did not suffice, so the whole pressure of Great Britain—economic, political and diplomatic—was brought to bear "vigorously, extensively and variedly" in Europe and the Americas, to keep the Jews where they were.

Even the unanimous recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to admit at once 100,000 refugees was turned down. Similarly, the finding of the Anglo-American experts that the country could absorb 100,000 refugees within a year had no effect.

The White Paper policy proved to be superior to all humanitarian considerations, to all the economic needs of the country, to all obligations and requirements of the Mandate. Such a policy could only be carried out by force and the Government embarked on a system of oppression which turned Palestine into a police state. All civil liberties known to English law were not merely limited but for all practical purposes abolished. Orders can be made for the detention of any person for any period or "during the High Commissioner's pleasure" without any process of trial. Thousands were in fact so de-

tained and many have been kept in detention for years. Even persons convicted by the Courts were detained after having served their sentences.

Unrestricted rights of arrest, search, confiscation of movable and immovable property, detention and deportation have been reinforced by the wide powers given to Military Courts to impose the death sentence for the use and the mere carrying of firearms, explosives, etc. Liability to the same punishment is incurred by every member of a group if such an offence is committed by any other member. Searches of agricultural settlements, whether allegedly for arms or for persons engaged in defence training, or for "illegal" immigrants, have been increasingly numerous from 1943 onwards; settlers attempting passive resistance lost their lives on more than one occasion. On the 29 June 1946, large army forces occupied 25 settlements and the premises of Jewish national institutions in the towns. Jewish elected leaders were arrested and detained for four and a half months without trial. An unprecedented house-to-house search of Tel-Aviv from 29 July to 2 August 1946, involved over twenty thousand troops. The imposition of "statutory martial law" in March 1947 deprived 240,000 Jewish inhabitants of all the ordinary mechanisms of social existence for over two weeks.

Apart from these peak phases of military activity, the month in month out regime in Palestine for years now has been one of press censorship, house curfews, road curfews, police and military searches, patrols and identity checks, accompanied by the shooting of curfew-breakers and of persons who failed to answer challenges. Whether so intended or not, this regime has been in fact one of repeated collective punishment of the entire community.

Parallel to the official measures, there have been over the years recurrent unofficial assaults by police and military on the civil population—in the prisons, in detention camps, in the streets.

I should be the last person to make wholesale accusations; on the contrary, I must record numerous occasions when British soldiers and sailors carried out the painful duties of searches, arrests and expulsion of refugees with disgust and tears in their eyes, and tried as far as was consistent with their position to help the victims of the oppressive regime. There were cases of soldiers and sailors risking their lives to save refugees from drowning, and considering the spirit of the regime and the virtual lawlessness which it has established in this country, it is a matter of surprise that the unofficial assaults were so few. It is not the soldier or the policeman who is to blame—it is the regime, the White Paper policy, the breaching of pledges, the violation of the Mandate, in short, what Mr. Churchill called the "squalid war against the Jews."

(At this point, at the request of Mr. Ben Gurion, a brief recess was declared by the Chairman. The meeting resumed at 11.15.)

At the special assembly of the United Nations



last May the British representative, Sir Alexander Cadogan, candidly admitted the failure of the Mandatory in Palestine. The Palestine Government has recently published a memorandum on the Administration of Palestine under the Mandate to explain the reasons for that failure. It tries to achieve the impossible—to justify the White Paper of 1939, to show that that policy was inherent in the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate from the beginning. There is no need for me to refute such a contention. Again, instead of telling us what the Administration did to implement the Mandate, the memorandum tells us why the Administration disliked it. In this sense it is a revealing document. For the first time the Administration has openly confessed its hostility to the Mandate in an official document. For the sake of truth I must say that this self-indictment is rather excessive. The memorandum is supposed to cover not only the period of the White Paper of 1939, but the whole period of the Mandate since 1922. It is not correct to say that the whole Administration was hostile to the Mandate all the time, as the authors of the memorandum seem to imply. There were people in the Administration who tried to carry out their duties faithfully without any personal bias. I could mention several names, but shall mention only Field-Marshal Lord Plumer, High Commissioner in 1926 and 1927, who as far as I know was neither pro-Jewish nor pro-Arab but only pro-duty, and he carried out his job honestly and simply as a straightforward soldier without fear or favour. When there was Arab unemployment he tried to find work for Arabs; when there was Jewish unemployment he tried the same for Jews. There were people like him before and after. I could even name some among those who are serving in the Administration today, but I am afraid they will be embarrassed if I do so.

But it is true that, on the whole, this memorandum reflects the general attitude of the Administration in Palestine, as well as in some other places in the Middle East and in London, which were biased against the Mandate and the National Home from the beginning, and did everything they could to obstruct the Mandate until they succeeded in superseding it by the White Paper of 1939.

A full and detailed analysis of this memorandum will be published in time and presented to the United Nations. Here I shall make only a few observations.

First of all, on the so-called dual obligation. While we still maintain that the primary purpose of the Mandate was the establishment of the Jewish National Home, we readily admit that this was not the only obligation which was incumbent on the Mandatory. Even if there were not a single word in the Mandate about the non-Jewish population in Palestine it would be the duty of the Government as a Government to promote the wellbeing and advancement of all the inhabitants without distinction, Mandate or no Mandate.

If there are any complaints against the Gov-

ernment it is not that they have done too much for the population, but that they have done almost nothing for the National Home and very little for the inhabitants of the country. In our view, it is a fallacy to regard the duty of the Government to the population as a whole as in any way conflicting with its other duty, whether primary or not, to promote the establishment of the National Home. Even this memorandum does not deny that the Jewish effort "benefited the Arab as well as the Jewish section of the population," that the progress of the country as a whole was materially assisted by Jewish development and that the increase in the country's prosperity which resulted from Jewish enterprise facilitates the financing of measures of general development.

But the memorandum makes a great point of the disparity between Jews and Arabs in Palestine; a disparity there is, in mentality and social outlook, in public spirit, in dynamic power, and in many other things. There is also a disparity between people living in the twentieth century and those living in the fifteenth or some even in the seventh century. But in stressing the point of disparity the memorandum is rather one-sided; it brings it up as an accusation against Jews and gives it as a reason for curbing their progress. Now, if a disparity between Jews and Arabs is a defect which ought to be remedied by the Administration, then the Government should mention all the disparities between Jews and Arabs and try to remedy them all.

I shall mention only a few. There is the disparity in numbers. There are some 600,000 Jews in Palestine and some 1,100,000 Arabs. There are no reliable figures in this respect. There is an even greater disparity than that. The Arabs own 94% of the land, the Jews only 6%. The Arabs have seven States, the Jews none. The Arabs have vast under-developed territories—Iraq alone is three times as large as England with less than four million people—the Jews have only a tiny beginning of a national home and even that is begrudged them by the Palestine Administration. The most glaring disparity perhaps is that the Arabs have no problem of homelessness and immigration, while for the Jews homelessness is the root cause of all their sufferings for centuries past. Some of these disparities were summed up by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations in 1939 when they said: "It should be remembered that the collective sufferings of Arabs and Jews are not comparable, since vast spaces in the Near East, formerly the abode of numerous populations and the home of a brilliant civilization, are open to the former, whereas the world is increasingly being closed to settlement by the latter."

Perhaps the most amazing statement made in that memorandum is the representation of the Jews as a "privileged group" as against the Arabs, who are shown as hewers of wood and drawers of water. It would be interesting to know what are the special privileges accorded to Jews in

Palestine. Is it that, as His Excellency the High Commissioner has mentioned the other week, that the Jews pay 70% of the taxes while the Arabs get approximately 70% of the services? But the real mischief of that statement lies rather in the second part of the sentence, denying us the privilege of being "hewers of wood and drawers of water"; we consider this as a great, true privilege. It was denied to us in many countries and many generations, when we were forced to live only in the cities, and in the cities we were confined to a limited number of occupations. We were forcibly divorced from work on the soil, and if there was an ideal, in addition to the love for our country, which animated the tens of thousands of Jewish youth who came to Palestine, it was the ideal of becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water, to do all kinds of hard physical work with their own hands, to live by the sweat of their brow. What distinguished the Jewish community in Palestine from Jewish communities in the Diaspora, is precisely that fundamental change in our economic structure, that the great majority of our people here are people who are doing hard manual work in the fields, in the factories, at sea and on the roads. In a Jewish community of some 600,000 there are more than 170,000 organised workers, men and women: that means more than one organized worker for every four persons, including the aged and babies. It is the pride of the Jewish Labour Movement in Palestine, that it raised the dignity of labour in a country where work is despised.

I had my first conflict with a High Commissioner in this country on that very question. Then I was not representing the Jewish Agency but the Jewish Labour Federation, and I came to see Sir John Chancellor, who was High Commissioner from 1928 to 1931, to ask that Jewish workers be given a share in Government road works. Sir John, who had come from Rhodesia, tried to convince me that the most suitable system for this country would be the one existing in South Africa, that the primitive, hard, unskilled work should be left to the "native," while the Jews should concentrate on skilled, better paid jobs. He was very much surprised when I told him that this was precisely the status which we would in no circumstances accept in our country. We were not here to form a superior class leaving the rough and hard work to others. While we are willing to use our brains, we must and want to use our hands and do every kind of work which is necessary for the maintenance of society.

We had the same discussions with some Jewish employers among them the great benefactor of Jewish colonisation in Palestine, the Baron Edmond de Rothschild, who set out to drain swamps and who for that job brought over workers from Egypt. We offered to do the work ourselves, and when he objected on the ground that that kind of work was unhealthy, we said that that was an additional reason why we should do it ourselves.

I could not understand this contempt implied in the memorandum for hewers of wood and drawers of water. We believe that there is no more valuable and important work in this country, or in others like it, than drawing water. You have perhaps seen something of this work in the Negev. It is unfortunate that we could not do very much as hewers of wood, because many invaders and conquerors for the last eighteen centuries have ruined the forests of this country. But we delight in being hewers of rocks and stones, which still abound here. Nothing would antagonise us more than an attempt to deprive us of the privilege of being hewers of rocks and drawers of water, as the Government is trying to do. We believe that the homeland cannot be bought nor conquered. It must be created, and created by hard work.

Another complaint made in the memorandum is that the very purpose of the National Home has prevented it "from having a character other than Jewish and . . . prevented the assimilation of the culture of the Jewish community with that of the Arab population." We plead guilty. We are Jewish and we are determined to remain so. We refused to assimilate even with highly civilized European peoples. Jews in Germany, speaking better German than Hitler, were not saved by their assimilation. We shall be as Jewish as an Englishman is English. We do not need any justification. We are developing our own civilization, our Hebrew language. We shall arrange our life and organize our notions and needs, beliefs and ideas. But this will not hinder—on the contrary, it will stimulate—our seeing in the Arab a fellow-man; a neighbour whose fate is bound up with ours and whose advancement is as vital for us as it is for him. Perhaps it may take him a little longer because of the age-old disparity of standards and other differences, but we shall do everything we can to help him reach the same economic, social and cultural level as ours.

We are not the Government of the country, unfortunately, and while we are made responsible we have no power. We can only assist Arab advancement by our example and by our conscious private efforts, and this we are doing. But nothing can be farther from us than any idea of assimilation. We reject the implication that a conscious Jew who cherishes his beliefs and language cannot co-operate with a conscious Arab who cherishes his beliefs and his language. Even when we differ on political issues, we do not see why we cannot co-operate in daily life. There is co-operation between Jewish and Arab workers, Jewish and Arab peasants, where an opportunity presents itself.

In paragraph 8 of the memorandum we are told of the "anti-racial feeling which was shown in the riots of 1920, 1921 and 1929, and Jews were murdered for being Jews during the 1936–1939 rebellion. In the countries frequently held out by the Arabs as exemplary in the matter of Arab-Jewish relations outrages against the Jews as such occurred: in Iraq in 1941; in Egypt and Tripoli in 1945." I hold

no brief for the Arabs and I shall certainly not condone Arab riots against Jews, but there are two instructive omissions in that statement. One is the failure of the Administration—here is the finding of the Royal Commission of 1937:

“The first of all conditions necessary for the welfare of any country is public security’ . . . Today it is evident that the elementary duty of providing public security has not been discharged. If there is one grievance which the Jews have undoubted right to prefer it is the absence of security. Their complaints on this head were dignified and restrained.”

The second point is that it is not fair to make the whole Arab population of Palestine responsible for these riots. Not all the Arabs took part in them; on the contrary, very large numbers of villagers, especially those near Jewish settlements, rendered valuable assistance to their Jewish neighbours, by giving them information about the Arab terrorist gangs. In these riots, especially in those of 1936 to 1939, more Arabs than Jews were murdered by Arab terrorists. All the Arab victims of Arab terrorism were from the political opponents of the Ex-Mufti.

In paragraph 11 of the memorandum there is a curious explanation of why the land policy required by the Mandate was not carried out by the Government. Two articles in the Mandate are concerned with land—one is Article 6, which requires the Government to encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish Agency, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes. The other is Article 11, which charges the Government with the introduction of a land system appropriate to the needs of the country, having regard among other things to the desirability of promoting the close settlement and intensive cultivation of the land.

For the 25 years of the Mandate both articles have been entirely neglected. Now, for the first time, the memorandum reveals the hidden reason why the land policy of the Government was “retarded.” It is due according to the memorandum to the specific mention of the Jewish Agency in relation to settlement on the land, because such mention makes the Arabs suspicious of Jewish agricultural development and this suspicion causes the land policy of the Government to be retarded. But is this the true position? The Mandate, as you know, applied until recently to both Eastern and Western Palestine. Article 25 authorized “the Mandatory to postpone or withhold application of such provisions of this Mandate as he may consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions.” In accordance with this Article all the provisions referring to the National Home and the Jewish Agency were made inapplicable to Transjordan in 1922. Moreover, Jewish immigration and settlement were entirely excluded from that part of Palestine. But Article 11 remained in force in Transjordan, and one may ask what was done by the Government to advance its land policy in that part of the mandated territory in which that curious excuse of the Jewish

Agency did not exist. Why is it that Transjordan was even less, very much less developed than Western Palestine? Why is it that Transjordan is incomparably poorer and completely undeveloped? Why is it that in Transjordan the population has remained stationary for the past 25 years, and even now when it is made an independent kingdom it can hardly support itself. Again, we have another neighbour, Iraq, where that convenient scapegoat called the Jewish National Home and the Jewish Agency cannot be produced. For more than 20 years there has been a national Arab Government there and still the country is less developed than Western Palestine—95 per cent of the population is illiterate, the mortality of children is over 50 per cent, the sanitary conditions are at an appallingly low level and the Iraq worker lives on a far lower standard than that of the Arab worker in Palestine. The memorandum does not conceal the fact that Arab progress in Palestine has been much assisted by Jewish settlement here. But it is careful to explain that both Arab and Jewish progress is due to the Administration. Again one must ask, why are these beneficial results of the Administration not evident in the other part of the mandated territory, in Transjordan? The eastern part has remained almost as it was before the British Mandate, the western part has been entirely revolutionized both in the size of its population and in the state of its development, the only difference being that on one side of the Jordan you have the National Home and the Jews, and on the other side they are absent. I do not want you to feel that it is our view that the country has not benefited at all from the Mandatory Administration. They have carried out works of which no administration need be ashamed, for example Haifa Port and many excellent roads. I would especially point out the relief from the heavy agricultural taxes which oppressed the rural population in Turkish times, I would mention the Government health and educational services, although they serve only the Arabs. But all this does not change the fundamental fact that the Mandate for Palestine has not been implemented, its primary purpose has not been carried out and was very often obstructed even before the White Paper. The Mandatory in Palestine failed not because Jews and Arabs did not co-operate, but because the Mandatory refused to co-operate with the Mandate.

The White Paper in destroying the Mandate has removed the moral and legal basis of the present régime in Palestine. It is an arbitrary rule based on force alone. It is contrary to the wishes of the entire population of the country, it causes untold sufferings to our people, it threatens our national existence. It is incompatible with international obligations and good faith.

Now the question, the main and fundamental question arises: What should be the future régime of this country? It does not matter so much what name is given to the régime, whether

you call it Mandate, International Trusteeship, Palestine State, National State, Arab State or Jewish State. Neither does it matter very much what the formal constitution would be. You have countries with good constitutions on paper and with bad governments in practice, and you have the reverse. Life does not follow paper constitutions.

I will give you an example of a name which can cover different purposes: the term or name "bi-national state." I know at least two projects for a bi-national state in Palestine which are diametrically opposed to each other. One is based on the very denial of Zionism and the National Home whereas the other is a full blooded Zionist scheme.

The anti-Zionist bi-national state is the White Paper of Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, who claims that his policy envisages neither a Jewish nor an Arab State, but a bi-national one. Although the Jews will form one-third of the population, the state will not be Arab, but will be shared by both peoples, and shared in such a way that the essential interests of each community are safeguarded. It even promises to protect the special position of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. This is a bi-national state which prohibits Jewish immigration, condemns Jews to remain a permanent minority and perpetuates the homelessness of the Jewish people.

And there is another proposal for a bi-national state advanced by an important labour left-wing group in Zionism, the Labour party "Hashomer Hatzair." It is a project to settle from two to three million Jews in Palestine in the next 25 years. For that period Palestine would be placed, according to that plan, under the administration of a special Development Authority, the specific objective of which would be:

(i) to promote the settlement in Palestine of at least 2 to 3 million Jews during the next 20 or 25 years by developing the economic possibilities of the country;

(ii) to raise the standard of living and education of the Palestinian Arabs to approximately the present Jewish level during the same period;

(iii) to promote and actively encourage Jewish-Arab co-operation as well as to encourage the gradual development of self-governing institutions, local and national, on bi-national lines, until the stage of full independence within the framework of a bi-national constitution is reached.

To achieve this, Palestine would be placed under a Permanent Supervisory Commission of the three Great Powers and this Commission would be responsible for selecting an administration fitted to fulfill the aforementioned tasks. A development Board is to be instituted by that government in which Jews and Arabs will participate in equal numbers.

When independence had been achieved after some twenty to twenty-five years, the Permanent Supervisory Commission would continue to

execute some powers of general supervision until the United Nations decided that the new constitution was working well and that Palestine was ready for membership of the United Nations.

Jews and Arabs would be organized in two national, autonomous communities; when Palestine became independent, it would be constituted as a federation of these two communities. The Central Government would consist of four members, two Arabs and two Jews, elected by a State Assembly, composed of the two National Councils of the Jewish and Arab communities and of the State Council with half Jews and half Arabs.

You can easily see that, although these are both called bi-national state plans, they mean in reality two contradictory things. The question of the future regime in Palestine is really not so much a question of legal, constitutional arrangements, but a more fundamental question of the desired future structure of the country, the make-up, and size and composition of the population and the nature of the development of its resources. The most crucial question is immigration. Here you are faced with two possible lines of action: the anti-Zionist line, which is that the constitution of the country should preserve the status quo, freeze the size and the growth of the present population, arrest the development of agriculture and industry, stop immigration and turn Jews into a statutory minority.

And there is another line—the Zionist line: that the regime of the country should be designed to realize the maximum development of all the potentialities of Palestine; to cultivate as many millions of dunums as possible out of the 18 million dunums which are at present uncultivated; to irrigate instead of 400,000 dunums as at present, at least, 4,000,000 dunums; to increase the size of the population to three or four millions and afford full opportunities for the Jewish people to rehabilitate themselves, while raising the standard of the Arabs to the same level, and in this way to create a living example for the whole Middle East, where Jews and Arabs will cooperate and work together as free and equal partners.

I venture to submit that the second line was envisaged and adopted by the statesmen—British, Arabs and Jews—at the end of the first world war when a general desire for a new social order and new international relations stirred humanity. It was felt that the time had come to redress the ancient wrong committed against the Jewish nation and to give it a chance to restore its ancient commonwealth.

It was part of a larger arrangement which gave the Arabs their national freedom after many centuries of Turkish oppression. It is wrong to regard the problem of Jewish-Arab relations only in the framework of this little country. The statesmen who were responsible for the Balfour Declaration did not envisage merely the restoration of the Jewish nation alone. At the same time they provided for the

liberation of the Arab people and they achieved this on a much larger scale and in a more effective way. The Arabs gained their freedom in an area of 1,250,000 square miles, 125 times as large as the area of Western Palestine with a population of some 15 to 16 million Arabs—about the number of Jews living then in the world.

This was the real two-fold arrangement made with the Arabs and the Jews. The freedom of the Arab people in their countries—the restoration of Palestine to the Jewish people.

The representatives of the Arabs saw and acknowledged this two-fold arrangement, as can be seen from the following preamble to the Feisal-Weizmann agreement:

“His Royal Highness the Emir Feisal, representing and acting on behalf of the Arab Kingdom of Hedjaz, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, representing and acting on behalf of the Zionist Organization,

mindful of the racial kinship and ancient bonds existing between the Arabs and the Jewish people, and realizing that the surest means of working out the consummation of their national aspirations is through the closest possible collaboration in the development of the Arab State and Palestine, and being desirous further of confirming the good understanding which exists between them,

have agreed upon the following articles:— . . .”

And then the articles follow. The Mecca newspaper, “Al Qibla,” carried an article, in its 183rd issue of March 23, 1918, written by King Hussein himself, “calling upon the Arab population in Palestine to bear in mind their sacred books and their traditions, and exhorting them to welcome the Jews as brethren and co-operate with them for the common welfare.”

While realizing that the aspirations of the Jews and Arabs would be fully met—those of the Jews in Palestine, those of the Arabs in the Arab countries—the statesmen then were not unaware of the existence of Arabs in Palestine, nor were they unmindful of their interests. But these interests were limited to civil and religious rights, and did not comprise political aspirations which were fully met in the Arab countries.

This was the underlying idea in the agreement between the Emir Feisal and Dr. Weizmann. It contemplated an Arab State on one side—and a Jewish Palestine on the other. While it was stipulated that measures should be taken to protect and assist the Arab peasant in Palestine it was understood that Palestine should be a Jewish State.

All the promises made to the Arabs were fulfilled, most of them at once, others after some delay. The Arab political problem has been solved completely, and the Jewish people, not less than anybody else, congratulate the Arabs on achieving their full independence.

The promise given to the Jews has not yet been fulfilled. There is no doubt what the

promise meant: Not a Hebrew University, not a cultural centre, not a community of 600,000, not a minority. British and Arab statesmen at that time knew perfectly well what the promise given to the Jews meant. The original intention of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate could have been achieved and the Jewish Commonwealth would have been an accomplished fact before the Second World War— if the Mandatory had implemented its mandatory obligations resolutely and consistently. I ask you, gentlemen, to imagine for one second that there were two or three million Jews in the Jewish State of Palestine before the outbreak of the last war. (Do you believe that the disaster which overtook our people in Europe would have happened?) Hitler oppressed and enslaved all the peoples whom he conquered: Dutch, Czech, Yugoslav and others—but there was only one people which he singled out for complete extermination, the Jewish people, because this was the only people without a land of its own, a government of its own, a state of its own, which was able to protect, to intervene, to save and to fight.

And now I put the question to you: Who is prepared and able to guarantee that what happened to us in Europe will not happen again? Can human conscience, and we believe that there is a human conscience, free itself of all responsibility for that catastrophe? There is only one safeguard: a Homeland and Statehood! A Homeland, where a Jew can return freely as of right. Statehood, where he can be master of his own destiny. These two things are possible here, and here only. The Jewish people cannot give up, cannot renounce these two fundamental rights, whatever may happen.

The problem of Jewish-Arab relations is not merely the problem of Jews and Arabs in Palestine. It is the problem of the relations of the Jewish and Arab peoples as a whole. Their national aspirations in that broader sense are not only compatible but complementary.

Nobody can seriously claim that a Jewish Palestine could in any way endanger or harm the independence or unity of the Arab race. The area of Western Palestine is less than 1% of the vast territory occupied by the Arab States in the Near East, excluding Egypt. The number of Arabs in this country is less than 3% of the number of Arabs who have gained their political independence. The Arabs in Palestine, even if they were a minority, would still be a part of that large Arab majority in the Middle East. The existence of Arab States to the north, east, and south of Palestine is an automatic guarantee, not only of the civil, religious and political rights of the Arabs in Palestine, but also of their national aspirations.

But a Jewish Palestine, a populous, highly-developed Jewish State has something of great value and importance to offer, not only to the Arabs in Palestine, but to those in the neighbouring countries as well. Even the small beginnings of the Jewish State, where Jews have

occupied and developed only a small fraction of the country, have already had a marked effect on the advancement of the population in Palestine. Even now the position of the Arab peasant and farmer in Palestine is superior to that of the Arab peasant and farmer in Arab States. Our national aim cannot be achieved without great constructive work, agricultural, industrial, material and cultural, and this must, by its nature, raise the economic and social standards of all the inhabitants of the country. We cannot fully utilize the water resources of Palestine, which are now being wasted, without providing larger irrigation possibilities for the Arab fellah as well. We cannot introduce modern methods of cultivation without the Arabs learning from that example. We cannot organize Jewish labour and improve conditions of work without similarly organizing the Arab worker and improving his conditions.

As long as the government is in foreign hands, the impact of our development on Arab advancement is small. The theory of holding the balance between Jews and Arabs, which in practice meant curbing and obstructing our work, was not only injurious to us but to the Arabs as well.

One may rightly ask: Why is it that a million Arabs can be safely left in a Jewish State and why should not a million Jews be left in an Arab State? If the Jews and the Arabs who are in Palestine were all the Jews and all the Arabs that exist in the world, this would be a very logical and conclusive argument. There would then be no reason whatsoever why one should prefer an Arab to a Jew or a Jew to an Arab, and only numbers would count. But one cannot ignore the fact that both communities living in Palestine are merely fragments of larger communities living outside, and both of them belong to these larger units and their fates are inextricably bound up with the larger units. By depriving the Jews in Palestine of a national home, by preventing them from becoming a majority and attaining statehood, you are depriving not only 600,000 Jews who are here, but also the millions of Jews who are still left in the world, of independence and statehood. In no other place can they have the desire or the prospect of attaining statehood.

In depriving the million Arabs of the same prospect, you do not affect the status of the Arab race at all. An Arab minority in a Jewish State would mean that only a certain number of individual Arabs would not enjoy the privilege of Arab statehood, but it would in no way diminish the independence and position of the free Arab race. The Arab minority in Palestine, being surrounded by Arab States, would remain safe in national association with their race. But a Jewish minority in an Arab State, even with the most ideal paper guarantee, would mean the final extinction of Jewish hope not in Palestine alone, but for the entire Jewish people, for national equality and independence, with all the disastrous consequences so familiar in Jewish history.

The conscience of humanity ought to weigh this: Where is the balance of justice, where is the greater need, where is the greater peril, where is the lesser evil and where is the lesser injustice?

The fate of the Jewish minority in Palestine will not differ from the fate of the Jewish minority in any other country, except that here it might be much worse.

We are against the continuation of a mandate, whether a British mandate or a United Nations mandate. Twenty-seven years ago England undertook, and I believe sincerely undertook, the task of settling large numbers of Jews in Palestine, sufficient to build a Jewish State. She failed in her task. It was a difficult task; it required great effort, it met with no light obstacles, and the Mandatory refused to make these efforts and to surmount all these difficulties. It was not a vital need for the Mandatory. We, too, encountered difficulties, even greater difficulties than the Mandatory. We met not only with Arab opposition, we met difficulties inherent in the nature of the country, we were handicapped by lack of experience and by lack of means. We had to collect pennies from the poor Jewish masses in all the countries, for the rich Jews, with few exceptions, were indifferent to our work and refused to assist us. We persevered. We could not retreat because we stood with our backs to the wall; we had no choice, it was a matter of life or death for us. Would a mother be deterred by obstacles when saving the life of her child?

This is why we succeeded and the Mandatory failed; not because we excelled in ability, knowledge or experience—on the contrary—but because it was a vital, dire necessity for us; we simply had to do it!

What a single Mandatory cannot do, a joint trusteeship will be able to do far less. Intensive development and large-scale immigration require a dynamic administration, constant initiative, quick decisions and continued action. An administration taking directives from different governments can hardly perform a task of this nature.

Nor can the problem be settled by setting up a bi-national state. A bi-national state, if it has any meaning at all, can only mean parity, either parity of population or parity of government. Parity of population is biologically and politically impossible; nobody can devise means to equalize the numbers of Jews and Arabs and keep that parity constant. Parity in government means permanent deadlock. For those who are satisfied with maintaining the status quo and freezing the development of the country, such a government may be satisfactory. But if development and immigration are the objects, a regime of this nature is utterly unsuitable.

Only by establishing Palestine as a Jewish State can the true objectives be accomplished: immigration and statehood for the Jews, economic development and social progress for the Arabs. With the liberation of the Middle Eastern



countries from the decadent Ottoman Empire, the Arab race achieved its political aspirations. It is still very far from economic, cultural and social liberation. Formal political independence is not enough, and the more far-sighted people among the Arab leaders realize this very well. Unless the Arab peoples advance socially, economically and culturally, their independence is an empty shell.

When the Arab race was liberated, the Jewish people too was promised national restoration. The Jewish political aspirations have not yet been attained, but a great deal has been achieved in the economic, social and cultural fields. The historic interests and aspirations of the Jews and Arabs are not mutually exclusive—they are complementary and interconnected. Each one of them has in abundance what the other needs.

Co-operation between Jews and Arabs will prove the truest blessing for both peoples. Such a co-operation can rest only upon equality. Nothing will further the Jewish-Arab alliance more than the establishment of the Jewish State. The present tension and unrest, once the main problem is finally settled, will give place to a new orientation among these two Semitic peoples.

The United Nations possess the necessary authority to undertake that great act of statesmanship, which would change the face of the entire Middle East and free the energies of the Arab and Jewish peoples for a great constructive effort.

You will achieve your mission successfully when you restore freedom to Palestine, give justice to the Jewish people and stability, progress and prosperity to the Middle East.

These three objectives can be accomplished by the immediate abolition of the White Paper, the establishment of a Jewish State and the promotion of a Jewish-Arab alliance.

CHAIRMAN: Under what heading is the evidence from the Jewish side to fall?

MR. BEN GURION: Now, a Member of the Jewish Agency, Rabbi Fishman, will make observations on the religious groups of our movement and work.

CHAIRMAN: And what will follow after that?

MR. BEN GURION: Then, if you will prefer, questions to the first two witnesses.

CHAIRMAN: I should like to hear under which headings the following evidence is to be given because I do not know if we have all the necessary material on which to base our questions on the chapter which has just ended. Though you term this conflict as primarily one between a small meek people and a powerful world Empire, that it is to say between the Jewish people and the British Empire, do you still say that the case is a "complicated one?" It involves first, you say, "relations between Jews and Gentiles; second, relations between the Jewish National Home and the Mandatory Power; third, relations between Jews and Arabs." I have the impression that you have treated here more the relations between the Jewish National Home and the Mandatory Power, and that a further

development about the relations between Jews and Arabs is still to come.

MR. BEN GURION: Yes, that was the last section of my address—about the Jewish-Arab relations.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but is there no further development still to come?

MR. BEN GURION: There will be, sir, in the evidence given on the economic development of the country, and if you will raise the questions which I did not cover then you will be given all the material, information and explanations.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I want to avoid putting questions now which might be answered in the next chapter.

MR. BEN GURION: Well, it is left to you, sir, to arrange the work of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: If a further development about the Arab and the Jewish relations is still forthcoming, I think it would be wise to put off the questioning until we have also heard that chapter.

MR. BEN GURION: As you like.

MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Mr. Gurion, I think that the Agency has a competent staff of lawyers. I should like to put some questions during the next meetings about regulations in Palestine, especially emergency regulations. As it would be possible that the representative of the Agency would say he does not know exactly or that he does not have the legal knowledge to answer these questions, I should like you to bring here one of the members of your staff of lawyers in order that he can advise you on those questions.

MR. BEN GURION: We will do it gladly, sir.

CHAIRMAN: I recognize Rabbi Fishman.

(Rabbi Fishman took his place at the table).

Rabbi FISHMAN: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, as the representative of the religious wing of the Zionist Movement on the Executive of the Jewish Agency, I would begin by recalling the eternal bond between the Jewish People and this country—the Land of Israel. There is an indissoluble bond between the People of Israel and its Torah (religion), and there is similarly a strong and enduring tie between our People and this land, the like of which is not to be found elsewhere.

About eighteen hundred years ago—a century or so after pagan Rome had robbed us of our country—a Jewish sage said that Palestine had been given to the Jewish People because it was preeminently suited to its nature and character. The peculiar features and characteristics of this country and its geographical position, surrounded as it is by sea, desert and mountains, made it indeed a fit home for a people of distinctive outlook and spiritual traditions. Rabbi Yehuda Halevi, who lived over eight hundred years ago, and was one of the greatest Jewish figures of the Middle Ages, a physician, philosopher, and poet, perhaps the most Hebrew spirit since the days of the Prophets, was wont to stress the unique character of this attachment. The period in which he lived was one of prosperity

for the Jews of Spain, where he was born. They enjoyed full civic and political rights. Nevertheless he insisted that the Jewish People in the Diaspora was a body without a heart and a soul. He wrote: "Neither in the East nor in the West is there a place of assured hope for us." There was only one cure he could prescribe for his dispersed people: to return and settle in the Land of Israel.

The bond between the People of Israel and the Holy Land was maintained throughout the ages and lands of our exile. It was upheld by the leaders of the nation in successive generations: the sages of the Talmud and Midrash, the rabbis of Halakic and Midrashic literature, the Jewish pilgrims and travellers who recorded their experiences and impressions of the Holy Land. Sermons were preached in the synagogues and houses of study concerning the sanctity of the ancestral homeland. Legends and traditions were handed down embodying ancient memories and historical associations. In every age the leaders of the Jewish People in every land were busily engaged in activities for the benefit of the Jewish population of the Holy Land. There were many movements of re-immigration to Palestine, among the most notable being those of the Jews expelled from Spain and, about 150 years ago, of the Jews of Lithuania, Poland and the Ukraine. All these helped to strengthen the spiritual tie between the Jewish People and its historic homeland, a tie that will never be sundered.

Permit me to dwell on some aspects of this unbreakable attachment.

It was in the Prophetic Books that mention was first made of "Erets Israel" (the "Land of Israel"). This, and not Palestine, is the historic name of the country. It has been known as such to the Jews from the times of the Prophets to the present day. The Books of the Prophets convey a picture of our country in all its aspects. They describe its boundaries, districts and cities; they recount its history from the days of Joshua's conquest to the return from Babylon in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is from these sources that archaeologists and historians derive their basic knowledge. Often Jews, reading in distant lands the story of the country and its historic places, have reconstructed in their imagination forgotten episodes from bygone happy days. As in a vision the ancient places would become real to them, and they would be seized with an ardent yearning to make the ascent to the Land of Israel and kiss its soil.

From the time of Joshua to the present day, for a period of 3,318 years—I am only stating here what is known to every historian—Jews have lived in the land of Israel in unbroken sequence. After the destruction of the first Temple by Babylon, and again after the destruction of the second Temple by the Romans, Jews continued to dwell on this sacred soil. Those who were exiled to foreign lands strove at all times to strengthen the Jewish population of Palestine materially and spiritually, and to extend it and ensure its continuance. I would also point out

that, since the ancient Jewish Commonwealth was destroyed Palestine has never been an independent State.

After the advent of pagan Rome, which persecuted Christianity as well as Judaism, and which destroyed the Jewish kingdom, our nation was rendered homeless and was scattered all over the globe. To the world at large the Jewish people after its terrible fall appeared like a scattered flock of wandering sheep. Such would, indeed, have been their fate had it not been for their great past in this country and their unquenchable hope of a coming restoration. This unique past lived on in the heart of the people and encompassed it on all sides. Every Jew, wherever and whenever he was, heard in the pages of the Holy Writ the mighty voices of the past, the voice of the Almighty issuing from the lips of the Prophets, and beheld the ancient sites of his Holy country. From these he derived his hope and unshakable faith in the future.

In another three weeks our people throughout the world will again mournfully recollect the destruction of our Commonwealth and our Sanctuary. On that day the ninth of Av we observe year after year an annual fast of twenty-four hours, assemble in our Synagogues and mourn the destruction of our land and people. On that day we give ourselves up to weeping and yearning for our homeland. Our people sit with bowed heads on the floor of the Synagogue reciting the Book of Lamentations. They are a timeless reminder of a tragedy the impact of which is felt to this day.

But this age-long mourning is not merely an agonised cry of dejection uttered by a people bereft of hope and a prey to despair. There is in it also a strong note of protest against the civilized world which has failed to extend a helping hand to our martyred people.

The memories of the Zion of the past have implanted in our hearts the hope of the Zion of the future. Zion, the home of the Prophets and the center of Jewish creativeness—has been our guiding star throughout our wanderings in the lands of our exile. From the days of Daniel during the Babylonian Exile to the present day—that is to say a period of 2,300 years—every Jew saying his prayer has turned his face towards Jerusalem. Three times a day, in the course of his religious devotions he stressed the connexion between himself and his ancient home, praying for the return of his exiled people. The hope of a revival of Jewish independence in this historic land was the corner-stone of his faith. It was an essential of his spiritual life.

There are numerous religious precepts which can be properly fulfilled only in this Holy Land, and even those precepts which we are enjoined to observe in exile cannot there be carried out as they should be. The alien environment inevitably exercises a profound effect upon ourselves and our children. The life of the Jews in the Dispersion cannot be one of action, as in the life of any free nation moulding its affairs according to its own spirit. Living amid strange environments the Jew has been compelled to



adapt himself to the standards and the spirit of others. In spite of himself he had to accept their values and suppress his own national and spiritual characteristics.

In a renewed Jewish national life in Palestine such adaption to others will not be necessary. There the Jews will live an independent, natural and Hebrew life, free from the coercion of foreign rulers and the pressure of alien cultures.

Throughout their exile, Jews have steeped themselves in memories of their homeland.

For hundreds of years religious Jews have observed the practice when building a house, of leaving a patch one ell square unwhitewashed, in memory of the destruction of their country. Throughout the exile every Jew has a handful of earth from Palestine placed in his grave, so that even in death he may be united with his ancient land.

To go and settle in the Land of Israel has always been considered by the Jews as a most meritorious deed.

Throughout the ages we find Jews making efforts to reach the Land of Israel. The spiritual leaders of the people, were among the first to translate that ageless yearning into positive action. On reaching the land of their desire they would write to their people in the lands of their origin, telling them of the beauties of Palestine and urging them to follow in their footsteps.

Up to a few generations ago the journey to the Holy Land was fraught with hardships and dangers. Travellers would spend many years travelling in rickety carts, on ill-paved roads and in unseaworthy sailing craft. Many would leave their homes and property, their families and friends, to wander from country to country in an attempt to reach the Holy Land. They were exposed to persecution and mockery, an easy prey to robbers and cut-throats. Yet they willingly risked all these privations to accomplish their hearts' desire and for the many who perished on the way the Holy Land was their dying thought. Those who were fortunate enough to reach their destination arrived for the most part utterly destitute. They lived in great poverty and frequently in fear of their very lives, for conditions were most insecure. It was only because of their great love for the country, because of their conviction that by settling in the Land of Israel they were obeying a major precept of the Torah and hastening the redemption of the land and the people, that they were able to hold out. They accepted the tribulations bound up with life in Palestine in those days with love; and it was they who paved the way for the pioneers of the national revival in modern times.

In our view it is the duty of every Jew to come and live in Palestine; and any regulation restricting the fulfillment of this commandment is not only devoid of legal authority, but positively sinful. This land was once ours and by the grace of Heaven it will be ours again and a new Jewish Commonwealth will arise in it. No power in the world can stop us from returning to this our land. To make war on Jewish immigration

is to make war not only against the Jewish people but also against what we believe to be a precept of our creed. Since the dawn of political Zionism, which was created by Herzl, many leading rabbis, including the great Rabbi Samuel Mohilever, have lent their support to the new movement. A distinctive religious grouping, known as the Mizrachi, was formed within the Zionist Organization, and it was my privilege to be among its founders forty-five years ago. The Mizrachi Organization, which is wholly religious in character, has been enabled, largely by virtue of its labour section—the "Hapoel Hamizrachi"—to take part in the reconstruction of the country. Dozens of villages, including collective settlements, have been established upon the sacred soil by "Hapoel Hamizrachi," to the glory of our nation and the Torah. We have founded scores of elementary and secondary schools, where our children are brought up according to our religious traditions, and where they also receive a broad secular education. These schools are scattered throughout the country, and they are exercising a most profound influence.

The religious grouping within the Zionist Movement—it numbers tens of thousands of members—calls for the establishment of the Land of Israel as a Jewish State for religious as well as for political reasons. In its view, the revival of our Religion and the observance of its commandments in their entirety are possible only in an independent Jewish Palestine free from foreign control. Religious Jewry wants to see the new Jewish life in this country built up on the eternal foundations of the law of Israel. We do not however refuse to co-operate with non-religious Jews in the building up of the country. The precept to reclaim and rebuild this land is so holy, that whoever engages in the task, even if he is not religious, becomes sanctified thereby. We firmly believe that the holy character of this effort will also influence the non-religious builders, and that eventually they or their children will proceed along the path of the revealed Law and Jewish tradition. Such is our hope.

Here I wish to make it clear that this hope of ours does not entail the establishment of a theocratic State in Palestine in the sense in which the term is generally used. The Law of Israel is a law of life. It was vouchsafed equally to prophet and priest, to the leaders and the masses of the people. It was granted both to the individual and the community that all might study it and live according to it. We must make provision in our State for all its inhabitants whether they are of our faith or not. We must see to it that all have a livelihood, and that all are able to live in their own way. At no time have we wished—nor do we wish it now—to compel other peoples, even if they live in our midst as a minority, to accept our creed. We want our fellow-Jews to live according to our Law and tradition. But we cannot cast off those of our people who do not observe the precepts of their religion: the basic principle was long ago formulated by our sages, who said: "An Israelite who sins is still an Israelite." Our attitude is clear:

the entire people, including all movements and parties, whether they obey the commandments of the Almighty or not, are members not only of one religion, but of one nation. They constitute a single, united nation. We exist not only by virtue of our religion, but also by virtue of our natural inheritance passed down from father to son, by virtue of our homeland, lineage and race. As a nation we have been persecuted; and as a nation we demand the restoration of our homeland, the Land of Israel.

In conclusion, let me state a simple truth. We cannot and do not want to adapt ourselves to an alien life. We cannot and do not want to trade our soul and spirit for civic rights or for all the rights in the world, quite apart from the fact that we do not believe we shall ever achieve complete equality in foreign countries. We do not wish to forego our right to exist as a nation in our own land in accordance with our own traditions. It is utterly absurd to query the existence of a Jewish nation, even if we do speak a variety of languages and are scattered throughout many countries. We have only one homeland in the world—the Land of Israel. We shall never have any other. This is our country, and ours it shall be with the help of Him who chose Zion.

CHAIRMAN: We have heard the address of Rabbi Fishman. Does any Member wish to put any questions arising out of the statement?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. Horowitz is to follow. May I ask if a written statement of your speech has been distributed?

Mr. HOROWITZ (Jewish Agency): It is contained in the book I have supplied to the Committee, and is based on that book, "Trends of Economic Development in Palestine."

In my address, which will deal with the economic aspect of Palestine, I would like to establish two main points.

First that the economic capacity production of Palestine is adequate to solve the problem of large-scale Jewish immigration with which we are confronted. Secondly, that the process of absorption of Jewish immigration and transplantation of the Jewish people into Palestine has had and will have a favourable effect on the economic condition of the Arabs in this country.

The first question with which we will have to deal is what is economic capacity of absorption. It certainly is not an arithmetical concept. There is no such thing as a fixed, constant, rigid economic capacity of absorption *per se* inherent in any country. The economic capacity of absorption is a function of material and human forces. Space, natural resources, the quality of population, skill, knowledge, capital, productivity of labour and a number of imponderabilia such as the determination of the people or the necessity to strike roots in a certain country.

With the progress of the machine age and the development of managed economy, the material factors are decreasing in importance, in their effect on the economic capacity of absorption, while the human factors, such as application of

capital, skill and knowledge and the determination of the people to reconstruct a certain economy are gaining importance. They are both developing in inverse ratio. The utilisation of resources becomes more important than the availability of resources. The economic capacity of absorption is being created.

I would like to exemplify that statement with several instances.

Palestine has an area of some 10,000 square miles. Approximately 2,000,000 people are living in this area. Sicily has exactly the same area and supports a population of 4,000,000 people; Lombardy, of the same area, supports some 6,000,000 people, in Belgium 8,000,000 people live. On the other hand, Transjordan has an area three times more than Palestine and supports only a population of 350,000. Had Iraq an area similar to that of Palestine it would support, according to the present population of Iraq, only 200,000. In Europe, which has an area only half as large again as the United States of America, the population is four times as large. Czechoslovakia has an area of 140,000 square kilometres and supports a population of 15,000,000, whilst Bulgaria, 103,000 square kilometres, supports only 5,000,000 people.

This variation of density of population cannot be exclusively explained by natural resources. It stands in inverse ratio to natural resources and depends mainly on the quality of the population, on the economic effort, on all the resources of skill and capital, which are human and not material. Thus any definition of the economic capacity of absorption of a certain country *per se* as inherent in the country itself—any such limitation would be both far from the reality of the situation and highly wrong. There is no such concept as a static, constant, rigid, fixed economic absorption.

I would like to exemplify that point with another historical instance. A few years after the discovery of America, Sir Walter Raleigh led a few hundred people to what is now the most densely populated and richest part of America. They stayed there for about one and a half years, and were taken back to England by Sir Francis Drake on one of his voyages around the world. They did not find in the United States of America, in that area, sufficient economic capacity of absorption for supporting these few hundred people. The natural resources were certainly available, the area was tremendous, but there were other conditions necessary which were lacking in that particular effort.

The relativity of that concept of capacity of absorption is brought into relevance by the fact that that area, on which a few hundred could not exist, now supports millions of people on the highest standard of life on the globe.

That same fact is brought out by some instances nearer Palestine. There is a certain immigration of Arabs into Palestine. It is a controversial point whether the immigration is very extensive or only a small trickle, but there is no question that there is immigration of Arabs into Palestine and no emigration from Palestine to

other countries. Where do these Arabs come from? They come from Syria and Lebanon. These countries have a density of population 2.7 times less than Palestine. They come from Trans-jordan, which has a density of population fifteen times less than Palestine.

There is another phenomenon which shows to the same extent that these particular forces are much more important than natural conditions, these other forces, being social development, the ability of the population and capital.

There is an internal migration in Palestine. That fact was stated in 1931 in the "Census of Palestine" by the Palestine Government, a very competent and one of the best comments on Palestine prepared by Mr. Mills. He stated in that survey that there is without any doubt a migration of Arabs to the coastal plain. The coastal plain is the most densely populated part of Palestine. They come from sparsely populated areas to the coastal plain because Jewish development takes place in that area. Again, the human factors were more important than the natural conditions or resources of availability of space.

I would like to follow up that question of absorption and see by what instruments this preponderance of the human factor is becoming established. Let us take agriculture first. Probably agriculture should be more dependent on natural conditions and on space than any other branch. There are three main factors in the transformation of agriculture to modern methods. One is transformation of uncultivable land. Members of the Committee have had the opportunity to see some of that work of reclamation. They have seen areas cleared of stone, swamps drained and other methods of amelioration of the soil employed. There is no such fixed, rigid concept as cultivable or uncultivable land. Uncultivable land can be turned into cultivated land if methods of reclamation are applied. We have seen land reclaimed and now serving as a basis for thriving, prosperous agricultural communities.

There is a second method—increased productivity—rotation of crops, rational systems of fertilization, cross breeding, improvement of breeds. All those serve to increase the unit of production, the unit of productive capacity. I shall explain that further and exemplify with some figures.

Jewish dairy farming, which yields 4,000 to 4,500 litres of milk per cow, per year, against something like 600 to 800 litres of milk per cow in Arab primitive economy. The average yield of the Jewish breed of hen is 140 to 160 eggs as against 60 from the Arab hen. The wheat crop of 120 to 180 kilos per dunum as against 70 to 80 in Arab farming is another example. Also the quantity of 900 to 1200 kilos of grapes in Jewish production as against 300 to 400 kilos in Arab farming.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Horowitz made use at this point and subsequently of colored wall-charts corresponding to the diagrams, to which references are given in each case, set out in "Trends of Economic Development in Palestine" (Jewish Agency for Palestine, May 1947).

These instances could be multiplied, and form a very serious and formidable proof that productivity can be raised by effort, by knowledge, by application of capital and by application of different imponderabilia which have a very important bearing on the economic absorption capacity; the determination to make good, the determination to grow roots in a country.

There is a third method—the most important of the three—of turning agriculture into a more productive branch of expanding its capacity for colonization of workers and its capacity to produce income. That is the shift from less valuable to more valuable processes. It is mainly the problem of irrigation. The problem of capacity of absorption of agriculture for new settlers is not the problem of arithmetic. It is not a question of area. The relation is quite irrelevant in that case. What is important is the income-producing facilities, the income-producing capacity of a certain area. We know that about one dunum—one acre, for that matter—is equal in income-producing capacity to five dunums or five acres of other land, and then irrigation becomes a very decisive factor.

I would like to illustrate the development of irrigation in Palestine on this chart (Diagram 23).<sup>1</sup> We see a certain increase of the population. These blocks represent areas of irrigated land in various parts of Palestine. If you observe the extent of development you will see a very rapid increase of the irrigated areas of Palestine, which was much more rapid than the increase of the total population. The irrigated area of Palestine increased in that period about fourteen times, while the population increased by 144 per cent. That is, per head of the Jewish and Arab population, a five-fold increase in irrigated areas.

The shift from less valuable to more valuable crops is this: we distinguish in agriculture between two kinds of produce. One is the product of extensive farming, the second is the product of intensive farming. The first is that defined as energy-producing food, which is mainly grain, cereals, etc., produced under extensive farming. The second is called protective because it protects the tissues of the body. That is a biological term, and these products comprise dairy farming produce, vegetables, fruits, poultry-raising, etc.

There is a general shift in the world consumption from energy producing to protective foodstuffs, which means a transition from extensive to intensive agriculture. Now intensive agriculture provides more facilities for settlers and can support more people on a smaller area at much higher standards. This irrigation process enabled us to effect a transition from extensive to intensive farming, from farming that supports few people on a low standard of life to farming which supports many people on a high standard of life, from a production of energy-producing to protective foodstuffs.

I would like to illustrate that with the following diagram (Diagram 20). We have here four main lines. The red line represents citrus exports. Citrus is a produce of intensive farming,

a protective foodstuff. We see a steady, permanent and increasing trend up to the war. Then the exigencies of the war interrupted. There was a blockade in the Mediterranean and the citrus could not be sent abroad. Now we see again the same rising curve, a steady increase in production of citrus fruit.

A second protective foodstuff and the product of intensive farming is vegetables. We see a spectacular increase in the vegetable crops of this country.

Then we have wheat crops. That is an energy-producing food. It is almost stationary—it is represented by the yellow line—there is no change. It depends only on weather fluctuations.

This development of citrus crops and of vegetable crops and wheat crops which remain stationary reflects that process of transition from extensive to intensive farming which enables us to settle tens and thousands of people on the same area without detracting anything from the possibilities of the existing population, as I shall prove in my analysis later on.

All that is correlated to the blue line, which shows the steady increase of the share of the Jewish population within the total population of the country from eleven per cent to thirty-two per cent today. Is that a pure coincidence? My reply is that it is not. The development of intensive farming is entirely dependent on the expansion of markets, and the Jewish population of Palestine created these markets for both Jewish and Arab farming, and thus the capacity of absorption was tremendously increased by this transition from extensive to intensive farming, from the production of energy-producing to the production of protective foodstuffs.

I would like to show the results of this process (Diagram 24). Here we have these blue and red blocks. The blue blocks represent the value of production of agricultural produce. The red blocks represent the area on which they were produced. Here we have Jewish farming. On 7.7—let us say 8 for simplicity's sake—on 8 per cent of the cultivated—not cultivatable—cultivated area of Palestine over 28 per cent of the whole agricultural produce of the country was produced. Of course, that transition was very quick in the Jewish area. In the Arab area of 92 per cent, only 71 per cent was produced.

That does not mean that the Arab farmer could not establish the same standards. Probably he could do so by application of skill, knowledge and capital. That will be the process in the course of time, as I shall show later on. But this shows how, on a smaller area, much larger vegetation can be created, how the capacity of agricultural production does not depend on the arithmetical gauge of the area available but on what crops are produced and by which methods they are produced.

The next diagram, Distribution of Land and Population (Diagram 19), shows us the area occupied by the Jewish population of Palestine. The land area occupied by the Jewish population is shown in the brown block, that is, 6.9

per cent. The Jewish population—that is the green block—is 32 per cent of the total; while 93 per cent of the land and 68 per cent of the population is the Arab share.

How could we establish 600,000 people, a third of the population, on 7 per cent of the land? Of course, that area of land is insufficient. Someone might say, they probably live on agricultural produce, either imported or bought from the Arabs. However, the calculation shows us the following two facts: First, that 50 per cent of the consumption of foodstuffs of this 32 per cent of the population is covered by that area. 50 per cent of the foodstuffs produced in that area is consumed in that area. In addition, this area grows a certain quantity of citrus, which is exported abroad and provides the necessary cash for the purchase of other foodstuffs. So, this 32 per cent of the population is about 75 per cent self-sufficient in foodstuffs. Of course, we must take into account also the export of foodstuffs from an area of something like 7 per cent of the land of Palestine. Again a proof of how elastic the capacity of absorption is and how vastly it can be increased.

We pass to the second important point—industry. Here the dependence on natural factors and conditions is even less pronounced than in agriculture. In ancient times, industry was mainly based on proximity of raw materials. This period passed a long time ago. The development of transport has made the importance of local raw materials almost negligible. I would like to support that radical statement by some facts. Let us take the cotton industry of the world. It is concentrated in England, on the continent of Europe, in Japan and in other countries. But in these three territories, certainly, there is a big cotton industry. None of these countries has cotton. There are two countries rich in cotton, India and Egypt. India has a certain cotton industry, but it certainly cannot compare with any of these territories. Egypt has a negligible cotton industry. One of the most important centers of production of machines is Switzerland, which has neither coal nor metals. Of all the countries of the world, Switzerland—Belgium being the first with the highest proportion of people engaged in manufacturing processes, 44.4 per cent—Switzerland is certainly one of the countries which is the poorest in raw materials.

I would like to recall a personal experience. In 1940, I was invited by one of the heads of a department in the Government of Palestine to advise him, before his departure for the Delhi Conference. The Delhi Conference was convened to co-ordinate and intensify the war effort against Hitler, in 1940, by the whole Middle East and Far East. He told me that he was in a difficult position. What could he offer in Delhi as our contribution? This was the beginning of the war. We are a country poor in raw materials—nearly none. What can we offer in the desperate situation in which the Allies are now placed? My reply to him was much more optimistic. I told him we had one very important

and very valuable raw material which may prove decisive in our war effort. He eagerly asked what that raw material was, and I replied "brains and skill." That statement might have been, at that time, presumptuous, but subsequent events have proved that Palestine was really the most important force in the economic and industrial war effort in the whole Middle East. That fact has been recognized.

Industry here is based not on availability of raw materials but on import of skill and knowledge and a determination to make good out of despair. History has shown that industries were established in that way many times. The wool industry was established by Flemish refugees. The Huguenots brought their industries all over the world with them. The Jewish immigrants from Czarist Russia established the clothing industry in the United States of America.

The very economy of the growing population provides to industry the most important asset—and that is markets—gives a filip, a stimulus to that expansion of industry. Industry expanded in correlation with the Jewish immigration: the number of employees, 6 times; capital, 10 times, while population in the same period increased 69 per cent. Net output, 6 times; consumption per head, 258 per cent. That is per head, not for the whole population. This is shown in these two diagrams (Diagrams 25 and 26). The green line shows the increase of the Jewish population. You can see the tremendous increase from next to nothing, shown in these three blocks which represent persons employed, capital and gross output, to this tremendous increase shown here, 6 times against 69 per cent of the population as a whole. This process of industrialization exceeded by far the increase of population. It is clearly shown here. Of course, it is done according to different scales. What is important here is the gradient. You see a very slow, slight gradient in the total population and in the Jewish population, and a very rapid increase in these three indications, capital, number of workers and gross output of industry. Here is shown the Jewish population and the number of Jewish enterprises. Against this is shown how industry kept pace and exceeded the growth of the population. Thus the capacity of absorption in industry was greatly increased.

I would like to emphasize again that the very growth of the population creates a basis for expansion of industry. Each industry has a certain technical, economic minimum. Man cannot establish a factory for ten thousand people, but the same factory may be established for one hundred thousand people. Otherwise, it would not pay. You need to establish it on a large scale to cover all your overhead expenses, and so on. Even today, one cannot establish an automobile factory in Palestine. Fifteen years ago it would not have paid to establish a glass factory in Palestine, but today, we have such a very prosperous concern. In the meantime, the population has increased and the very increase in the population has provided the marketing facilities. In modern, managed economy, the difficulty is

not so much the technical process of production as the finding of facilities for the marketing of the new product. And the broader the expansion of population, the broader the basis of industry by establishing various technical minima in new branches of industry.

Again we have a diagram (Diagram 27) showing the increase of Jewish population and gross consumption of Jewish products. Not only did the consumption keep pace with the increase of population but the consumption per head of industrial products increased in that way.

Here we have increase of productivity during this period 1922–1936 and 1937, exemplified and reflected in these blue blocks.

I am aware that this whole process must have raised certain doubts and certain problems in the minds of the Members of the Committee. One of them, an important one, mentioned by almost every one who analyzes Palestine economy, is the trade balance of the country. How can it be that Palestine imported before the war to the tune of some fifteen million pounds and exported to the tune of some five million pounds? I would like to call your attention to this diagram (Diagram 3) in which I have tried to explain that whole process. We have here three main factors reflected in these diagrams: The black one is the net trade deficit of Palestine; the red one shows the Jewish capital import; the third one is the Jewish capital investment. It is not the same; one can import capital without investment, but the yellow one shows Jewish capital investment. Now, if you look at these three indications, you will find an exact correlation between the three factors in their development. If Jewish capital import rises, the net trade deficit rises and the Jewish capital investments increase, and vice versa. It would be fallacious to say that capital import covers the net trade deficit. Capital import causes the net trade deficit, and that is obvious. What can be the material form, the substance of capital import?

Let us say that capital is imported for planting of orange groves. It takes the form of pipes and pumps. Capital is imported for the establishment of textile factories. It takes the form of spindles, looms and motors. Or, if we are to establish a metals industry, we bring lathes, shaping machines, and so on. Of course, this tremendous import of one hundred fifty million pounds during that period since 1922 must have taken that shape. Otherwise, it would have been very bad, had it not been accompanied by a tremendous import of capital goods, because that import of capital goods, which is the cause of the net deficit in the trade balance, serves the development of the country and the final balancing of the trade account. Because, when these orange groves, for which pipes and pumps were brought over, bear fruit, they increase the export of the country. If a textile factory starts producing its yarns or materials, it will either decrease the import of textile goods into the country or increase the export of these goods abroad. So that the very net trade deficit is an

expression, a material, substantial expression of the development of the country. It is not covered by capital import. It is created, caused by capital import, and it is shown exactly by that correlation of the three indications of Jewish capital and investment, Jewish capital import, and net trade deficit that it is not a coincidence. There is a wholesome connection between the three.

As a matter of fact, it is not a phenomenon peculiar to Palestine. Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine, and the United States of America had, for a long period of time, an adverse trade balance because they were developing. That was the material expression of their development.

Of course, in the first period, capital goods, means of production, must be brought into the country. A new community starts with production of consumer goods and not capital goods. No country with no industry will start producing looms and spindles. It will produce textiles. So, the first period is import of capital goods which must create a trade deficit. Of course, from one point of view, we are in a more fortunate position than all these young countries were in their period of development. There, also, the deficit in the trade balance was a concomitant of development, but they had afterwards the difficult legacy of that development. They had to repay the borrowed capital, because that capital was not invested in the country, at least not in a great proportion. The bulk of it was borrowed and they had to pay amortization and interest charges, which were a heavy burden on some of these countries, a very heavy burden, and created very serious and grave problems. We shall not have to deal with that problem because the capital brought into this country is not borrowed capital at all. It is refugee capital, or capital raised, for the express purpose of the development of the Jewish national home, by Jewish people all over the world. So, we will be more fortunate in that we will not have to contend with that legacy of quick and rapid development, repayment of borrowed capital.

Now, another problem with which the Members of the Committee are confronted. How does this rapid influx of immigrants in the thirties bear on the employment situation in the country? In this diagram, (Diagram 5) we see two curves: The black curve represents the number of Jewish immigrants; the red curve, the number of Jewish unemployed. This diagram proves that paradoxically, at least on the face of it, they are in inverse ratio. The larger the immigration the less unemployment. Immigration seems to create employment. Of course, we cannot rely entirely and exclusively on that empirical evidence that there is an inverse ratio in development. We have to try to analyze it from the point of view of economic theory. And that was done quite convincingly and adequately by some English economists in their analysis of unemployment in the 'thirties. They proved that the usual notion of the man in the street that there is a fixed volume of employment and that if you bring in more people they are bidding for

the same volume of employment, competing with one another, is entirely erroneous. That theory is called "Lump of Labor Theory." That was disproved completely, because each man added to the population is not only a worker, an employee, a producer, but he is at the same time a consumer. As economic crises in our modern economy are mainly crises of marketing, crises of supply and demand, and not of difficulty of production. So that with increased population a great filip, a great stimulus is given to development of agricultural and industrial production. We have witnessed that in Palestine, that unemployment must decrease. Immigration created employment. Unemployment was always in inverse ratio to immigration. That is proved by the inverse ratio in figures and facts in these two factors, and also by economic theory.

I would like to touch on another problem. How was the government revenue and development of government services affected by this immigration? This is very important. New population requires new services, new communications. It imposes a certain burden on the Government. The question is how can the fiscal system of the Government keep pace with this new immigration. We have here in this diagram (Diagram 28) two curves. One is a red curve which represents Government local revenue. In this case, "local," means not grants and aids from the British Government but what is raised here on the spot in Palestine in the form of revenue from the local population. It does not mean help to the local Government.

Here we show Jewish immigration. I think the correlation between these two curves is unmistakable. It shows how immigration produces not only employment but revenue for the Government. As immigration increases, revenue increases; as immigration decreases, revenue decreases. All the time, without the slightest exception, the correlation is absolute and consistent.

We have another problem which was touched upon by Mr. Shertok in his evidence, the question of the occupational distribution of the Jewish population. We brought into the country a population which was mainly urban, a population which had to be adapted to new conditions, and which we intended to establish on a sound and hearty basis of an occupational distribution which would be similar to that of modern, developed countries. The Jewish population in the world had the following occupational distribution: 3 per cent agriculture, 36 per cent artisans and manufacturers, and 61 per cent in what are called tertiary services of production, services of commerce and all kinds of subsidiary occupations. This picture, in itself, shows a very unbalanced occupational structure. The facts were much worse than are reflected in this diagram (Diagram 4). The 3 per cent in agriculture and the 36 per cent as artisans did not represent real agricultural workers but entrepreneurs. Here our primary industry in agriculture, and the secondary industry is manufacturing. We had to carry into effect a trans-



formation of our occupational structure. We can see that transformation on the other blocks. Here we have Palestine, occupational distribution of Jews: 19 per cent in agriculture, 27 per cent in industry, 54 per cent in tertiary occupations. These are not entrepreneurs; these are real workers. We have effected in one generation this complete transformation of the occupational structure.

The present occupational structure compares very well with the structure in other countries. For instance, in the United States of America there is 19 per cent in agriculture—the same as we have here—31 per cent in industry—a little bit more than we have here—and 50 per cent in tertiary occupations. In Australia, there is 24 per cent in agriculture, 29 per cent in industry, and 46 per cent in the tertiary stage. Great Britain has 6 per cent in agriculture, 43 per cent in manufacture, and 50 per cent in tertiary stages.

I do not want to tire you with these figures. I think it is sufficient to say that the point is illustrated by these blocks in this diagram. The occupational distribution of Palestine Jewry very much resembles the occupational distribution of countries with very healthy and sound economies, the United States of America, Australia, Switzerland and other countries. Our present occupational distribution is in complete contradiction to the occupational distribution which we had all over the world among the Jewish population.

Now I shall try to prove the second thesis of my evidence; that this process of transplantation of the Jewish population of Palestine and immigration into Palestine has had a most favourable effect on the economic conditions of the Arab population. I have here a diagram, Moslem Expectation of Life at Birth, Jewish Share of Population and Jewish Immigration, Diagram 7. The green blocks represent the expectation of life at birth. We see that in 1925, the first year for which we have reliable figures, in the first block, males and females, that the expectation of life at birth was 37. All my figures are based on Government statistics. Even if in some cases we consider these statistics controversial, for the sake of uniformity, we have taken all the figures on the basis of the Palestine Survey, submitted by the Palestine Government to the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry. As I said, the life expectancy in 1925 was 37, for males and females. In 1945, the life expectancy was 49 for males and 50 for females, an increase in the life expectancy at birth by 33 per cent.

At the same time, the share of the Jewish population in the total population of Palestine increased from 11 to 32 per cent. I shall not go into the analysis of the cause and effect of this correlation, for the time being. I shall only show the correlation, the concurrent development between the increase in the Jewish share of the population and the general improvement and progress of the Arab population and Arab economy. Later on, I shall try to show that there is a close link between them. But, for the time being,

we see only this coincidence, this simultaneous development, this steady and consistent increase in the share of the Jewish population and the total population and the increase of expectation of life at birth in the Moslem population by 33 per cent. It is illustrated here: the red curve represents the increase of the share of the Jewish population; the green blocks represent the increase in the expectation of life at birth.

Now, we have worked out Moslem expectation of life at birth. We have taken the whole period of time and analyzed the dynamic development in that period. Now we shall try to do the same in space, to compare Moslem expectation at birth in Palestine in comparison with that of independent Arab States. We have here that diagram (Diagram 8). The important blocks are the three uppermost. That is the expectation of life at birth in Iraq. In Egypt it is slightly larger. These are the Moslems of Palestine, and to the extent that Iraq and Egypt has other populations than Moslems it rather colors the picture against my argument. I mean if there are Christians they have longer expectations of life, so that if you would have Moslems separately for Egypt, probably their expectation of life would be even shorter than here. But, as we do not have reliable statistics, I take the whole population of Iraq and Egypt—even then we see a tremendous difference between Iraq, Egypt, and the Moslems of Palestine. This difference, of course, is explained by the previous diagram. Twenty years ago it was about the same. But this development, the increase of expectation of life by 33 per cent which is concurrent with the share of the Jewish population within the total population, brought the Palestine Moslems far away from the usual level of expectations of life in the Middle East.

The next diagram, Jewish Share of Population, (Diagram 9) shows a definite gain. If you look at the blue curve you will see an increase from eleven per cent to thirty-two per cent in round figures. That is the blue. Now the black line shows Moslem Infant Mortality in Palestine. Now, if we look at these two curves we see that they develop in inverse ratio. They tend always to increase in their discrepancy. It is a kind of opening scissors. The larger the Jewish share in the total population of Palestine the lower the Moslem infant mortality. It decreased from 186 per thousand in 1922–24, a three year period which was used in order to eliminate any accidental factors, to 100 per thousand in 1944–46, a decrease of 46 per cent. This opening of the scissors is indicative of a certain concurrence. In the analysis of infant mortality, which is considered all over the world by experts as the most conclusive and clearest indication of the economic condition, progress, and cultural level of a population, a new system is now applied. It is the system of regional statistics. It was first applied in England and it showed a very close correlation between poverty and infant mortality, poverty and general mortality. The so-called "depressed areas" were proved to have a high incidence of sickness. The increasing infant mor-

tality was most accentuated. In the most prosperous districts it was much less than that. Now we have tried to apply to Palestine that method, and I must say concurrently, the Government Statistician did it on the one hand and we on the other hand, not knowing one from another. And if you read in the "Survey of Palestine" the chapter on the standard of life of the Arabs you will find an excellent corroboration of my thesis here. It states exactly the same thing, namely that it cannot be a coincidence that the highest rates of infant mortality are in those districts in which there is no Jewish colonization at all. It is most pronounced that the lowest is in the Jewish colonization. The lowest rates are in Jaffa. You see that in Jaffa (Diagram 10) this brown color shows very dense Jewish settlement. In Jaffa it is 81.4 per thousand, and in Haifa it is 117.7 per thousand. The two most Jewish districts, where the Jews form the largest proportion of the population, have developed the lowest infant mortality. The highest is in Bethlehem, 176.4 per thousand, where there are no Jews at all. In Ramallah it is 171.5 per thousand.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Would you mind repeating the number please?

Mr. HOROWITZ: Ramallah is 171.5 per thousand, Bethlehem is 176.4 per thousand, almost double that of in Haifa and Jaffa areas. There are no Jews there, none at all. The middle districts with mixed population show almost an exact correlation. It is an exact correlation but in inverse ratio—the larger the share of the Jewish population the lower the Moslem infant mortality.

Now on this new diagram, the Development of Arab Economy, (Diagram 11) I would like to show the development of the condition of the Arab working class in this country. We have figures only since 1939 for the Arab as published by the Government. We see these three blocks. The yellow block represents the cost of living. The green block represents Arab daily earnings in agriculture. The red block represents the Arab daily earnings in building. Now if we follow up the yellow blocks we see a certain increase in the cost of living. But then, particularly since 1943, we see suddenly that wages in building and agriculture far exceed the increase in the cost of living. That means that real wages, not nominal wages only but real wages of Arab workers throughout the agricultural industry increased in a very pronounced way, far above the increase in the cost of living. Here you see the development of the condition of the Arab working class as reflected in their real wages, an increase in wages in comparison with the increase in the cost of living in the two most important branches of Arab economy—agriculture and building. The increase in agriculture was approximately five times as much, and in buildings it was about five and a half times as much. Now we shall again apply our previous methods. We have shown something in the category of time. Now we will take again space. This diagram, (Diagram 12) shows the Average Weekly Wages in Industry in Egypt and the Arab In-

dustry of Palestine. This is based on Government statistics. The Egyptian Government has published a special book on the development of wages in industry. Here it is a little bit against Palestine because at the time these statistics were taken the cost of living in Egypt was 291 and in Palestine 262. That means the difference is much more pronounced if we also take into account that their cost of living index was higher in that period of time. In January 1946 the difference is more pronounced. The red blocks are various industries, food, beverages, tobacco, etc. The red blocks represent Arab wages in Arab Palestine, the blue blocks in Egypt. I think the indications are unmistakable. Always bear in mind that the factual picture is more pronounced. Of course their cost of living increased more than ours in that period of time.

Here is an illustration of a similar development in agriculture in the non-Jewish sector. This diagram (Diagram 15) shows the Indications of Agricultural Development (Crops) in the non-Jewish sector, and the growth of the Jewish population. The tremendous increase of crops is correlated to the increase of the Jewish population. As the Jewish population increased, the crops, fruits and vegetables, fruit being violet and vegetable being green, increased tremendously while wheat remained stationary. Of course that is not a coincidence. Again it is the same thing. They started on the same way of transition, from extensive to intensive farming—the Arabs from the production of energy-producing foodstuffs, which supports few people on a lower standard of life, to production of produce of intensive farming, vegetables, fruits, and so on, which support the agricultural cultivation which is much denser and on a much higher standard of living. That is not a coincidence. There are many Jews who appear as buyers in the market and by so doing have enabled Arab agriculture to affect that tremendous and spectacular increase in their production of intensified farming.

I now show you a diagram entitled Indications of Agricultural Development (Livestock) in the non-Jewish sector and the growth of the Jewish population (Diagram 16). This diagram shows exactly the same as the last in another fashion. It concerns livestock, fowls, cattle, sheep, and goats. Again there is a spectacular increase in cattle, which is green, and poultry which is red. There is a very spectacular increase in the crops of the Arab farming coincident with the development of the Jewish population. Not so sheep and goats. They remain stationary, like wheat, because that is extensive. They produced for the Jewish market, and so they were enabled to raise their standard of life, and to improve their farming by the development of these urban markets. Again there was a close link between the two phenomena.

In this diagram we have Some Economic Indications in Palestine and Middle East Countries (Diagram 17). Again we apply our method of checking our results by an analysis in time and by an analysis in space. We have Palestine, red; Transjordan, blue; Egypt, yellow; Lebanon, vio-



let; Syria, green; Iraq, brown. Import of Agricultural Machinery—that is Palestine. Imports of Industrial Machinery (mills per head)—they are heads of the population. Government Revenue, red. Health Expenditure, Foreign Trade—all these indications are quite unequivocal. There are others which show the inverse ratio. Palestine is lowest in Infant Mortality. In Government Revenue, in import of Agricultural Machinery, in Imports of Industrial Machinery, in Health Expenditure, and in Foreign Trade it is always the largest of all. In Infant Mortality it is always the lowest. In Number of Inhabitants per Tractor it is the lowest. In Number of Motor Vehicles it is the highest. So that if we can check our results in space, the results which we have gained by the analysis in time, we arrive at exactly the same conclusions. The Arab population of Palestine is in a quite different position from the Moslem Arab population in neighboring countries, and that these coincidences must appear curious if they were the only coincidences.

I now introduce the diagram on Jewish Anti-Malaria work in Palestine (Diagram 14). Here I approach the analysis of the causal link between these factors. This covers the territory in Northern Huleh area, Southern Huleh area, and the Beisan area. There is the incidence of sickness here in the last year and in the first year. If you look at these blocks there is a descending line. You will see one of the facts which must have affected the Arab population as well. We have the statistics only for the Jewish population for incidence of disease. But, obviously, the swamps destroyed the people without giving heed to race, creed, or nationality.

This new diagram is entitled Some Economic Indications in Cyprus and non-Jewish Palestine (Diagram 18). This is the last diagram before I come to the final explanation. This is a diagram which shows another country under British administration, having no Jews, or nearly no Jews, and it shows the development in this country in various indications which resemble very much those in Palestine. I am referring to Cyprus. I do not want to contend, of course, that the past administration had nothing to do with this progress. But, I would like to emphasize that the main factor in this very rapid development was Jewish colonization, Jewish reconstruction, and Jewish development. We have (in red) Health Expenditure per head of Population. Red is Palestine and blue is Cyprus. In red from 1930 to 1938 we see a very pronounced increase. At the same time we see a decrease in Cyprus. In Education Expenditure per head of Population there is a very pronounced rise in Palestine and stationary or slightly decreasing in Cyprus. But what is more important is the development of the population itself. We see the total increase in Palestine and the total increase in the same area in Cyprus. Now the natural increase was larger in Palestine due to the decline of infant mortality. But even more pronounced is the Migration. While Palestine, according to Gov-

ernment figures, had in the Arab population an increase of some two per cent by immigration, there was a decrease of the Cyprus population by migration from Cyprus by eight per cent which had to be deducted from the twenty per cent of their total increase, so that their increase really was about thirteen per cent. The natural increase in Palestine since 1931 for the Arab population is thirty-six per cent—of that thirty-four per cent was a natural increase and two per cent was due to Arab immigration. In Cyprus the total population increased in that period by thirteen per cent. It is true the natural increase was also twenty-one per cent, but there was a migration from Cyprus of eight per cent.

Now we have seen the series of diagrams and indications. It seems to me that the very fact that so many curves and blocks converge in the same direction proves that it cannot be a coincidence, particularly if we check it by our results in comparisons in space and time, checking one another, and by analysis of another country which is also under British administration. Now, what bearing does Jewish colonization, Jewish development, and Jewish reconstruction have on the condition of the Arab population. Every economist will say that the import of 150,000,000 pounds into such a small country cannot remain confined to one community. You must have a percolation of that capital, a transfer of part of that capital into the other communities. There are various channels for it. The one is purchase of land at exorbitant, fantastic prices. Of course it would be quite unreasonable for an Arab to buy land for himself at the price of, let us say, eighty pounds per acre in an Arab part of Palestine. He can get the same land at a tremendously cheaper rate either two kilometers east or north of Palestine. For the Jews that is the only place in which they can settle, so they are obliged to pay these exorbitant prices. That is one of the most important channels of transfer of Jewish capital from the Jewish settlement to the Arab settlement. Of course Jewish agriculture cannot develop for natural reasons as quickly as the Jewish population can, also for lack of space. The Jewish population buys extensively Arab agricultural produce and will continue to buy it. That is a most important factor for the population, two-thirds of which are farmers. For the farmer the market for his primary produce is the most important factor. Moreover, he produces building materials, stone, and lime, all of which you have seen. Everywhere you see stones being grinded in the mills and worked by Arabs. There are new employment facilities created by the Jews.

And last, but not least, the contribution of one-third of the population of the country to the revenue of the Government is, according to Government admission, two-thirds of the whole revenue, while the benefits (I do not say at the moment that I challenge that policy, I state only the facts) are distributed in inverse ratio. That is a factor which must have led to the development of the Arab economy. It was aided, assisted

by the very fact of an example of such a model development by Jews: reclamation, new health services, all that, also to some extent directly assisted by health services. But that is a secondary factor and is not as important. The important point is the indirect effect, the provision of means and the provision of ways and a model of development. All these comparisons between the Arabs and the Jews explain the tremendous effect of Jewish economic development on Arab production and standard of life measured by both their standards since the extension of Jewish colonization work and that of the Arabs in the neighboring Arab States.

I would like to summarize now my evidence and emphasize the salient points. The dynamic development which creates new economic capacity of absorption; the establishment of an economy of growing population which stimulates expansion of production and investment; the interchangeability of space and skill; the art of substituting space by capital and skill, which makes it possible to utilize on a much larger scale and more efficiently the natural resources of the country: all are shown and reflected by these analyses of the economic factors acting and self-propelled in this country. Thanks to the impact of these factors on the economy of Palestine, facilities for new economic capacity of absorption were and will be created in the future, leading concurrently to a further rise in the standard of life and to a further improvement in the condition of the Arab population.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is time we adjourned this hearing. The hearing is adjourned until Sunday morning at 9 a.m.

*(The hearing was adjourned at 2 p.m.)*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem,  
Palestine, Sunday, 6 July 1947, at 9 a.m.*

*Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCIA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCIA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. SIMIC, Yugoslavia  
MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCIA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

### Continuation of Hearing of Representatives of the Jewish Agency

The agenda contains continuation of the hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency. Mr. Bernstein, I think, is going to be the next speaker. Will you come to the table please?

*(Mr. F. Bernstein, representative of the Jewish Agency, took a seat at the table.)*

I recognize your right to speak.

MR. BERNSTEIN (Representative of the Jewish Agency): Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I have to present, on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, some of the economic aspects of the case in which the judgment of the United Nations has been invoked by the Mandatory Power. Any such presentation should, it seems to me, be preceded by several general observations:—

1. In reviewing the past, it should be borne in mind that the determining element in the history of the British Mandate in Palestine has been a vast discrepancy between the ascertainable purposes of British Palestine policy and those of the Jewish Community of Palestine. The Jewish Community here (or Yishuv, as we commonly refer to it) has accepted as valid objectives of public policy only the purposes laid down in the Balfour Declaration and subsequently embodied in the terms of the Mandate, while the Mandatory has often created its own national and imperial objectives as primary. This discrepancy of purposes was not too conspicuous during the first ten years of the Mandate. It was perhaps ill-understood on the part of the Jews and became only gradually more distinct, and was clearly revealed finally in the White Paper of 1939. Though not unaware of the effort made by some elements in the British Government to place ever more restricting interpretations on the obligations of the Mandatory Power towards the Jews, world Jewry nevertheless remained convinced that, on the ground even of the 1922 White Paper, no restriction could be placed on Jewish immigration and Jewish development other than that naturally imposed by the rate of progress of the economic absorptive capacity of the country. But those elements in the British Government which became clearly dominant in 1939 had in view, as in the meantime has become abundantly clear, a limitation of Jewish development which, expressed in demographic terms, meant to prevent the growth of the Jewish population of Palestine beyond about a third of the total population.

There are, it is true, some doubts about the exact number of the Arab population as estimated by Government statistics, the source of estimates in rural Arab districts being only unverified statements of mukhtars, but it may be assumed that in actual fact the one third limit has not been seriously transgressed. However this may be, it is quite natural that so striking a difference between the purposes of the Mandatory Government and those of the Jewish people caused friction, steadily growing in intensity, between the Jewish national bodies and the Jewish Yishuv on one side, bent on development as comprehensive as possible, and the British Central Government and the Palestine Administration on the other side. The Palestine Administration contemplated with increasing disquiet

the progress of Jewish development, which necessarily would bring about much earlier than thought desirable the somewhat dreaded moment when the appropriate Jewish population limit, as envisaged by the British Government, would be reached and the freezing-up of Jewish development would have to be enforced.

Our attitude to the economic and fiscal policy of the Government, largely critical it must be admitted, is the inevitable result of the discrepancy of purposes indicated above. Jews regarded themselves as entitled to an economic policy actively furthering the Jewish colonization effort and the development of the National Home and to a fiscal policy employing the gradually growing taxable capacity of the Jewish Yishuv for the benefit of those who were creating that capacity by their labour and investments as well as for the benefit of those large sections of world Jewry who needed and desired to emigrate to Palestine. The British Government used and uses Jewish tax money largely for Arab development. The Mandatory could not conduct the economic policy required by the interests of building up the Jewish National Home without speeding up a process which even without the help of an adequate Government economic policy went at a pace much too stormy for the aims of British Palestine policy.

2. Inquiries into the economic possibilities of Palestine, conducted by experts and commissions at various stages of Palestine development, seemed initially to be genuinely concerned with the gravely-doubted ability of the Jews to build up a National Home. But in the course of time such inquiries, as far as they were official, became increasingly governed by the political objective of proving that the absorptive capacity of the country could not be considerably increased and that therefore Jewish immigration ought to be severely limited. Consequently we Jews went to great pains in order to prove that we could achieve something in the field of colonization and upbuilding and that an adequate development policy would secure a productive self-supporting livelihood for a great number of additional Jewish immigrants, without displacing a single Arab. There were of course differences in the estimated numbers, according to some necessarily hypothetical elements in the estimates. But the numbers of even cautious estimates were rather impressive.

By now the manifold apprehensions of inquiring experts have proved unfounded. The Jews have shown some measure of ability in the field of agricultural and urban colonization. Considerable numbers of immigrants were absorbed long after British statesmen had expressed the opinion, that the economic absorptive capacity of the country was entirely exhausted. No Arab has been displaced. But now the British Administration sees the main danger precisely in the Jewish ability for colonization and even more in the objective possibilities, no longer to be doubted, of developing the absorptive capacity of the country to such a degree, that additional

numbers of immigrants to a total most frightening to the British Administration, could be absorbed.

From the purely political point of view now adopted by the British Administration instead of the economic argumentation earlier adhered to, anything said about the economic aspects and prospects of Jewish colonization can be construed as proving the need to halt, if need be artificially, a development which, on the strength of its economic possibilities, would open vast future perspectives.

Nevertheless we believe it our duty, to place the economic facts, as we know them, and the economic possibilities as we see them, before your Commission.

3. The promise contained in the Balfour Declaration seemed to provide the enterprise of Jewish colonization with what it needed most: a firm political basis, consisting (a) of the recognition of the political aims of that colonization by the Power ruling the territory, (b) a governmental Administration acting in consonance with the recognized aim and the main purpose which caused the Mandate for Palestine to be entrusted to Great Britain.

Though the fundamental discrepancy between the aims as understood at the time of the Balfour Declaration and those of the actual British Palestine policy revealed itself distinctly only at a relatively late stage of development, it became clear already in the first years of the Mandatory regime that the confidently expected political basis was lacking in both respects. The political aim ostensibly recognized was subject to a series of interpretations gradually emptying it of its original meaning. The Palestine Administration, barely tolerating the Jewish colonization effort instead of assisting it, seemed chiefly concerned with what was explained as the protection of the Arab population from the dangers threatening them, in the freely expressed opinion of the Administration, from Jewish colonization.

The consequences of this lack of political basis initially hoped for were far-reaching in many respects, more particularly in the economic field.

Jewish colonization, i.e. the total of economic activities bringing about the absorption of Jewish immigrants into the economic structure of the country, instead of being supported by adequate political conditions, and consequently being freed from any consideration with regard to their political effect, had, on the contrary, to be instrumental in regaining or acquiring the political basis which had been lost or perhaps never really existed. This reversal of the necessary relation between political basis and economic colonization forced Jewish colonization to the necessity of seeking a maximum of autonomy and thus, from the outset, introduced an element of mutual suspicion into the relations between Jews and the Administration. And, still more important, Jewish colonization and Jewish enterprise had to observe, with regard to the Arab population a measure of exclusivity, which would not have been necessitated to such

an extent by the mere requirements of a national colonization, had political conditions not been so very adverse.

It is true that the Arab population nevertheless derived immense advantages from the Jewish colonization. But what Arab goodwill towards the Jews could have been obtained as a result of these economic benefits was, in large part lost due to the lack of a more direct economic co-operation and due to the fact that those benefits were represented as the gift of a protecting Administration, which by the very attitude of protector denounced Jewish colonization as harmful and dangerous to Arabs.

After these introductory observations, I propose to request your attention to some of the main problems besetting Jewish colonization in the field of urban and industrial development, agricultural colonization being dealt with by my colleague, Mr. E. Kaplan.

While the Jewish Agency concentrated, for both ideological and practical reasons, during the first two decades after the British occupation, mainly on agricultural colonization, urban and industrial development was left on the whole to private initiative. The beginnings were certainly modest, but it is an error to believe that Jewish industry was established only during the war. The output of Jewish industry and handicrafts in 1936 already reached a net value of £19,109,000; of this total £17,887,000 was contributed by "factories" proper (viz, enterprises employing more than 10 hired workers). But it is true that industrial development made exceptionally great strides during the war years. This rapid progress was due to two main factors. The war situation necessitated the provision of the local population and of the Middle East armies with commodities locally produced as far as possible. For once, and as far as war necessities were concerned, the Government assisted industrial development with all available means. The Jewish population of Palestine, owing to experience gained in Europe, was able to develop the required industries. The isolation of the Middle East, caused by the war and by the diversion of the resources of the old industrial countries to war purposes, fulfilled the function of a protective tariff, behind the walls of which young industries had developed in most countries.

I do not want to tire you by figures and facts which have been provided to you, I hope not too abundantly, in writing. But I should like to say a word about the specific problems of this development.

As a matter of course, industrial development in Palestine is not an isolated case. It is part of what might be called the migration of industry from the old industrial countries to colonial or semi-colonial territories. The case of Palestine, within this movement, is somewhat irregular in character and certainly in intensity, but it is nevertheless part of this general movement. Its significance is not always fully understood, especially not by economically backward populations who will ultimately be its main beneficiaries.

Those populations, and especially their ruling classes, still labour under the illusion that political independence can be gained by diplomacy and maintained without an adequate economic basis. The illusion is understandable, since the so called diplomatic victories can be won, sometimes, rather easily while the prerequisites of full economic, and especially industrial development are not quickly and not easily acquired. The introduction of modern industry into the Middle East by the Jews means in this respect a unique chance, since they are sufficiently equipped to perform the task and vitally interested in performing it. The same cannot be said with regard to any other factor inside the Middle East or outside it. The Jews are therefore,—though the dominant social group in the Middle East are slow to recognize this—by their industrial achievement and example, laying the only really solid basis for a measure of independence of the Middle East from imperial domination by great powers whose primary economic base lies elsewhere.

Industrial development in Palestine has to struggle with great disadvantages. In the beginning no one thought it possible, or even desirable, and the Jews themselves regarded it rather as an unimportant sideline. The Mandatory Government certainly accepted this general view most gratefully, not being interested in the general movement of migration of industries into colonial territories, nor in a quick increase of the Jewish population of Palestine. The preservation of Palestine in a State of patriarchal somnolence, which means the preservation of its economic structure as a country of rather primitive agriculture, seemed at the time the main idea of dominant elements in the Palestine Administration.

Nowadays industrial development is largely dependent on the economic policy of the Government, especially on its policy of customs tariffs, import licensing, exchange control, and taxation. This does not mean that even the most favourable Government policies can build sound industries. But Government policy can greatly hamper and almost prevent industrial development. Palestine has been, in this respect, extremely ill-fated, the famous—or infamous—paragraph 18 of the Mandate (much more carefully respected than some other paragraphs of the Mandate) having been interpreted to deprive the country of any possibility of preventing it from becoming the dumping place of industrial produce of all industrial countries, especially Germany and Japan. As a consequence of the absence in Palestine of a well conceived trade policy designed to protect and foster the rational development of industry, the few industries which try tentatively to supply the local market which gradually became significant as the result of immigration, were confronted by crushing competition of foreign import made cheap, in many instances, by export premiums or similar measures. The question of industrial exports did not yet exist, but in the field of the citrus export the obnoxious influence of that

paragraph 18 was severely felt. It established the most favoured nation principle unilaterally with regard to all countries then members of the League of Nations (and even for countries like Japan, who had flouted the authority of the League but maintained friendly relations with the United Kingdom), and it deprived Palestine of every possibility of concluding trade agreements with other countries securing equal treatment and adequate outlets for its own produce. The Anglo-American Enquiry Commission has stressed the obnoxious effect of this paragraph (on pages 12 and 33 of their Report).

The customs tariff of Palestine is built on purely fiscal lines. Some raw materials have been exempted, after many representations, from customs duties, but there is still a rather impressive list of raw materials and partly finished industrial products on which duties are levied while local industrial products are in no way protected, even modestly, by tariffs. During the war additional duties were introduced, but, again in accordance with the purely fiscal aim, indiscriminately on dutiable raw materials, half finished industrial products and consumer goods alike. The financial results are important. Government income from custom duties arose from LP 2 million in 1939-40 to LP 11 million in 1946-47. It should be noted that some essential commodities not produced in Palestine pay high duties, as sugar 43 per cent. So do some industrial products not made in Palestine as motor cars, tractors and typewriters.

Since the war the Government policy of granting (or withholding) import licenses forms a very important part of Government economic policy. In its effect on the Palestine economy, it is complementary to customs policy and even supersedes it to some extent. This matter is complicated by monetary problems, such as the protection of the pound sterling and the rate of release of Palestine held sterling balances. Agreements with regard to "loading areas" (the permitted sources of imports) too play a part. Both questions will be touched upon shortly in another paragraph. Meanwhile it should be stated that import licences have been granted with special liberality for industrial consumer goods that were also produced in this country at a time when it was clear that the transition from war economy to peace economy would severely test the staying power of the young Palestine industry. At the same time the Government displayed no concern whatsoever about providing us with imports of raw materials and machinery at low world-market prices. We are, in fact, being asked to meet the impact of world competition with our hands tied. Can there be any wonder that there is a growing suspicion among the Jewish business community that the Government of Palestine is deliberately attempting to stifle our young industry?

As every protection tends to pamper industry and to delay the introduction of efficiency, so the opening up of the country to foreign competition can have a salutary effect. Palestine

industry is now, however, being exposed to that cure somewhat recklessly, and it cannot be denied that the transition period causes many difficulties. In some branches, medium and small plants will have to combine or to co-ordinate their production. In some instances new plants now being built will insure still better finishing processes. The establishment of marketing companies for some kinds of industrial produce is also contemplated. In any case, it seems improbable that any important part of our industry will succumb or that the industrial expansion now in progress will be thwarted. But great difficulties will have to be overcome, and many of these difficulties are unnecessary and are connected with the unconstructive character of Government economic policy.

In the first place, the high cost of labour stands in the way of Palestine industry becoming fully competitive with that of the old industrial countries, now that the cost of labour may seem to be an entirely internal affair not dependent on Government policy. But the high wages prevailing are partly due to the labour market having been virtually closed by the severely restricted immigration policy of the British Government and partly—even for a greater part—to the high cost of living prevalent in Palestine, one of the worst heritages of the war. There has been much discussion about how this high price level has come about, how prices could have been prevented from soaring sky-high and how they could be lowered. We have come to the conclusion, which lately seems to have been partly accepted by the Administration too, that the high cost of living is chiefly caused by the fact that Palestine is obliged to buy some of the most essential foodstuffs and cattle fodder from the high priced areas of the Middle East. Lowering the cost of living will not be possible, to any important extent, unless Palestine gets access to the low priced countries exporting foodstuffs and unless Palestine is able to buy these commodities at the same prices as the United Kingdom; the United Kingdom now allocates to itself supplies at half the price of the supplies that it allocates to Palestine.

This lowering of the prices we have to pay would be partly a matter of change in agreements about loading areas. Partly it would depend on the full availability of Palestine earnings in hard currency, especially dollars, for Palestine purchases.

Palestine has earned during the years 1940-1946 165,088,000 United States dollars, of which 98,182,000 so-called gift dollars, provided by American Jewry to funds for upbuilding Palestine and 66,906,000 from exports to the United States of America, especially polished diamonds. This total all went, in the first instance, to the United Kingdom. Neighboring countries got dollar allocations from Britain far in excess of their own earnings. So, in fact, Jewish dollar earnings were transmitted to Arab countries boycotting Jewish produce. The Jewish Agency has been allowed to use gift dollars for the requirements

of the Yishuv under such restrictions that in actual fact about two-thirds of the gift dollars have gone to the London pool. Therefore, by her control of our dollars and our imports, the United Kingdom has, in fact, been exploiting Jewish Palestine on a very large scale. We hope that the United Nations will be in a position to end this exploitation—which is certainly very far from the purposes for which the Mandatory system was established. It is not yet clear at all what amounts of hard currency and sterling will be available for the Palestine economy in the future, but experience has taught us that in the case of Palestine lack of an independent bargaining position has allowed the British Government to let political considerations and the interests of the United Kingdom override those of Palestine in general and of the Yishuv in particular.

There are, of course, some additional basic factors affecting not only the industrial development but, in different degrees, all branches of economy. I would like to mention here the high cost of oil and oil products, determining to a great extent the price of electricity, industrial power and cost of transport. When, twenty-five years ago, the economic possibilities of Palestine were under discussion, it was always stressed that the prospects must needs be poor, since Palestine did not possess coal or such water resources as would enable the generation of power. Meanwhile, one of the most potent sources of power became available on the spot in practically unlimited quantities, oil. But Palestine does not get this oil at cost price plus normal profit.

We are charged for benzine, excluding excise duty, at Haifa 19 mils per four gallons, as against a price of 104 mils for exactly the same oil c.i.f. United Kingdom ports, thus including freight and insurance. Fuel oil costs at Haifa LP 4.800 per metric ton as against LP 2.950 for exactly the same oil sold at Haifa port for bunkering. Gas oil is sold at Haifa at LP 7.350 per ton, in Haifa port for bunkering at LP 4.429.

I hope you will pardon me for giving you some figures for once, but you will easily imagine how great is the hampering effect on Palestine development of such exaggerated prices and profits being charged for the main source of industrial power. The differences of price, as specified above, are the more striking since Palestine oil concessions have been granted to oil companies at so fantastically favourable conditions (exemption from all existing and future Government and municipal taxes, exemption from paying customs duties on goods brought in by the concessionaires, expropriation by Government of land needed; freedom to import workers; no effective obligations as to selling prices in Palestine; no obligations to sell by-products in Palestine) that the Permanent Mandates Commission before the war criticized these concessions as being too favourable to the concessionaires and too unfavourable to Palestine. The British Government has, in fact, a large

interest in the petroleum business of the Middle East and great influence even over the companies in which it has no ownership participation, but the position of the British Government has not been used to protect Palestine from monopolistic extortion.

The usual assumption that the development of industry is impossible without large natural resources of raw materials has been denied in Palestine, though not there alone. Enterprise, ability, the skill of workers, experience, and scientific training, together with a burning and all-pervading desire to create new possibilities of living are of far greater importance. But an economic policy, conducted by a sympathetic government, bent on furthering that development instead of viewing it with apprehensive suspicion, would greatly facilitate and speed up a process which until now, the war years excepted, had to rely only on the driving force of private initiative undeterred by whatever difficulties.

Theoretically, the future possibilities of industrial development in Palestine are nearly unlimited the more so since space, so essential for agriculture, is less vital for industry.

But the major policy of the British Government, resolved to keep the growth of the Jewish population within the limits of a *numerus clausus*, does affect our growth possibilities very seriously. A continuation of that policy would deprive industrial development of the expanding home market urgently needed, both as the necessary basis for an export industry and for the additional workers, who are required for industrial development.

In connection with industrial exports, a single observation may be made with respect to the Arab boycott. We believe that those who advised the Arab governments to resort to this boycott did singularly bad service to the Arab cause, not so much because Arab consumers are being deprived of some goods which they used to buy for their own advantage and not for that of the sellers, but because the real Arab interest lies in an industrial center being established in the Middle East. It can never be or become a watertight center, even if the Jews wished it to become so and it must needs have a beneficial influence on general economic developments in the Middle East. But then politics are often short sighted, and they are ruled more frequently by passions than by clear reasoning. The effect of the Arab boycott can never be what it was meant to be according to its sponsors: to destroy the economic basis of the Jewish Yishuv. It has not remained, of course, without some adverse effects, but they are certainly not decisive and new export markets have been opened up to Jewish industrial products. But can it not be imagined that the British Government might have been able to protect the interests of a population entrusted to its care, and assailed by such a boycott, by other measures than some very belated, very weak, very reluctant, and manifestly ineffective declarations? The British Government has, in



fact, treated the boycotting countries with every conceivable indulgence. In 1945, before the boycott, Palestine bought from the high-price Arab Middle East countries (apart from oil) some LP 4,237,000 of goods more than she sold them; in the following year—the first of the boycott—Palestine, under British trade exchange controls, bought from the boycotting countries LP 7,334,000 more than she sold them. The boycotters received a reward of some LP 3,100,000 in increase in Palestine's net payments to them. Palestine had dollars to buy the same goods elsewhere far more cheaply, but British controls deprived Palestine of the use of these dollars. The dollars were transferred to the boycotters by the sterling pool. Is there any wonder that the boycotting countries believe that powerful forces in the British Government approve of their action?

It would perhaps be worthwhile to devote part of this short survey to the fiscal policy of the Palestine Government and its influence especially on Jewish development in this country. Also it might be of value to say something about a question apparently puzzling the Government itself: how it is possible that Palestine could accumulate sterling balances amounting to some 150 million pounds, while the value of imports has exceeded those of exports almost during the whole period of the Mandatory regime by one-third and more?

But both questions would involve a rather implicated analysis of figures. I am afraid it would be a too tiring procedure. We are prepared to give any information on those subjects, if desired, in writing. At present, I would like to content myself with two general remarks.

It has been contended that the structure of Jewish economics in Palestine is essentially weak, because a too important part of the outlay is covered by Jewish contributions received from abroad. As far as these moneys are used for investment purposes, there is certainly no reason for apprehension, it being clear that colonization in Palestine is not possible without large capital import whether this be private or public capital. It is only the use of these contributions, as they indeed are partly used, for services, which could elicit unfavourable comment. However, it should be remembered that the Jewish Yishuv pays at least 70 per cent of the Government budget, that is in the present financial year something like LP 18 million. Of this sum, admittedly a very small part is returned for Jewish services, whilst the balance, as far as not needed for direct administration expenses of the Government, goes to the Arab sector. It can be assumed, in all confidence, that the Jewish economy could largely cover the expenses of its own services by local income, were it not obliged to pay so largely for non-Jewish needs. And I believe it can be stated in truth that foreign Jewish contributions, as expended on services, make up only part of the sums extracted from the Jewish Yishuv for non-Jewish purposes.

As regards the seemingly so unfavourable balance of trade, it should be understood that in a

country of colonization the difference between balance of trade and balance of payments must be great, since a considerable part of the import in goods, paid by capital import, is spent on investment and development purposes. The situation would become dangerous if the consumption and services of the settled population of the country were partly paid for out of import of capital, but the accumulation of balances in London alone proves that this cannot be the case.

There is an additional reason why I do not want to analyse government budgets and balances of payments before your Committee. This might have been necessary if I thought that the case to be judged were essentially an economic one. If it ever was, it has ceased to be so, I am afraid, long ago. We are confronted with the puzzling situation that what was demanded from us at earlier stages, namely to prove the economic possibilities of Palestine colonization, is by now largely used against us because we have proved them. The issue has now become visibly what it, in fact, always has been: whether the Jewish people will be given the opportunity to build up a future in which the famous four freedoms are not only a figure of speech, or not. We do not really understand the motives of those who want to cut off our development. If there are really conflicting interests, and I doubt it, it should be remembered that there are conflicting interests everywhere in the world, and wisdom can only decide what solutions are most promising of peace and development. As to the moral issue it should not be forgotten that whatever claims of other interested parties may be, the Jewish people in its effort to build up its national future in Palestine, is fighting for life in the most primitive sense of the word. All others concerned are, at best, fighting for power. We trust that the moral issue will be decisive in the judgment of the United Nations.

CHAIRMAN: We have heard the testimony of Mr. Bernstein.

Now, I suspend the hearing for ten minutes.  
(The hearing was suspended for ten minutes and then resumed.)

CHAIRMAN: The meeting is called to order.

The next to give evidence for the Jewish Agency is Mr. Kaplan.

Mr. KAPLAN (Jewish Agency): My task is to sum up the economic evidence of the Jewish Agency and to answer questions, if any, with regard to the economic and financial activities of the Jewish Agency, with regard to our general plan of economic development, and with regard to our programme for the financing of this development.

In summary, our contentions are: that Jewish immigration has created new economic absorptive capacities in Palestine and has given a great impetus to the economic progress of the country as a whole, to the benefit of all its inhabitants; that we have established a Jewish economic entity which is sound and self-supporting; that



we are in Palestine still at the beginning of the development process; that Palestine can absorb additional millions of people; that our plan for the absorption of a million Jews during the next decade, as submitted to the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee, is a practical one; and that, given a reasonable amount of international co-operation, the means can be found to finance this absorption.

I had the privilege of testifying before the Anglo-American Committee mainly on matters pertaining to agriculture. I tried then to indicate, in some detail, that the supplies in Palestine of the basic natural resources of land and water are not the limiting factors in the absorption of large numbers, and that the agricultural population of this country can easily be doubled and maybe trebled. The things that are needed to make this great agricultural expansion possible are large-scale immigration and a broad development policy designed and executed with vision, courage, and a pressing sense of need on the part of the responsible authorities. The progress of modern agriculture depends upon the expansion of urban markets, and we consequently envisage further agricultural development in this country as a part of its general all-round progress. My previous testimony on these questions appears as a part of the statements and memoranda submitted to you under the title "The Jewish Case." In the hope that you had an opportunity at least to glance through the printed material, I shall, with your permission, confine myself to a brief review of the basic data. I shall try to supplement our printed submissions principally by summarizing for you the research and development work accomplished during the past fifteen months.

Let me begin with the Legends that Palestine is a country where land is scarce and water is still scarcer. The latest memorandum of the Government of Palestine on "The Administration of Palestine under the Mandate" states that "under British rule in Palestine the main impediment to large-scale planning was, however, and remains, uncertainty as to the availability of land not only for close settlement of an additional agricultural population, but adequately to support the existing population. The position as regards water resources was equally characterized by imprecision." Please note that this uncertainty and imprecision still holds good in the minds of the Government after 27 years of its rule in the country. It might perhaps not unreasonably have been anticipated that, if the Government of Palestine was so uncertain of the land and water resources of the country, it might have used more of its resources during the past 27 years to go thoroughly into these questions instead of leaving them predominantly to Jewish public and private bodies. The Government has, on the other hand, not refrained from translating its uncertainties into policies that stand as barriers across the main line of economic progress. Despite the uncertainty in its own judgments, the Government justifies the

White Paper by the argument that "there was no room in certain areas for further transfers of Arab land, while in some other areas such transfers of land must be restricted if Arab cultivators were to maintain their existing standard of life and a considerable, landless Arab population was not soon to be created." "In fact, a review of the condition of congestion in Arab and Jewish rural areas carried out in 1938, had indicated serious congestion in almost the whole of the Arab area, whereas Jewish land supported fewer families in proportion to the acreage." In my evidence before the Anglo-American Committee, I repudiated this assertion with regard to the use of land at Jewish disposal. If we take only the rural population, we have a ratio as between Jewish and Arab population of 1 to 5 in Palestine as compared with a ratio of cultivated land of 1 to 10. Further, in accordance with Government statistics relating to 1944-45, the ratio of Jewish to Arab use of cultivated land under main groups of crops (excluding citrus), was 1 to 13, while the ratio of value of crops was 1 to 4½. Jewish rural population is therefore twice as dense as Arab rural population per unit of cultivated land, and Jewish output is therefore three times as great as Arab output per unit of cultivated land. Nevertheless the Government again now cites conclusions of a "review" made in 1938—a review never put at our disposal so that we might be able to analyse it and show how it had fallen into error. At the same time the Government ignores its own published figures, which flatly contradict the conclusion of this 1938 "review."

With a clear conscience I say: the truth is that this little country contains sufficient land and water to feed not only its present population but twice and thrice this number. I say it upon the strength of our colonizing experience during three generations and on the basis of the scientific research which we have conducted during the past 35 years. Of course Palestine, like many other countries, cannot and should not produce everything. But then Palestine produces some commodities in abundance which other countries will gladly take from her in exchange for products of which she is short.

The White Paper divided Palestine into three zones, in reverse direction from the official explanation of the reasons for the restrictions on land transfer. The free zone, consisting of about 5 per cent of the total area of Palestine, embraces the most congested areas. The restricted zone, constituting 32 per cent of the total area, and the prohibited zone, constituting 63 per cent, are the zones which comprise land to a large degree uncultivated and described by the Government as "uncultivable." It may be of interest to add that the agricultural standard of living in the so-called congested free zone is the highest of all the farming population of Palestine. The Government of Palestine has restricted or prohibited land transfer and development precisely in those parts of the country in which least de-

velopment had taken place. The backward are to remain backward.

I would ask for permission to illustrate it by a few maps. Here is the map of Palestine and here are the three zones. The green one is the so-called free zone. The red one is the so-called restricted zone, and the other part, the yellow one, is the so-called prohibited zone.

We Jews own, in the free zone, about 50 per cent, or, to be accurate, 49.2 per cent; in the restricted zone we own about 6 per cent. In the prohibited zone we own less than 3 per cent.

I will not go into an explanation of the map. This map and the next are part of a set of maps that we have submitted to you, together with the book mentioned by me, "The Jewish Case." This is the map showing the density of the population in the different parts of Palestine. If studied more closely, it will show, as I said, that the free zone is actually the most congested one. If you look at either Zone "D" or Zone "A" you will find large areas where the population is between eleven and twenty-six to fifty per kilometer. It is, as I said, less populated.

The other map shows, in accordance with the Government statistics, the distribution of cultivable land. The brown ones are uncultivated. The green are cultivated between sixty and a hundred per cent. The brownish one is cultivated between twenty and sixty per cent.

Again, if I take the so-called free zone, apart from these few patches, which are sand dunes—it is highly cultivated. In the other two zones you will see a lot of these brown and browner patches which mean uncultivated land. Even the Judean Desert, where there is no population, is included in the prohibited zone.

The total area of Western Palestine is about 26,400,000 dunums, counting a thousand square metres to the dunum. About a third of this area is uninhabited desert and largely unexplored. Of the remaining 17,000,000 dunums, about 9,000,000 are cultivated, and about 8,000,000 are uncultivated and given up by the Government as uncultivable. We have shown by experience and reasonable analogy that this area of cultivable lands can be increased by millions of dunums, which would provide a livelihood to tens of thousands of families in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, you have visited the Negeb. In accordance with Government figures there are in that area about 1,600,000 dunums of cultivable land of which only one-half is cultivated. You have seen the primitive form of cultivation which now prevails. You have seen the first beginnings of our efforts to convert this semi-desert into a highly cultivated area. It calls for vision, and certainly we cannot always claim success, but we are pursuing the method of trial and error. After observing the experience of three experimental settlements over a period of three years, we established an additional thirteen settlements during the past ten months. I should rather say the nuclei of additional settlements. We have tried to study the climatic conditions, the proper form of cultiva-

tion; we have tried to bring water to these places. You have seen the dam and the reservoir at Revivim. It was quite costly, as is each new experiment, but—from the point of view of the development work that will be carried out there in the future—such a cost is amply justified. In the neighbourhood of Beersheba, on a plateau three hundred meters above sea level, we are trying a different system of water supply—that of underground storage. By building a number of lower dams, we are trying to stop the fast flow of flood water and to recharge the underground basin. Experiments have shown that by this method an accumulation of millions of cubic meters of water is possible. We are trying a third method of bringing water from a distance, and you have seen the work done at Nir Am and our water pipeline that may soon cover a distance of 164 kilometers. The cost of the water through the pipeline will be, in its first stage, about 16 mills per cubic meter. But again we are still in the stage of experimentation. Higher than average water costs are justified in this arid zone. Water will bring a blessing not only to the Jewish settlements, but also to the whole area. We are already supplying water to our Arab neighbours.

During your visits you have no doubt had an opportunity to see our work of reclamation in other parts of the country. You saw that we have succeeded in converting large areas of so-called bad land into what are now among the most productive parts of the country. May I mention that of the one million dunums of land acquired by the Jews during the last twenty-five years, more than half was thought to be uncultivable and unhealthy waste land. The total area reclaimed by us is more than 600,000 dunums and we believe that larger possibilities are still before us in this country. More than half of Northern Palestine—about 8,000,000 dunums—consists of hill country, of which only about 2,000,000 dunums, according to Government statistics, are cultivated. This very low ratio of cultivation is the result of centuries of neglect. By deforestation, over-grazing and improper cultivation, large areas have been reduced to rocks and boulders. The soil itself is of the highest fertility. Many of these areas can be revived, and I state this on the strength of the achievements both of our settlements in the hills and of many Arab farms. All this area is now part of the prohibited zone. We firmly believe that the White Paper of 1939, with its land prohibitions and restrictions, was not only a blow to the Jews, but continues to be a major handicap to the proper development of the country as a whole. So much for the legend of the scarcity of land.

Of even greater importance than the size of cultivated area is the question of better, more economic and more intensive use of the land. In my statement before the Anglo-American Committee I dwelt at some length upon farming methods. I told the story of the reduction of the land area in our settlements from as much as three hundred dunums per family three generations ago, to twenty-five dunums of irrigated land

in our intensified farms of today. Experience has shown that on the average, in Northern Palestine, one dunum of irrigated land is worth, from the agricultural point of view, five dunums of unirrigated land—in the Negeb much more. I wish here merely to sum up the required land area that we now accept as the basis of our settlement activities. In the plains, ten to twelve dunums of irrigated land for citriculture or for market-gardening farms in the neighborhood of towns; twenty-five dunums of irrigated land for mixed farming; one hundred dunums of unirrigated land for mixed farming. In the hills a family unit should comprise fifty dunums, of which thirty should be of superior quality reclaimed and ameliorated for fruit growing green fodder and vegetables, and twenty dunums of inferior quality for carob plantation and controlled grazing.

I have also, in my testimony before the Anglo-American Committee, challenged the Government's figures with regard to its hypothetical data bearing on the problem of the "lot viable." Our figures have never been refuted. I do not intend to go into all these questions today.

The experience of agricultural improvement in Palestine is the basis for our belief that it is the character of land use which is of primary importance to both Jews and Arabs. Our Arab neighbors have improved and intensified their land use greatly during the past fifteen years of rapid Jewish growth. This improvement has taken place often as a direct consequence of resources made available by Jewish land purchases. Other stimuli have been Jewish urban markets, the example of Jewish farm methods, and the aids made available through Jewish-paid taxes. It is a most notable fact that in Transjordan, under the same Mandatory rule, but from which Jewish immigration was excluded by the partition of 1922, the Arab farmer shows no corresponding progress despite the availability of large land resources.

In accordance with official figures, the average income of the Arab farmer increased from the year 1931 to 1939 by approximately 30 per cent (disregarding the gain in citrus). By 1945, again utilizing only Government figures, and disregarding war-time price advantages, the income of the average Arab farm family was approximately 50 per cent higher than in 1931. This gain reflects great progress in land use and in farm management. The Arab fellah has diversified his farm and has greatly increased his production of vegetables, olives, fruits, eggs and fodder. The Arab agricultural economy also profited to a very important extent from a favourable war-time price development. Arab agricultural output increased during the war by about 15 per cent, but the portion of output designed for the market increased to about 30 per cent of the total Arab production. Prices of characteristic Arab farm products rose far more than his cost of production or than the costs of the consumer goods that the Arab farmer buys. Because of this price differential in his favour—along with

his increased productivity—the Arab fellah was able to raise his standard of living notably and at the same time to pay off the greatest part of his debts.

There has been, in the past eight years, an even greater development in Jewish agriculture. The increase of the output on Jewish agriculture (again apart from citrus) during the war, in constant prices, was about 110 per cent. This increase has continued in the two years after the war; the output is now about 140 per cent higher than the output of 1939. This increase in Jewish agriculture was caused by further intensification, by a substantial increase in the irrigated area, and by establishment of new settlements. From the beginning of the war we have established 94 new settlements; this includes 36 nuclei of new settlements, established during the past 15 months. I should actually say now thirty-eight.

Again I wish to give an idea of the expansion of the Jewish settlements on the two maps which I have here.

Here are the Jewish settlements after the first war. We had then 45 settlements. You can see where they were concentrated. Here is the progress made by us up to July 1947. We have now in Palestine 328 settlements. Of these, close to 300 are agricultural settlements. It is now two years after the war, and both Jewish and Arab farmers face a difficult problem of readjustment and adaptation to world markets. The Jewish agricultural economy is based mainly on the production of protective foods. The prices of its products have risen since the beginning of the war by about 360 per cent. During the past year there was a limited decrease of the prices of Jewish farm products, but I regret to say there was at the same time some increase in the cost of production. Jewish agriculture, which produces about 75 per cent to 80 per cent for the market, depends to a high degree on imported fodder. The cost of fodder has increased substantially during the last year. Our agricultural settlements paid last year about 600,000 pounds more for fodder than the year before. We are compelled as a result of Government policy, to buy our fodder mainly in Middle Eastern countries, where prices are extremely high. We pay about six times the pre-war price for grain. Jewish farming has to face the difficult situation of a high cost of labour resulting both from the high cost of living and from the scarcity of labour. An increase in immigration will make labour more readily available. Then, with a sizeable increase in the importation of cheaper fodder, we will be able, though not without a difficult transition period, to adapt ourselves to prevailing world prices as we did before the war.

But the question of agricultural reconversion will be no less difficult for the Arabs. The prices of Arab products have increased since the war even more than those of the Jews; in fact, by 46 per cent. The Arab farm is based to a much greater extent than Jewish farming on the production of grain, and when the present sellers'

market is over, Arab grain growers too will have to adapt themselves to world market prices. Before the war Arab cereal villagers were generally unable to cover their expenses out of their farm income and were compelled either to incur debts or to seek additional sources of income through hiring themselves out for labour. In our view the only way for these Arab farmers to avoid a post-war relapse into their former indebted and impoverished condition is by the improvement of farming methods and additional irrigation with corresponding expansion of urban markets.

The Government of Palestine stresses the great obstacles in the way of rapid development. Certainly they exist, but these obstacles are not the scarcity of natural resources, but are rather connected first of all with the present system of tenure of land, then with the lack of education and training, and finally with the lack of capital. All these obstacles call for a bold development scheme. The methods of land tenure and the extreme fragmentation of holdings call urgently for a thorough-going land reform; lack of capital can be made good by additional Jewish immigration and new farm credit facilities; marketing possibilities can be provided by a rise in the standard of living and by additional Jewish immigration. Irrigation water can be provided in exchange for land. Training calls for example. There must be Government intervention, guidance and planning; without Government authority and initiative it is hardly possible to carry out large development schemes. But I regret to say that our experience under the present regime has been a disappointing one. The Government of Palestine has lacked imagination, determination and interest in economic development. The aim of the Mandatory Government's intervention in economic affairs has been "keeping the balance"—mainly not development, but restriction, and the sufferers have been Jews and Arabs alike.

I wish to add to my text one remark with regard to the most important question of land tenure. We inherited this backward system from the Ottoman regime. In Turkey itself this system has been abolished, but in Palestine it is still in force in its main lines. The settlement officer is not empowered here to readjust and to redistribute the land so as to improve agrarian conditions. He is authorized only to deal with the rights of ownership. In this connection I call your attention to page 607 of "The Jewish Case."

I have mentioned briefly the land regulations of 1940. Only this week we were confronted with the publication of a draft law called "Irrigation Water Bill, 1947." We were amazed by the Government's decision to introduce such radical legislation, putting all underground water under strict Government bureaucratic control without recourse to the courts at a time when the whole question of Palestine is *sub judice*. The general tendency of this law, as of most other laws enacted since 1939, is restrictive and not creative. What Palestine needs is a governmental authority which is determined to execute large develop-

ment schemes combined with large immigration. Such development initiative is the primary economic requirement of both the Jewish and Arab population now resident in the country and of the many hundreds of thousands of Jews who need to come here.

I turn now to the second of our stultifying legends—that of the scarcity of water in Palestine.

About forty years ago, in 1908, the Zionist Organization started its colonizing work in this country. There was then not a single modern well in Palestine. About fifteen years later the total irrigated area in Palestine was about thirty-thousand to forty-thousand dunums. Now the area under irrigation totals 450,000 dunums, which means that in the last twenty-five years the area has increased more than ten-fold. But we are confident that it is possible to increase the irrigated area of Palestine further to an amount totaling at least eight times as much as is now irrigated. In this direction lies the future of Palestine's agriculture. We are only at the beginning. The discovery of water is, in our view, the greatest discovery ever made in Palestine. I would like to say that in the last fifteen months we have had quite a number of further striking successes in finding water in different parts of the country.

I discussed the question of irrigation at length in my statement before the Anglo-American Committee, and on that occasion explained the work of our water companies and the schemes prepared by local and American experts, especially the over-all irrigation scheme prepared by Hays and Savage. Mr. Hays is an outstanding American irrigation engineer with very wide experience, while to Mr. Savage may perhaps be accorded the title of the foremost irrigation engineer of our times. I understand now that the Hays-Savage scheme is contested, in some particulars, by the Palestine Government's water officers. We proposed fifteen months ago that a round-table conference should be held where the American experts and the water officers of the Palestine Government would be brought together in order to clear up the differences of opinion. Some Members of the Anglo-American Committee heard the explanations of Messrs. Hays and Savage (see "The Jewish Case," page 612), but I regret to state that the Government representatives did not appear at that meeting, and up till now most of the criticism of the Government has been kept secret. This seems to us an extremely strange way for a Mandatory to deal with a scientific and technical question that is of the greatest importance for the development of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am in a position to state that our local and American experts are ready to appear before you whenever you desire; they are ready to appear before you in Europe, if that is more convenient, and they are prepared to give you, or any competent engineer you may designate, any explanations you may care to have of their scheme. In accordance with Mr. Hays' report, an additional area of about 2½ million dunums beyond what is now irrigated can be

irrigated by utilizing the water sources of this country. He envisages a further development by way of co-operation with the neighbouring countries.

Our Agricultural Research Institute at Rehovoth has followed up the Hays-Savage scheme by more detailed calculations of actual water requirements, by crop and region. They have prepared cultivation plans in accordance with the soil and climatic conditions prevailing in various parts of the country, and they have reached the conclusion that with the same quantity of water as estimated by Mr. Hays a further area of about 800,000 dunums can be irrigated, bringing the total area of new irrigable lands up to 3,300,000 dunums. About 120,000 intensive farm units can be established under this scheme. This means doubling the agricultural population of Palestine. We estimate that there are now in Palestine about 85,000 Arab farm units and about 15,000 to 16,000 Jewish farm units.

Arguments have been brought against this scheme, questioning the quantity of water available and the feasibility of the scheme because of the present form of land tenure, and also stressing the high price of water. I do not intend to go again into all these questions. As regards the high price of water I would like to stress again that what is decisive is not the absolute price of the water, but the relation of the cost of the water to the value of the crops produced. Our Agricultural Research Institute has made a detailed study of the ratio of the cost of water to the value of different crops in the different parts of this country, and they came to the encouraging conclusion that a price of  $2\frac{1}{4}$  mil per cubic metre is an economic one as regards most of the products of an intensified farm unit, even assuming the low pre-war level of agricultural prices. Mr. Hays believes that the price of water in Palestine will be less than 2 mils. He emphasizes that the water will cost less here than in California. We know that it will be less than that paid in many places in Palestine before the war.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, in order to narrow the field of controversy, and to explain the large development possibilities, we instructed our Agricultural Research Institute to prepare an additional plan as a part of Mr. Hays' over-all scheme based upon quantities of water which are indisputably known to be available for irrigation and which do not raise serious objections as to cost. It was laid down by this instruction that such schemes should not embrace the whole of agricultural Palestine, but only limited areas of cultivated or cultivable land which could be brought under irrigation under the most economic conditions. After careful examination of the soils, of the climatic influences, of the water available, of agricultural practices, of marketing demands, eleven agricultural districts were chosen, extending over a development area of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million dunums—all to be cultivated in an irrigated and intensive manner. The major part—about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million dunums—of the area is in the coastal plain. This area requires one billion

cubic metres for irrigation. The rest of the development area consists of inland plains—valleys known as the Hulch, the Valley of Jezreel and Asdraclon, and others. These inland plains cover an area of about one million dunums. They require about six hundred million cubic metres of water for their irrigation.

Here you have again the map of Palestine, and in general it is the Hays-Savage scheme covering, as I said, additional land of 3,300,000 dunums, together with the irrigated land—about 3,700,000 dunums. That is, as I said, a provisional scheme prepared by us covering the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million dunums.

Leaving that aside for the moment, you see you have an irrigable area of the Jordon Valley and about one million dunums of irrigated land in the south of Palestine in addition to the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions which I mentioned just now.

CHAIRMAN: Is that map to be available for us?

Mr. KAPLAN (Jewish Agency): Yes, it will be available.

The authors of this limited scheme confined themselves to no more than 60 per cent of the irrigable area of plain land and to a quantity of water which is available even at the most conservative estimate of water potentialities in Palestine. (Most conservative experts agree that at least 2 billion cubic metres of water are available for agricultural and other uses.) An important feature of this development plan is the carefully worked out "water duty," which is not derived by a purely statistical average but is a directly computed sum of the quantity of water actually required by the various crops under the actual conditions of their growth, taking into consideration soil, climate, season and farm practice.

The development area under consideration in this most recent scheme contains at present about 45,000 farm units, Jewish and Arab, in the approximate proportion of 1 to 2. The plan envisages the establishment of an additional 50,000 farm units on the same area, bringing the total to about 100,000 farming families. In addition there would be about 25,000 to 30,000 families in this area engaged in other rural occupations. A comparison of the value of the agricultural output from the area in question, at pre-war prices, before and after development will illustrate clearly the resulting change. While the present value of the farm output of the area is about five million pounds, the estimated value of the future output is about eighteen million pounds at constant prices. The net income of an Arab farm which paid no rent or interest, was authoritatively estimated at about £30 and £40 in pre-war years, while the development scheme provides now for a net income of £60 at pre-war prices in the first stage of the plan, which will grow to £100 in its final stages. In the case of a mature Jewish farm, this net return is now about £100 to £120 at pre-war prices if the farmer practices irrigation and mixed farming. In the Jewish section, the development plan is mainly designed to increase the number of farms, the principle of intensification and diversification having been now well established. It is of course to be

expected that, in the long run—as farm practices are perfected—the average income per Jewish farm unit will also rise.

As I have stressed earlier, we asked that this development plan be prepared within the general framework of the Hays-Savage Report, into which a series of regional or local water projects can fit at various stages. These water projects would be capable of functioning separately to a large extent. The linking of regional water projects insures their advantageous functioning and collateral safety in that each can, when necessary, rely upon the surplus water reserve of the other. This fact becomes of the utmost importance when it is considered that both water resources and rainfall are not evenly distributed in the country. The Hays-Savage design permits great elasticity in the carrying out of the work in such stages. Working schemes, balance sheets of the different types of farms and estimates of production and cost have all been prepared, and—provided a market for the produce is assured by new urban development—the whole scheme is economically sound.

We consider it dangerous to neglect the market factor in planning for agricultural improvement. Our plans are very cost-conscious, and therefore we must emphasize that the presence of a large number of new consumers is a precondition for the full utilisation of the agricultural resources of Palestine. Modern agricultural development depends upon urban development. For that reason, I said in my statement before the Anglo-American Committee that the whole discussion of the quantity of water is not relevant to the present proposal made by the Jewish Agency with regard to the immigration of the first million Jews. Even the limited scheme designed by our Agricultural Experimental Station provides for more additional irrigated land than would be needed to meet the agricultural needs of an additional Jewish immigration of one million persons. As shown in our memoranda submitted to the Anglo-American Committee, the quantity of irrigated land needed for an additional Jewish population associated with one million immigrants is about 650,000 to 700,000 dunums and the quantity of water needed is about 450,000,000 cubic metres. These quantities of land and water are certainly available. There is no question that Palestine has far more available land than water and are required for a Jewish immigration of one million. Serious disagreement is possible only if we consider significant multiples of one million.

This brings me to the ten years' scheme of absorbing one million Jews into Palestine. My colleague, Mr. Bernstein, has explained to you the development possibilities of industry. Industry and agriculture are the main cornerstones upon which we have built our scheme for the economic development of the country and absorption of one million Jews. The details of the scheme were given in testimony by Mr. Hoofien before the Anglo-American Committee. May I also draw your attention to the books *Palestine Problem and Promise*, by Messrs. Nathan, Gass

and Creamer, and *The Outline of A Plan for Jewish Palestine*, by Mr. Gruenbaum. The former is a searching review of our development problems and possibilities by three independent American economists; the latter is a parallel study by a Palestinian economist associated with the Jewish Agency's planning work. We have built our blueprints for the absorption of one million Jews (during a period of ten years) upon past experience, upon research and planning. We know that the experience of life will be more varied than we can take into account fully even in our most judicious blueprints. Our planning is correspondingly flexible.

The Government of Palestine discloses a basic lack of understanding of the fundamental nature of our work in Palestine when it accuses our Jewish economic system of exclusive racialism. At the same time, the Government engages in unfounded innuendo when it states that it is inconceivable "that a civilized society consisting of a privileged group and a balance of hewers of wood and drawers of water should be deliberately constructed under international agreement." A society divided along national lines into privileged and exploited is exactly what we have tried and succeeded in avoiding. We Jews hew our own wood and draw our own water.

It is impossible to understand the Palestine problem (and Zionism) if one does not understand our conception that we are trying in Palestine not only to find a haven for refugees but to re-establish a Jewish nation. We must do our work of national building with our own hands; our national home can not be based on the exploitation of another people. The Government policy derives from entirely false premises and could only result in failure when it conceives, as a common end, a unitary Palestine and not co-operation between two equal peoples, two nations—Jewish and Arab. There is no lack on our side in desire and effort to achieve co-operation, but only on a basis of Jewish nationhood in Palestine. Government policy was unwilling to encourage this development. At best the Government has, in principle, been neutral towards our efforts, but *de facto* often hindered them.

Mr. Horowitz in his evidence explained to you the occupational structure of the present Jewish population of Palestine. About 47 per cent are occupied in primary and secondary industries, and about 53 per cent in tertiary occupations. We Jews have not infiltrated ourselves into the existing Arab economy. We have already built a new entity, more or less upon the pattern of Western economic life. From the economic point of view we are already a nation in the making. The ten year plan provides for the further and faster development of the present trends.

We believe that the economic and social foundations laid by us are sound and the possibilities for great expansion are there, provided proper conditions are forthcoming. We are strengthened in that belief by postwar development here. Two years have passed since the termination of hostilities. We have had to face quite a number of difficult problems. Like other countries engaged



in the war effort, Palestine was confronted with the tremendous task of readjusting its economy from war conditions to the requirements of peace. But our task was not limited to preserving our economic equilibrium and safeguarding the standard of life of our people. Our economy is a dynamic and expanding one, governed by the clear objective of absorbing new immigrants. During the years 1945-46, in accordance with Government quotas, 36,000 Jewish immigrants were absorbed into the country, and this task was successfully more or less solved in addition to the re-absorption of almost 26,000 Jewish men and women demobilized from the armed forces. The adjustment of Palestine's economy to these needs took place under adverse political conditions which are not without repercussions on the economic life of the country: restriction of immigration, terror, reprisals, martial law, Arab boycott and curfew. All these formidable obstacles had to be overcome.

Moreover, while in other countries the task of postwar reconstruction was considered as the main purpose of the Government in the period of transition, and all endeavours of Government were directed towards this end, here the Government was largely indifferent to this problem and concentrated its activities mainly on the prevention of immigration and the maintenance of the political *status quo*. Neither the foreign trade policy nor the foreign exchange policy of the Government of Palestine has been governed by the objective of fostering the economic development of the country to carry out the purposes for which the Mandate was entrusted to the United Kingdom; quite other considerations have been determinative. As a result, we had to work under conditions of unnecessarily high costs. We had to carry out our economic development tasks in an unorganized economy, with a quite unnecessary degree of inflation, bringing a vicious spiral of soaring wages and prices. Despite these necessary and unnecessary difficulties, I dare say that we succeeded to a considerable extent, and we have tried to prove our success in the memorandum on the Reconversion of Palestine which has been submitted to you. Our economy is continuing to expand, though with certain important structural shifts due to the reconversion of war industries; citriculture and construction—both hard hit by the war—are progressing rapidly; mixed farming is growing in all its branches. Even in these two difficult and hard years, we have therefore strengthened and expanded our economic position, and we have correspondingly by strengthened our belief in the feasibility of our large development scheme.

The ten year plan calls for large finances and for government authority. In our presentation to the Anglo-American Committee, and in the books mentioned above, this problem of financing is discussed in detail. The question was also discussed in great detail in negotiations with the Anglo-American experts in connection with the recommendation to bring 100,000 Jewish refugees to Palestine as soon as possible. The experts then reached the conclusion that the immigra-

tion and integration of this 100,000 would cost a sum of £70 million or about £700 per head. We believe that this amount is perhaps a little too high even under current high cost conditions; in any case, only about half of the funds for the first 100,000 would be required in the first year.

The cost of absorbing immigrants before the war was between £200 and £300 *per capita*, but the index of cost of living has now risen to about 275 and that may explain the figure fixed by the experts of about £700 per head. However, we are discussing a ten year plan, and no one can give an exact forecast of the price structure and price development in the coming ten years. It is reasonable to expect however, especially upon the strength of our experience here in Palestine after World War One, that prices in Palestine will adjust themselves to the international price level. An average price level of 50 per cent higher than the prewar figure is perhaps a reasonable expectation. That means, as Mr. Hoofien put it, that we may have to mobilize, invest and spend during these ten years a sum of about £400,000,000 to £450,000,000. We have tried to outline the different sources for mobilizing these funds: savings of the Palestine Jewish economy, immigrants' capital, investment from Jews abroad, Zionist funds, sterling balances abroad, non-Jewish foreign investments, German reparations, international bank loans, etc.

The question of international participation was discussed last year in connection with the abovementioned proposal of the 100,000 Jewish immigrants. The Government of the United States promised then to contribute its share. During my latest visit to the United States, a few weeks ago, I again discussed the possibility of an international loan provided there is a favourable political decision. During the same visit I was strengthened in my estimate of the participation of Jewish private capital in the building up of Palestine; the interest of world Jewry in Palestine is tremendous. I regret to say that the results of our activities with regard to reparation funds were less successful; for the moment only some tens of millions of dollars are assured to Jewish organizations for the resettlement and rehabilitation of displaced persons, whereas our estimate of looted Jewish property runs into several billions of dollars.

Last year was quite a promising year as regards Zionist funds. Upon the request of the Anglo-American Committee, I placed before them some figures about the financial activities of the Jewish Agency and the other principle Jewish institutions. The total expenditure of the main Jewish bodies for the period 1917 to October 1945 was £45 million. From October 1945 to October 1946 the same bodies spent in Palestine an additional £12 million. The total expenditure of these bodies therefore came to about £57 million. Of this total about £21 million was spent for the purchase of land and agricultural settlement; more than £10 million for education and cultural activities; about £5½ million for immigration; about £5 million for national organization and religious and cultural



institutions; about £5 million for urban settlement, trade and industry and urban investments; about £4.6 million for health and social services; about £3¼ million for public works, labour and housing, and about £2.6 million for administration and miscellaneous. The income of these institutions reached a figure of £53 million. Of this the Jewish Agency and its financial instrument, the Palestine Foundation Fund, had an income of about £27 million and spent about £29 million. The Jewish Agency spent about £9 million for agriculture alone.

In addition to this capital brought into the country by the principal Jewish institutions (though about 10 per cent of the above sum comes from Palestine itself), about £125 million of capital has been brought in by private Jewish individuals and companies. Of this total, about four-fifths was brought in during the period between the Great Wars.

I would, however, be doing this Committee a disservice if I were to give the impression that the sizable capital sums which Jews have brought into Palestine during the past quarter century (more exactly thirty years), have served Jewish purposes alone. On the contrary, we have been contributing capital on a very large scale to the Arab community of Palestine. During the past fiscal year, 1946-47, we Jews contributed about £8 million to the Arab community of Palestine through the Government fiscal mechanism alone. Though Arab wealth has increased markedly during recent years, the Jewish community's share of total taxes continues to rise. In 1946-47 the Jewish contribution to Government revenue was more than three times that of the Arabs. Even the wealthiest Arabs pay very little in taxes. It is this financial contribution which has made possible a standard of social services (education, health, and so on) for Palestine Arabs far above those of any Arab country. We anticipate that as our development plan proceeds we shall continue to bring financial and economic benefits to our Arab neighbours. We regard it, however, as an elementary right that, in the future, such benefits should be realized in a framework which takes due account of our own needs.

The Government, in its statement advocates "the willingness of each to contribute according to his means and to the need of the other." We accept this, as a general principle. But a fair evaluation of needs and means is imperative to a just application of this principle. We question the evaluation implied by the Government's statement. We Jews have always to consider not only the needs of the existing population in Palestine (and we have also in our community many under-privileged) but also the needs of our people abroad. In accordance with Government statistics, of 7,851 Jewish immigrants during the year 1946 only ten persons with two dependents brought £1,000 or more *per capita*. Before the war about 28 per cent of the Jewish immigrants arrived under the so called "capitalist" category. Now, 99 per cent of the immigrants arrive in Palestine penniless. They are the victims of the war and of Nazi persecution.

We have to care for their human rehabilitation and economic integration. The reason for the large collections of funds in Jewish communities in all countries are to settle new immigrants to expand the country's economy so that more newcomers can be absorbed, and not to support the established population in Palestine. These are the needs which have first claim on our attention.

I do not under-estimate the magnitude of the financial problem of the years before us, but the upbuilding of Palestine should not be discussed merely as an economic and financial problem. It is a great human problem for all the peoples of the world; for us it is a question of the revival and survival of the Jewish people, and who is able to appraise the cost of the survival of a people?

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: The economic evidence of the Jewish Agency has tried to show you the Jewish achievements in Palestine and the possibilities latent in this country. This is a small country, but at a time when the whole world became too small for those Jews fleeing from Nazi persecution, Palestine alone was large enough to provide for them with a haven and a home. Palestine is our home, our only home. The Jews need Palestine, and Palestine needs the Jews.

I hope, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that during your visits you were able to see the spirit of the people behind these achievements. We have had to overcome great difficulties. Only the belief in national revival, and in an economic democracy, enabled us to overcome these difficulties. I ask to be permitted to finish my evidence with the same words that I used in my statement before the Anglo-American Committee. "Return to us confidence in humanity and international responsibility. We need this confidence to strengthen us in the unequalled effort of reviving a good but badly neglected land and the remnant of an ancient people. The land and the people are bound together."

CHAIRMAN: May I ask if we have the map before us that you have been referring to, or some other map?

MR. KAPLAN: Of the six maps you have but two, but I am ready to submit, if you wish, all the other maps.

CHAIRMAN: What I would like to know is whether on this map which we had before us just now, or some other map, are indicated the regional or local irrigation schemes and the number of settlers which they would allow for?

MR. KAPLAN: No sir, but I am ready to submit an additional map whereon will be indicated the regions of the development schemes, and the number is submitted here. Further, if you are asking for details, I am ready to submit all possible details.

CHAIRMAN: I think it would be useful to have such a map.

MR. KAPLAN: Thank you very much, sir.

CHAIRMAN: The hearing is now adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9.

*(The meeting adjourned at 12 a.m.)*

# VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y. M. C. A. Building, Jerusalem  
Palestine*

*Monday, 7 July 1947, at 9 a.m.*

## *Present*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCIA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCIA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

## *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCIA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The agenda for today contains two points: one, public hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency, and the other public hearing of representatives of Vaad Leumi. I think we can adopt this agenda.

It is adopted.

## **Continuation of Hearing of Representatives of the Jewish Agency**

I wish to ask first if we shall consider the evidence of the Jewish Agency as ended so far.

(At this point Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Shertok took seats at the Council table.)

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shertok, are you going to make an address as your colleagues have done?

MR. SHERTOK: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Then we consider the evidence as ended so far, and we will put our questions. I understand that on the political issues you, Mr. Ben Gurion, and you, Mr. Shertok, are going to answer.

(Assent signified.)

CHAIRMAN: Before we begin, I should like to ask my colleagues that, when putting a question, they speak into the microphone so it can be heard in the hall.

If the Committee is able to make recommendations which will contain a remedy for the troubled situation here, I think it is very important that we should determine what is really the root of the evil. Now, you had, in your addresses, put rather much in the foreground your conflict with the Mandatory Power, and we have heard at length your grievances against the Mandatory Power and the Administration of Palestine. You have rather put the conflict between the Jews and the Arabs in the background. There are, however, certain indications that at the root of the evil is this conflict between Jews and Arabs.

The first question I want to put to you is this: do you agree with me that if you could

find a solution of this conflict between Jews and Arabs, the conflict between you and the Mandatory Power would be relegated to secondary place and perhaps be solved automatically?

MR. BEN GURION (Representative of the Jewish Agency): I am afraid, sir I cannot agree with that view, because it implies a few things which we think are not the way you put it, Mr. Chairman. We have no conflict with the Arabs on our side. As far as this country and the Arabs are concerned, what we say is that we were dispossessed from our country, although it was a considerable time ago. But we did not give it up. It is our home. We admit that all those who are living in this country have the same right to it, just as we. We do not say, as in the case of other dispossessed people, that the people who are there ought to be removed.

There was such a view held by the Labour Party, adopted only two years ago by the British Labour Party, just before the election, that in order to make more room for Jews the Arabs should be encouraged to transfer to other countries. We did not accept it even then; we did not approve of it. We do not claim that any Arab ought to be removed. Therefore, we have no conflict, as far as we are concerned, with the Arabs. They deny our right to be in our home. If you call this a conflict, then there is a conflict, but it is not a conflict on our side.

We do not claim anything they have. The Mandatory here, when these countries were liberated, undertook to facilitate our return. This is the conflict. It is true that at the beginning, the representatives of the Arabs agreed to that settlement. They later did not keep it.

So, I would not say there is a conflict between us and the Arabs. If there is a conflict, it is a one-sided conflict. The Arabs try to deny our right to our country here. We do not deny their right to this country here.

CHAIRMAN: Then I must ask, is it not enough to create a conflict that the Arabs deny your right to come here? And as further indication of this conflict, is it not true that the Arabs have not contented themselves with contesting your right in an academic way, that they have shown that contestation of your rights even in acts?

MR. BEN GURION: Yes. In this, it is the same as in private or in any other public law. This question was adjudicated by the world tribunal when the question arose. It was some twenty-seven years ago. You have the same question in many countries where Jews as private persons—not as a people—were dispossessed by the Nazis. In the meantime, their goods were given away to others, but the law said—at least in many countries, in Greece, I believe, in Czechoslovakia, and some other countries—that the goods taken away forcibly from the Jews were to be given back. Sometimes the people who had then refused to do it. But there is a law which is superior, and this law ought to be carried out. And the Mandatory undertook to carry out that law. It failed in that.

CHAIRMAN: I only want now to explain why I said that there are indications that there is a conflict between yourselves and the Arabs. In the grievances that you make against the Government, you have referred to a pro-Arab attitude of the Government. That presupposes opposition between Jews and Arabs. I further see, in the case you stated before the Anglo-American Committee, that you end your case by saying, among other things: "The issue is not merely one between Jews and Arabs. It concerns the whole world."

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, sir.

By the way, I did not use the term that the Mandatory is pro-Arab. I doubt that very much. Anyhow, I did not say so, that they are pro-Arab. I said they were against the Mandate, but I did not say that they are pro-Arab.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I will go on with my questions.

I suppose that your conception of the essence of the conflict is influencing your proposals for settlement. Now, it is not altogether clear how you imagine the development of things here. We have seen that you oppose the White Paper, the land regulations. I suppose you want them abolished—the restrictions on immigration and the land regulations. You want them abolished and, I suppose, immediately.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: On the other hand, we see that you want the abolition of the Mandate and you do not want the substitution of a trusteeship, or something of that kind, for the Mandate. Then the question must come up: how do you think that immigration could be implemented if the Mandate has ceased? What kind of government do you think should be established in this country instead of the Mandate?

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, that is a very legitimate question, and a very sensible question, and I will try to answer you to the best of my ability. We say that the White Paper policy is illegal, and therefore, it should be removed at once. The Mandate, in fact, does not exist because it was violated by the Mandatory. We are not in favour of renewing it. We do not believe that in the future it will be carried out better than in the past. Therefore, we say that the original intention and the need, and what in our conviction is just, should be decided upon by the United Nations, and a Jewish State should be established.

There are two parts in the establishment of a state: one is the material part, which is the most essential; the other is the legal part, the purely formal one, which is also of great importance.

I will say a word about the material establishment, because the whole difficulty of the problem here is that you have a people, you have a country, and their right to the country was acknowledged, but the people do not happen to be there yet. They were dispossessed, and they have to come back. So, the first thing is the material establishment of the state, which

means that plans based on our experience and on achievements, examined and approved by experts—economic, irrigation, agricultural, industrial experts, and so on—should be examined by the Committee and the United Nations to see how they can be carried out; and that a million Jews should be resettled in their country.

In our view it is not only possible, but it is possible to do so by good will. It is possible to do it in a very short time. This is the material establishment of a national home for the Jewish State. This may take some time. In the meantime, it will be supervised by the highest authority of the United Nations. The fact that the Mandatory itself referred it to the United Nations implies a certain recognition that this is the place where it has to be judged and decided, although the Mandatory did not undertake formally to carry it out. But there is an indication that this is the place where it should be decided.

Assuming that on the recommendations of your Committee the United Nations approves of that plan, the material establishment, it means the settlement of the first million Jews—I say a million, it may be 900,000 or it may be 1,100,000, to state a round figure—in the shortest possible time. Even the shortest possible time may and must take some time. I am unable to say how long it will take. I think no one is able to say that, because there are always in human affairs unforeseen things which may happen. But it should not take longer, as far as we can judge now—it must not take longer than a few years. Not necessarily longer than a few years. Then, in the meantime, a committee, or any instrument which the United Nations will decide on, will supervise.

This plan means two things: bringing in a large number of Jews, and developing the Arab parts of the country. Because we cannot—not only because we are philanthropists—we cannot irrigate the country as a whole—and the basis of our plan is, first of all, irrigation. You cannot irrigate only the Jewish part of the land. You must irrigate all parts of the land. And we must give irrigation to the Arabs. We must give roads to the Arabs. We must give better buildings and better schools. And it implies raising the standard of living of the Arabs to the same level, as possible, as the Jewish.

These are the two essential features of our plan of development: a large Jewish settlement; a considerable raising of Arab standards.

When this plan is approved by you and by the United Nations, then the Jewish Agency can be charged to carry it out, not only because it is responsible but because it is able to do it. We will be able to do it. It is our baby. If the Arabs are willing to take part, we will welcome them to take part in it. It will be under the highest supervision of the United Nations.

When a considerable part of the plan is carried out, because you must not wait until the end of it—a considerable portion of that large-scale plan of immigration, settlement and im-

provement of conditions of Arabs is carried out, then the United Nations will decide there is no more need for supervision and the independent State of Palestine can be established. And we can envisage a State in Palestine only on absolutely democratic lines, where every citizen in the country is an equal citizen. By the way, I want to express what we mean by a Jewish State. We mean by a Jewish State simply a State where the majority of the people are Jews, not a State where a Jew has, in any way, any privilege more than anyone else.

I want to mention on this occasion that during our last talks with the Government in London, when certain proposals were made for a settlement—which, unfortunately, we could not consider—we were offered that Jews should have more rights than others. And certain examples were given us of certain British colonies, in Ceylon and other places. And we declared emphatically to the Government that we will not accept, we will fight any privilege accorded to a Jew because he is a Jew. What we want to have is more Jews in Palestine but not more privileges for the Jews. A Jewish state means a state based on absolute equality of all her citizens and on democracy. When the United Nations will see that the main purpose for which this country is destined, to solve the Jewish problem, that the main thing has been done and that the time is ripe to undertake administration of the Government itself, then the second phase, the legal, the formal establishment of a state will be reached. Whether it will take two years or three years, I cannot say, but in that transition period it will be in charge of the United Nations. That is all we envisage here.

CHAIRMAN: If I sum up correctly what you have said, you mean that it would be an administration of the country under supervision by the United Nations?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, The Jewish Agency—

CHAIRMAN: But is that not a continuation of the Mandate in another form?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, it is not. Because the Mandate means—and you will see the first Article of the Mandate begins: "That the Mandatory shall have full power of legislation and of administration . . . save as they may be limited by the terms of this Mandate. This had to be done because at the beginning there was only a very small Jewish community of some 60,000 and they could not foresee how long it would take to reach the consummation of the purpose of the Mandate. We are now in a different phase. There is only a very short interval between the decision to have a Jewish State and the material and legal consummation of a State.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, when I asked whether it is not a continuation of the Mandate, that was a contradiction, as there will be no Mandatory. It will be a direct administration by the United Nations. But do you think there is an advantage in such a situation?

Mr. BEN GURION: There is, because, first of all, there will be a clear-cut, unequivocal de-

cision that Palestine is becoming a Jewish State. The fact—and this has been admitted by many—the fact that this was not quite clear in the Mandate has led to contradictions. But the first thing is that there will be a clear-cut decision. Then the interval will be very short. Therefore, although you can say what is the difference if you call it a Mandate or if you call it supervision—the difference is that it is for a very short time, you know exactly where you are going, and you know what is going to happen in a few years.

CHAIRMAN: May I ask who will then take care of the administration? If it is the United Nations, they would have to set up a special administration just as the Mandatory has done hitherto.

Mr. BEN GURION: No, not exactly. there will be, for a certain time, a kind of government that is called a dyarchy, as in India.

There will be the plan of development which will be carried out by the Jewish Agency. They will not undertake here the whole Government of the country, for many reasons which there is no need to enter into. But the development of the country, irrigation, building, bringing in immigrants, settling immigrants, providing for immigration, this will be undertaken by the Jewish Agency. All the rest, safety, security, relations, and all other functions of the Government which have nothing to do with development will be for a time—and we believe a very short time—under the supervision of the United Nations.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, it will be an administration on the lines, more or less, of the one which exists here now, with the difference that the Jewish Agency would assume certain important functions in the administration?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, but this difference is very important.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course there is a great difference.

Mr. BEN GURION: A great difference.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

CHAIRMAN: Is it a question referring to this matter?

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Yes.

May I ask if, in this transitory period, the administration of the country as concerns security, the administration of the law, and so forth, will be administered by the Mandatory Power, by the United Nations, or by any special administration? This point is not quite clear to me from your statement.

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, I think this is a matter for the United Nations to decide. I do not think that the present administration can be left, because you cannot have an administration charged with a thing which they heartily dislike. But whether they should remain, whether it should be an international administration or a single administration, this should be left to the United Nations. The United Nations will decide.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): It means that you, sir, have no idea of your own about this aspect of the question.

Mr. BEN GURION: We did not discuss it, and I cannot speak on behalf of the movement which I represent.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do I understand correctly that you want a Jewish State to be established, to be forced on the country by the arms of the United Nations?

CHAIRMAN: I was just going to put a similar question. I understand this one hundred per cent Jewish solution of the Palestine question and a complete dismissal of the Arab claim to the country. I suppose you agree with me that it is.

Mr. BEN GURION: I will tell you—first of all, I think I ought to answer the question of Sir Abdur Rahman.

CHAIRMAN: I will come to that, but at a later stage.

What do you think will be the Arab reaction to such a solution?

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, I will answer both questions. I will answer first the question I was asked by Sir Abdur Rahman.

CHAIRMAN: I am coming to the same question that Sir Abdur Rahman asked after you answer this one. What do you think will be the Arab reaction?

Mr. BEN GURION: Do you want me to answer your question first and then the question of Sir Abdur Rahman?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, you asked me a question which I am afraid is not for me to answer. I am sorry that you have no Arab representatives here, because this question can be really authoritatively answered by them. I cannot say. I would not presume to tell you what may or may not be the Arab reactions because, as far as I know, there may be different reactions of different people and I know there are different attitudes. I happen to know this.

CHAIRMAN: Now I come to the question of Sir Abdur Rahman.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): In connexion with your own question, Mr. Chairman, would it not mean a war between the Jews and the Arabs? Let us put it straight. Would it not mean an absolutely bloody war between you and the Arabs?

Mr. BEN GURION: Do you want me to answer this question now?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

Mr. BEN GURION: I will answer the question as it was put to me first and as it is put to me now.

Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India): They are two different questions.

Mr. BEN GURION: I want to answer both questions. The first question is whether we want the United Nations to force upon the Arabs a Jewish State or Jewish immigration. This was the question.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The Chairman wants the second question to be answered first.

Mr. BEN GURION: Do you want me to answer the second question?

CHAIRMAN: I do not want to press my question. What I wanted to know was whether one could assume that there will be a violent Arab reaction. Then you have to answer the question which Sir Abdur Rahman put.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes. The supposition is that no armed forces are loosed against anybody. First of all, I want to say that the fact implied in that question that at present armed forces are not being used is not quite correct.

The present position is that armed forces are being used against us. Armed forces are being used against Jews that are coming into the country. But for the armed forces of the British Navy, the Jews who are still suffering in camps would be here. Because it is only the armed forces that have prevented them from coming.

Before I answer the question, I will ask this question: Are you for using forces of the United Nations or of a Mandatory to prevent Jews, by force, from coming back to their country, a thing which is happening now?

CHAIRMAN: Well, we will not answer that question. We have the answer to our question.

Mr. BEN GURION: I am not asking you a question; I am not asking you to answer.

CHAIRMAN: You are answering my question.

Mr. BEN GURION: I have to answer. I said that the facts are that at present force is being used against us for two purposes: for preventing us from coming here—because, without force, I want Sir Abdur Rahman to know these Jews would not have been prevented from coming back; and secondly, force is used to enforce the racial discrimination against Jews.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is not the answer to the question. It is going absolutely beyond it. If he would only concentrate on the answer to the question put to him, it would be better, because when he says force is being used, the same force is being used against the Arabs, and the same force is being used against anybody who contravenes the law. If I contravene the law, the same force would be used against me today.

Mr. BEN GURION: I did not finish my answer.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You are going beyond it. We will not finish for two months if you go on in that way. I do not mind if we take two months or two years. Let me lead the questioning. You say you have not finished your answer?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes. I say that the fact is, first, that force is being used against people exercising their rights. Our right is to come back. To prevent this, force is being used.

If the United Nations will give a decision in justice and equity that the Jews have a right to come back to their country, then I believe it will be their duty, if necessary, to enforce it.

I do not know how much force will be necessary, but you have the same problem everywhere in the world. The main question is not whether to use force or not; the main question is whether a thing is right or wrong. That is what the United Nations have to decide: Is it right or is it wrong? If it is wrong, then it is for the United Nations to stop every Jew from coming into the country, and perhaps, as some people here want, to send away those who are here. Such a thing has happened to us. So, this is the question: if the United Nations will say this is right, then they will do everything to enforce that right, the same as they are doing to enforce right everywhere else in the world. It is not a special question applied to us.

CHAIRMAN: The object of this transitory period of administration, in order to get in the immigrants and to enforce that policy, implies, I suppose, the object of coming to a State where you could use afterwards democratic means to govern the country?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes. When the country has reached a stage when the main object for which this country has to serve can be fulfilled, then you do not need any foreign intervention any more.

CHAIRMAN: The object is to create the conditions for a democratic rule of the country?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Now, let us return to the Arab claim. You know well the Arab claim and the basis for it?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It can be expressed very shortly. It is a claim based on the possession of the land for a considerable period of time and the right of self-government of the people of the land. What is your answer to this claim?

Mr. BEN GURION: My answer to that claim is the answer which was given not only by us but by human conscience almost in the whole world. The same claim was made almost twenty-five years ago. The reply was that you cannot judge this country which has a special history and special conditions which cannot be found anywhere else, and the relations of the Jews of this country cannot be judged by a rule applied to other countries not having the same unique conditions. Really, it is a unique case. You have first of all the people who were here a very, very long time ago; you know that. I can give you the Arab case. I understand the Arab case and I fully realize it. It is very simple. They state they do not care what happened, and nobody ought to care what happened fifteen hundred or two thousand years ago. We are here. We are not here from yesterday; we were here for centuries. We are the majority, and we have a right to self-determination. We will decide, just as the people in the United States or the people in Canada, whether to allow or not to allow immigrants. The fact that Jews were here some two thousand years ago is the same as the Roman legions having been in England some two thousand years ago, or when Arabs were in

Spain fourteen or so many centuries ago. That is their claim. It is simple.

Not one but many nations in the world did not accept that claim because they were faced with a unique case which is not as simple as that. You cannot compare it with Spain and the Arabs. Can you find a single Arab in the world who cares to go back to Spain? Can you find a single Arab in the world who will spend a penny for Spain? Can you find a single Arab in the world who dreams of Spain? What has he to do with Spain? He has his own country. Many kinds of people come from many countries, but here you have a unique case without any parallel in history. Here is a people who for many centuries were dreaming of this country. They might have found a country anywhere else, but no, and they never gave up their claim. It is unique. Also, the case of Palestine is unique. It is not the same. We did not say it alone, but the entire civilized world said that while the Arabs were liberated in various territories there was room for the Jews in Palestine. The Jews are connected with this country. We recognize their connexion. They are coming back. They have a right to come back. They put only one limitation. We, ourselves, would have put this limitation if it had not been put by others: not to displace the population right here. I do not know if I have to go into that again. That was the decision. What happened? Nothing happened. Did it prove the Jews do not need a home? Did it prove that Jews cannot build? Was it proven that we can come in only by displacing Arabs? Everything that happened since that world decision strengthened that decision. The need of the Jews, their ability to come back, and their not displacing (I do not want to bring in the point that we are benefiting anyone—we are, but not because of that), these three things were proven even more than they were known twenty-five years ago. Now, I return to the question: what reason have you, not you the Commission, but what reason has world conscience to reverse that decision? There is only one reason that the people here say "No, we will not let those Jews come back." The same thing happened in many countries. In certain countries the Government submitted that, and I do not want to mention the names of those countries. There are Jews who were dispossessed by Hitler. I do not speak of Germany, but countries that suffered from Hitler. When the Jews were dispossessed, very few, because the majority were murdered, came back and claimed their possessions. They did not get them back for the simple reason that the countries were occupied and did not want to give them back. That was the only reason. But this case is not similar to that because then the Jews had three or four rooms and, in the meantime, somebody else occupied all the three rooms. Here we have a case where there is a large building and three rooms are occupied, eleven rooms are not occupied, and we say, "Stay in your three rooms, we are going to occupy the other eight unoccupied rooms." He says, "No,



we don't want it. Stay out." The world has said "No," and we say there is no reason why you should reverse that decision, because justice and the necessity are the same, if not stronger. There is no reason whatsoever. The only reason is that those who undertook to do it failed to do it.

CHAIRMAN: You think the fact that a claim to a country has not been given up is so essential?

Mr. BEN GURION: Our claim?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BEN GURION: It is very. Of course, if we are invaders, then we have no right.

CHAIRMAN: And you do not think that a thousand year's possession is enough to oust the claim?

Mr. BEN GURION: Sir, I do not lay down general rules. I say on this occasion, under this historic and geographic position, no it is not, for the reasons which I gave in my address. It is not a question of the Arab race; they are fully liberated. It is not a question of the Arab individuals who are here; they are not suffering. Our claim stands; we did not give it up.

CHAIRMAN: Let us go now to this decision that you spoke of. I suppose you mean the Mandate?

Mr. BEN GURION: The Declaration and the Mandate.

CHAIRMAN: Let us return to that act. You mean that that is an absolute promise to give the country to the Jews as a state?

Mr. BEN GURION: Sir, in human affairs you cannot speak about "absolute." I would not commit myself to the word "absolute" because it is a term whose meaning nobody understands. But, it was a definite undertaking, a definite promise based on the recognition of these unique facts to which I have referred.

CHAIRMAN: Why I use the word "absolute" there is to come to my further questions which are aiming at seeing whether you admit any reservations in the undertaking. The Mandate is based on the Balfour Declaration, and in the Balfour Declaration the word "state" is not used; the term "National Home" is used. Further, it is said "Palestine," and it has been so stressed. The phrase used is "in Palestine." You do not think there is any reservation in these terms?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, sir, there are two reservations: one is the reservation that the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities should not be prejudiced. That is one reservation. There is another reservation that the equality and political status of Jews in other countries should not be prejudiced. These are the two reservations. Of course, they are clearly defined. Well, I can leave out for the moment the latter reservation because you have no trouble with the Jews. What you have in mind is the first reservation concerning the Arabs. This very reservation is a clear indication as to what they meant by a National Home for the Jewish People. If, as this memorandum or the White Paper claimed, it was meant or even contemplated that the Jews remain a minority, I

ask you if in a country the Jews are not a minority why must you have safeguards for the rights of a majority. It is nonsense. The whole question, after all, state or no state, is the question of whether the Jews must remain a minority or may they become a majority. This is the question, because a state follows from that. If this was meant why do you need to safeguard against prejudicing the rights of the non-Jewish communities? Then you ought to have safeguards against prejudicing the rights of the Jewish community. If it was meant that the Jews should be a minority, then you should have to have a National Home which means a minority, and then to safeguard their rights as against the majority. But you do not need to safeguard the rights of a majority. Therefore the safeguard itself is a clear indication as to what was meant. However, we are not neutral, and I do not claim to be neutral on that question. But you have a clear explanation why the word "State" was not used then. It was not used for the simple reason because it could not depend on the best will of the British Government to have a State. It was not for the British to take the Jews from Russia, Poland, or from the United States of America and compel them to go to Palestine. They could not say they would do it, and therefore they used this term. They did not say "A Jewish Home." They said "A National Home for the Jewish People." First of all they did not say merely "a home." "A National Home" in English has a definite meaning. In English you say "Nationality." In English they say, "What is your nationality? To what State do you belong?" There is a difference in the question. "Nationality" in Continental Europe, in English, means "State." They said "A National Home." But, they did not say only that, they said "A National Home for the Jewish People." Every word was weighed. It was not simply that somebody got up and wrote a declaration. For months they discussed every word of it. It is true that they did not say "Palestine as a National Home," they said "in Palestine." But "in Palestine" does not necessarily mean in a part of Palestine, because if they meant in a part of Palestine they would have said so. They adopted the wording of the Zionist Programme. There was a Zionist Programme formulated in 1897 in Basle, Switzerland, where our first World Congress was held. There we formulated our programme. The Balfour Declaration adopted the same wording, and it did not adopt the same wording by chance. The reason why they did not use that term "Palestine as," I think is that it could be easily interpreted as meaning removing the Arabs from Palestine, which they did not want to do; they should not have done it; neither do we like to do it. But, in Palestine, it does not mean a part of Palestine. Suppose you are introducing Socialism in England, when you say Socialism in England it does not mean socialism in a part of England. But, also, it could not have meant a minority. Further, we have the very simple and clear evidence of the Prime Minister. He said that to attribute to that

Declaration an intention or a meaning of a possibility for Jews to remain a minority would have been a fraud on the people to whom this was given. So, the reservation which was made even strengthens our understanding, which is not ours, which was the understanding of the Commission, and of every responsible statesman, that a Jewish minority was not meant. In no State is there a question as to whether the Jews are a minority or not.

CHAIRMAN: When I referred to that term "National Home in Palestine," I had in mind a passage in the statement of British policy in Palestine published by Mr. Churchill, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in June 1922.<sup>1</sup> I quote here from the Government's memorandum where it is stated as follows: "When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world in order that it may become a center in which the Jewish people as a whole may, on the grounds of religion, race, interest and pride—

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, yes, but you are quoting from the memorandum.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am.

Mr. BEN GURION: Here, sir, is the White Paper in its entirety.

CHAIRMAN: I have it, too.

Mr. BEN GURION: And I read it from the beginning to the end. I did not read only that section. It is very easy to extract a few sentences from a long and complicated document to lend it another meaning than it was originally meant to be. First of all, what is of very great importance is that that paper, the White Paper, contained several documents. It contains, first of all, and this is perhaps the most important part of the White Paper, letters sent by Mr. Churchill to the Arab Delegation to whom he certainly would not like to exaggerate the obligations which they undertook to the Jews. On the contrary, writing to the Arab Delegations he would like, as far as compatible with the obligations to the two, to put them in a very right frame. The Arab Delegation claimed then what they claim now. There is a majority and the majority want to rule, and a national government should be set up. He wrote "... We cannot do it because we are responsible for the Declaration made on November 2nd, and a national government in Palestine under the present circumstances would preclude the fulfillment of that undertaking. . ." I quoted that in my address, and I do not want to quote it again because I know they are only telling you little half-truths even about documents. I gave you the evidence not of the Jewish Inquiry, but of a purely British-Arab Inquiry. They have the evidence

of Mr. Churchill, himself. While this phrasing was meant, as far as possible, to consider the Arab, it was not its meaning to preclude the establishment of a Jewish State.

What is the meaning of a Jewish State? As I told you before, a Jewish State does not mean one has to be a Jew. It means merely a State where the Jews are in the majority, otherwise all the citizens have the same status. If the State were called by the name "Palestine," I said if, then all would be Palestinian citizens. If the State would be given another name—I think it would be given another name, because Palestine is neither a Jewish nor an Arab name. As far as the Arabs are concerned, and we have the evidence of the Arab historian, Hitti, that there was no such a thing as "Palestine" at all: Palestine is not an Arab name. Palestine is also not a Jewish name. When the Greeks were our enemies, in order not to annoy the Jews, they gave different names to the streets. So, maybe the name of Palestine will be changed. But whatever the name of the country, every citizen of the country will be a citizen. This is what we mean. This is what we have to mean. We cannot conceive that in a State where we are not in a minority, where we have the main responsibilities as the majority of the country, there should be the slightest discrimination between a Jew and a non-Jew.

CHAIRMAN: Well, so far we have treated this term "National Home in Palestine." We come further to the clause in the Balfour Declaration wherein it is spoken about maintaining the civil and religious rights of the other sections of the populations in Palestine. That expression is in the Mandate recorded in Article 6, where there is a slight difference in wording. It is said there "The administration of Palestine while insuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions. . ." Do you think that this clause while showing that the right position of Arab sections of the population are not prejudiced could be considered as placing an obstacle to Jewish immigration?

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, on that, sir, there is an authoritative interpretation. Again, that can be answered by His Majesty's Government, itself. Before this White Paper there was another White Paper. There were many White Papers, such as the Passfield White Paper.<sup>2</sup> Then two former Chancellors and Lord Hailsham, challenged the Government that this White Paper was curtailing the rights of Jewish immigration as against the international obligation, and they requested the Government to put it to the test before the Hague Court. But the then Government did not see its way clear to go as far as that and they set up a Cabinet Committee, who discussed the question. Then they gave an official explanation which is called the MacDonald Letter,<sup>3</sup> which really should be called Henderson's because he was then Labour Foreign Secretary. He elaborated on this letter and gave an attempted explanation as to what was meant by

<sup>1</sup> Cmd. 1700.

<sup>2</sup> Cmd. 3692, 1930.

<sup>3</sup> Official letter from Prime Minister MacDonald to Dr. Weizmann, 13 Feb. 1931.

the references to the rights of other sections—that these were not meant to impair or to worsen the position of the other sections in Palestine, and that as long as the position of other sections were not impaired, it would be worsened. It was the duty of the Government not to allow but to facilitate immigration—this was a positive obligation. Such was the official interpretation undertaken by His Majesty's Government when this question was for the first time raised. I am sorry I have not got it with me, but I will send you that official document.

CHAIRMAN: My question is more of an abstract nature. What I am aiming at is the circumstances in which the position of the other Arab sections of the population could be so jeopardized that the clause (in the Mandate) giving protection would operate.

Mr. BEN GURION: If you mean economically, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN: Not economy, political conditions.

Mr. BEN GURION: No, that is a different question. First of all, do you ask me whether this was meant by the Mandate, or a part from the Mandate on the basis of equity?

CHAIRMAN: I ask on the basis of the Mandate where there is stated the understanding that the rights and position of other sections of the population would not be prejudiced."

Mr. BEN GURION: Then I say quite definitely that I would not use the word "absolute," complete conviction and knowledge that what was meant was the economic conditions and position of the population of Palestine because it is dealing with economic matters. Article 6 is dealing with two economic matters, immigration and colonization. They asked the Mandatory to facilitate immigration and to encourage close settlement of the Jews on the land on the condition—or some other phrasing, I do not remember—while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced. I want to say that we accept it wholeheartedly, not only because it is there but because it is right. What is meant by the economic interests of the population is that their economic position should not become worse because of Jewish immigration and settlement. This is what the Mandate meant.

CHAIRMAN: But is the immigration wholly an economic matter? Does it not also have political implications?

Mr. BEN GURION: Absolutely. But the political implication was to allow the Jews by immigration to become a Nation and have a National Home, not a minority. That was the political implication.

CHAIRMAN: As I said before the terms of the Balfour Declaration were to a certain extent altered in this clause. The Balfour Declaration spoke about civil and religious rights. You do not think there is any implication in this change of the wording?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, Sir. I do not think there is any alteration at all. Here they lay down the terms of the administration of Palestine. When

the Balfour Declaration was given it wasn't even said that England would rule the country. It had nothing to do with the concrete administration. Here in the Mandate they have to lay down a number of set principles for the administration of the country. For instance, there is nothing about the Holy Places. They do not cover the whole problem of the Holy Places because the Holy Places in Palestine are not merely the concern of the communities in Palestine, but of the world at large. However, there is not a word there because it has nothing to do with that point at all. Here they have to lay down more details about the administration of Palestine. Further, they said while you have to encourage Jewish immigration, you are to see to it that the economic position of other sections should not be impaired or become worse. In the Balfour Declaration there is not a word of Jewish immigration at all, although it is implied. There they lay down only the main general principles. Here they gave the implications of that principle.

CHAIRMAN: I come to another aspect of this absoluteness of the promise of which you spoke. How far do you mean that the Mandatory Power would have to go to enforce the immigration of Jews into Palestine? Was the undertaking to go to war, to go to whatever effort it might mean?

Mr. BEN GURION: Again I have to take exception to the implication which is contained in your question, that they have to enforce. We did not discuss this question, and what I will say now is because you ask me a question and I want to make it clear. I am responsible for it. We can be left alone with the Arabs in Palestine. We do not want England to impose anything. We want her only not to impose a stoppage of immigration. We do not ask England to impose anything; we ask her not to impose a stoppage of Jewish immigration, which she is doing against the Mandate. The Mandate was to facilitate immigration. They are imposing armed forces against immigration. We ask them to take away armed forces and not to impose non-immigration.

Mr. RAND (Canada): What about 1922? Would you make the same answer?

Mr. BEN GURION: The question would not have arisen.

Mr. RAND (Canada): It might have if the Arabs had opposed immigration and the United Kingdom Government had kept its hands off.

Mr. BEN GURION: In 1922 the Arabs opposed immigration, and when you read the White Paper of Mr. Churchill you will see that he wrote a reply to the Arab delegation when they declared that they were opposing it, and he said: "We cannot accept your position."

Mr. RAND (Canada): What I mean is that in 1922 you were a very small proportion of the population. You were not in a position physically to impose immigration on resisting Arabs.

Mr. BEN GURION: The question has never arisen.

Mr. RAND (Canada): We are dealing with

the interpretation of the Declaration and the Mandatory and you must consider it under all conditions. In that case would you have been satisfied just to allow the United Kingdom Government to keep its hands off the opposition to immigration?

Mr. BEN GURION: In 1922—I do not really know why you ask about 1922.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I am trying to find out what the Mandatory means.

Mr. BEN GURION: In 1922 we were a small community in Palestine, and if left alone we could easily have been exterminated.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Therefore, you had to have some protection.

Mr. BEN GURION: We had to have it, and the world gave it to us, and it was the privilege of England to do it.

Mr. RAND (Canada): So it is not merely a question of withholding the hand against Jewish immigration? It is also a question, in some situations, of shielding immigration.

Mr. BEN GURION: I was asked by the Chairman how long we would ask England to impose, and to that I have answered that we do not ask her to impose any more.

Mr. RAND (Canada): It was not for how long; it was how much. How much force do you think the United Kingdom ought to take? You said, we do not want any force except to remove force against immigration. In 1922 it was different, I agree.

CHAIRMAN: You said that you are going to impose immigration?

Mr. BEN GURION: No; "impose" means some hostility. When I am going back to my home I am not imposing; I am going back to my home—unless you deny that it is my home. If you give judgment that the place where I am living does not belong to me, then I have no right to go.

CHAIRMAN: I refer to your own words. You used the words, "we are going to impose."

Mr. BEN GURION: I did not say "impose." I said, we will come back by ourselves—not "impose."

Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India): Would they be content if the Government removed the preventing of immigration and left the thing just now to the fate of the Arabs and the Jews? Would they be content?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You know that the Royal Commission said that in their view the association of the policy of the Balfour Declaration with the Mandatory system implied the belief that the Arab hostility to the Balfour Declaration would sooner or later be overcome.

Mr. BEN GURION: You read from the memorandum.

CHAIRMAN: No, I did not read it from the memorandum; I remember it from the Royal Commission's report. You are not in agreement with the statement implying that the Arab hostility to the Balfour Declaration would sooner or later be overcome?

Mr. BEN GURION: I even now believe it; I believe it may be overcome. If there is any certainty in the future, I am certain that if, allowed to come back to our country, we will live in peace and co-operation with the Arabs. I believe that as I believe in the Jewish State.

CHAIRMAN: Let us assume that there would be violent resistance to enforcing the immigration, would you mean, in any circumstances, to go on and fight down the resistance?

Mr. BEN GURION: I said we do not ask for a Mandate any more, so it is not a question. The question does not arise on the Mandate. But my answer to the question is, you have to decide whether what we ask is right or wrong. If it is right, and force is necessary, you have to apply it. If it is wrong, not only you do not have to apply force, but you do not have to allow it. It is a question of right and wrong, and not whether to apply or not to apply force, as in any other conflict in the world. And this is the reason the United Nations was established.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I suppose that is one case in which you can resort to absolutes.

Mr. BEN GURION: No absolutes. This was the reason why we were ready in 1937—I mean the majority—to consider a compromise. Although we knew we were entitled to an entire country, when the British Government came and told us the result of that Commission, they said, you are right, but this will require force and we do not want it and we cannot do it, and therefore we tell you here is a compromise. The majority said, that they were willing to consider it.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Are you still ready to consider a compromise?

Mr. BEN GURION: I told you in my evidence that when we had the talks after our last congress with the Government in London, we told them that if a Jewish State in an adequate area of Palestine were offered, we would consider it.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Does that mean partition?

Mr. BEN GURION: "To partition," according to the Oxford dictionary, means to divide a thing into two parts. Palestine is divided into three parts, and only in a small part are the Jews allowed to live. We are against that.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Several times I have heard about the possibility of violence if a decision of the United Nations were not accepted by a certain party. Suppose that decision would give absolute freedom to a Jewish State, would the Jewish people be able to resist violence and defend themselves?

Mr. BEN GURION: You mean violence on the part of the Arabs? The first thing we will do if such decision is given will be to make the greatest effort to come to an agreement with the Arabs. First, we will go to them and tell them, here is a decision in our favour. We are right. We want to sit down with you and settle the question amicably. If your answer is no, then we will use force against you. Then we will take care of ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: There is one argument in the

Arab case to which I want an answer. They say, this decision of the League of Nations is all right, but nobody can dispose of our country without our consent. What do you answer to that?

Mr. BEN GURION: The answer is this is our country, including the Arabs who are in it. This country is the country of the Jewish people and of all the other inhabitants. This is our answer.

CHAIRMAN: I think you have already answered the question. If you can envisage another solution, then this hundred per cent Jewish solution that you have—

Mr. BEN GURION: It is a matter of justice, I am convinced.

CHAIRMAN: I have exhausted the questions I wanted to put. Does some other member of the Committee wish to ask any questions?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are you taking subject by subject, or are you giving the members the option of putting all their questions? I want to know the procedure.

CHAIRMAN: I think the members who have additional questions to put ought to do so on this political issue.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I do not think that is fair to the members. Let the members exhaust their own questions which they want to ask at any stage. There are a number of other questions which arise out of the answers which it is impossible to put at this stage. Therefore, I am suggesting that the best thing would be to leave the other members to put their questions, and when they have done with it, if another member wishes to put another question in regard to another question, it is all right. Otherwise, one member must be allowed to exhaust his questions before you go on to the next one.

CHAIRMAN: You have interpreted my intention to follow that procedure.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I have no objection.

CHAIRMAN: We adopt the procedure that the questions of one member will be exhausted before I give the word to another.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): You have said in your evidence before the Peel Commission in 1937 that you would ask for a Jewish State if Palestine were an empty country. But you said there are other inhabitants in Palestine and they have a right not to be at the mercy of the Jews. Further you said that a State may imply domination by the Jewish majority of the minority. Is Palestine more empty now, or does the Jewish State imply less domination of the Arab minority than ten years ago?

Mr. BEN GURION: I remember well that evidence, but I am afraid you have got only a small extract from it. I will give the gist of the whole of it and then you will realize more fully what I meant by that extract which you have read.

I was asked the same question about a National Home and a Jewish State, and I explained

that a National Home is more than a Jewish State. Why? Because a State belongs only to the people who are there, and they can say, we will not allow anybody else. Suppose there are a million and a half Jews in Palestine and it is a Jewish State; that State can say to the Jews in Roumania or Germany, we do not want you. This might happen.

I was present at an Imperial Labour Conference in London in 1925, convened to discuss only the question of immigration in the British Empire. There was a discussion between British labour and Australian and Canadian labour. The British asked for a larger immigration—there was a great deal of unemployment in England, about two million unemployed, at that time. They asked for immigration of British labourers to Canada, Australian and New Zealand. The delegates from the Dominions were against it. They had their own reasons; it is not my business to say who was right or who was wrong. They all belonged to the same stock—British stock. Such a position might arise in a Jewish State. The Jews in Palestine might say, you are suffering in Germany; that is your business. Therefore, when you said “a National Home for the Jewish people” I said it was more than merely a Jewish State for those who are there. As long as there is a Jew who can not stay where he is, and as long as there is a place in Palestine, a Jewish State will not have the right to prevent him from coming. Therefore, a National Home for the Jewish people is more than a Jewish State.

I went on to explain why the Zionist Organization, in its programme, did not use the term “Jewish State,” and I gave three reasons. One reason was that it might imply—though it must not—domination, and we did not want the world to have the impression that we want to dominate anybody. The other reasons I do not remember but you have read it. I stand by those reasons, and we do not want a Jewish State based on domination. I will send you our programme. When we asked for a Jewish State we said the Jewish State must be based on neither domination nor being dominated. We stand by the same principle. There is no change.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): Would you agree to have a State with a Jewish majority?

Mr. BEN GURION: I may add that tomorrow you will receive a memorandum and all these things you will find fully explained.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): Would you agree to have a State with a Jewish minority or majority—with a parity in the Government?

Mr. BEN GURION: In my statement I gave the reason why parity in a Government can be a good expedient when there is a foreign power ruling the country. We were in favour of parity as long as there was a Mandatory Regime in Palestine. We said it was not right, although there was a deep, historical reason why there should be for a time a Mandate. But even in a transitory period the population should not be excluded from the Government. They should

be there on parity—two equal parts. But you cannot have parity in an independent State.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): Why?

Mr. BEN GURION: You will have a permanent deadlock. Parity means not that a single Jew and a single Arab have the same right, but that the two communities have the same right. You will have a parity of ten Jews and ten Arabs and a Government of three Jews and three Arabs. You will have a permanent deadlock. The question of development will come up—the development of the Negeb. We are for development for two reasons. We are for development as Jews; we are for development as progressive people. They are not anxious for development. I do not say they are not progressive. They are. But it is their right to be what they are. But they will be against it. They will prevail because you need a positive decision and positive action. A parity can always prevent any action being taken.

The second question, which for us is just as vital, is the question of immigration. You will have two for, and two against. That is enough to prevent immigration, because you must have a positive decision to have immigration. So you will have a permanent deadlock, which means blocking immigration and blocking development, and I cannot imagine how the Government would exist. There is no such thing in the world.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): You are definitely pessimistic about the prospect of Arab-Jewish agreement?

Mr. BEN GURION: On the contrary; I am definitely optimistic. I am sure that as soon as there is a Jewish State and we are an independent factor, the Arabs will see reason, because they are sensible people and know what is good and what is bad. As long as they believe they can prevent us from being here it is natural. I do not blame them. When the Arabs are against us I do not blame them for some of the means which they use. I can understand their attitude. I blame the Mandate—not the Arabs. When the Arabs say they prefer a poor country to a rich one I can understand it.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Did you say, on page 16, that the Racial Land Law still exists? Do you then consider that this Racial Land Law implies violation of the Mandate and of the Charter of the United Nations?

Mr. BEN GURION: I think it is definitely against the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): By its character of racial discrimination?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I should like to know, in a few words, the process of the practical application of that law in Palestine.

Mr. BEN GURION: What is the scope of your question?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): You said there were racial laws here. I asked about the application of the racial laws in Palestine.

Mr. BEN GURION: Here you have a case where certain things can be done only by Jewish-Arab co-operation, because in order to acquire land you must have the consent of the Arab who is the owner, and we acquire land only by Jewish-Arab co-operation. But here comes the Government and says "No." I will tell you the application of the law.

Take the case of the Negeb. There are people there who have large tracts of land. The land is desert. They have not got the means nor the ability to develop the land. So they say, we will sell a part of our land to the Jews and this will enable us to develop the rest of our land. This was mainly the process by which we acquired land in other parts. Then comes the Government and says, "No, you cannot do it." The result is that the land remains desolate. We cannot come there, and the Arab who would like to develop the land cannot do it because he is prevented by the Government. This is not an imaginary case. There are tens and hundreds of such cases.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): In another part of your exposition you gave a special concept on the relations between Arabs and Jews. Did you speak of co-operation and express the view that the co-operation can only rest upon equality? I consider it would be worth while to know your opinion especially on this point. Do you think that such co-operation might be possible at this moment under the actual conditions?

Mr. BEN GURION: In another place you will find that I told you that there is co-operation now between Jews and Arabs, just as there is co-operation between English and French, or Czechs and Poles. They represent two distinct things. They are human beings and they are peoples. I spoke about co-operation in both senses. There is co-operation between Jews and Arabs as individuals. As far as it depends on us we are willing to co-operate—not because we are philanthropic, but because we believe it is for the good of both to co-operate. Jewish workers are co-operating with Arab workers. The Government is not always very happy about it because it is mostly against the Government.

There was only recently a strike of some fifty thousand employees of the Government—Jews and Arabs. There is co-operation between Jewish villages and Arab villages. This is going on. We would like to go on on a larger scale, as far as we are concerned. There is co-operation between Jews and Arabs as individuals.

You quoted now the co-operation between Jewish people as a people and Arab people as a people. Such co-operation is possible only when we shall have the status which they have—an independent nation, not when they are able to boycott our goods and we are powerless to do anything. But when there is an independent state, instead of a boycott by Arabs of Jewish goods there will be an exchange of services and goods because it will be for the benefit of both Jews and Arabs. Therefore, in order to have co-operation between these two peoples you



must have equality. Only two equals can co-operate.

CHAIRMAN: Are you optimistic about the co-operation between Jews and Arabs in a Palestinian State in political matters.

Mr. BEN GURION: What political matters do you mean?

CHAIRMAN: I mean co-operation in governing the state.

Mr. BEN GURION: The Arabs are just like any other people; they have different views, although publicly it may appear that they have only one view.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I am asking about the economic and social co-operation.

CHAIRMAN: I added the political matters.

Mr. BEN GURION: As I say, there are even sections among the Arabs here, and in neighbouring countries, where they are willing for political co-operation.

CHAIRMAN: On the whole?

Mr. BEN GURION: On the whole. There are Arabs who are against it.

CHAIRMAN: How will it turn out?

Mr. BEN GURION: If we and the Arabs who want to co-operate are encouraged, those sections here and abroad among the Arabs who want to co-operate would be strengthened.

CHAIRMAN: I asked whether you were optimistic about political co-operation.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, absolutely—as far as it is absolutely known. I am infected by your language.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Mr. Ben Gurion, in relation to the immigration problem, you spoke about the fate of the Jews and the Jewish children and the prohibition of their entry into Palestine. May I know, if it is possible, the number of people who are now in the camps at Cyprus, especially the number of Jewish children in the camps at Cyprus.

Mr. BEN GURION: The total number, I believe, is something more than fifteen thousand—seventeen thousand. I cannot give you the exact number of children.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): May I obtain the number later?

Mr. BEN GURION: My colleague tells me there are two thousand children there.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I would like to know the number of Jewish people who are now in concentration camps in Europe and the conditions in which those people live at this moment.

Mr. BEN GURION: As far as I know, there are some two hundred twenty thousand Jews in the camps, but this does not comprise—

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): What are the conditions of living in the camps, the social conditions, the health conditions, the cultural conditions for the young people, for the women, for the men?

Mr. BEN GURION: We will send in a memorandum giving you all the details of the conditions,

but I can tell you now that I visited the camps soon after the liberation and I visited them recently. There is a very strong deterioration in the conditions, for many reasons: for political reasons, economic reasons. There is also a deterioration in the relations between the Jews and the German population there. There have already been cases where many Jewish D.P.'s have been murdered by Germans and by German police.

CHAIRMAN: These camps are now called Assembly Centres, but I do not suppose that changes the conditions very much.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Mr. Ben Gurion, you speak of about one million children killed in Europe under the Nazi persecution.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): These children in the camp at Cyprus, do they have parents?

Mr. BEN GURION: There are many who have not; there are some who have. There were many Polish Jews who escaped to Soviet Russia, and they were saved, with their children. Most of the large families which you will find in the camps, and some of them also in Cyprus, with mothers and fathers and children, are those who escaped to Soviet Russia and have now come back. They went back to Poland and from Poland to Germany, in order to get to Palestine.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Thank you.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask first a question about the form of government Mr. Ben Gurion has in mind for the transitional period. Mr. Ben Gurion says that Jews are entitled to build up a country here with a Jewish majority, and therefore, they have in mind, they visualize an immigration plan of about one million Jews. Mr. Ben Gurion says that it will take a few years. Then he adds that as soon as a considerable part of that plan is carried out, independence can be established. Now, of course, it is not possible to state exactly how many years it will take before, in the view of Mr. Ben Gurion, that moment has come, that that considerable part has been carried out. But perhaps Mr. Ben Gurion can agree that it will take at least something between, say, five and ten years.

Mr. BEN GURION: Not necessarily.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Have you in mind a shorter period?

Mr. BEN GURION: Not necessarily, sir.

CHAIRMAN: How many people do you think you can take in here per year?

Mr. BEN GURION: I will answer the question, but I do not know whether you will accept the answer. Last year there was a commission of experts, English and Americans. They discussed the recommendation of the Anglo-American Commission about the 100,000 people. They came to the conclusion—and this was announced by Mr. Morrison who was the President of the Council—that you can absorb 100,000 within one year. This was without any special authority given to the Jewish Agency. If the Jewish Agency is given full authority for development and im-

migration, with the assistance of Jews and certain damages to which we are entitled—which has already been recognized, we are getting part of that now, as I imagine Mr. Kaplan told you—then much larger numbers can be brought over and settled. You do not need to wait until you have settled the entire million Jews. We worked out a plan of a million Jews, for two reasons: One, it was approximately the number of Jews whom we know are in dire need—they cannot stay where they are; and it was also based on certain calculations of land and industry which we know we can develop. But this is not related to the political problem. You can solve the political problem in half the time that will be required for settling the one million Jews in Palestine. In other words, if you need eight years for settling and absorbing a million Jews, then you may need only three or four years until you can establish a complete or a considerable form of self-government of the country on a purely democratic basis.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Well, just to have in mind a certain period, I will think of something between five and ten years. Mr. Ben Gurion is more optimistic about it.

Mr. BEN GURION: I cannot guarantee, sir; nobody can guarantee these things.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Anyway, there will be a transitional period.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, sir.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask what form of government Mr. Ben Gurion visualizes for that period. For instance, who will provide the judiciary services, the police force, and so forth?

Mr. BEN GURION: As far as possible, judicial and police services will be provided by the people of Palestine, but under the supervision of the United Nations.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): What do you mean by supervision of the United Nations?

Mr. BEN GURION: They should have the final control until independence is established.

Mr. RAND (Canada): You mean administration rather than supervision.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, as far as administration will be necessary.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): As you know, in the United Nations there is nothing in existence at the moment in the nature of an international police force, or anything of that kind. So that will have to be provided by one or more countries.

Mr. BEN GURION: We did not discuss all these details. I must be frank about it. We do not really think it is for us to decide. We can only state a certain general principle, a certain line. The details of how to carry that out are not for us to decide. The general lines should be laid down, the principle should be adopted that there should be a Jewish state based on equality, and a large plan of development should be adopted. Then the details will be worked out on the basis of these three main lines. I really cannot

answer as to our view on these details, because we did not go as far as that.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I do not see these as details. I think it is a very important question, from a practical international policy, as to what the situation will be in the future.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, of course it is.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): So the Jewish Agency has no special plan in view as regards this?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, sir.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask Mr. Ben Gurion what is the opinion of the Jewish Agency on the report of the Anglo-American Committee, last year's report?

Mr. BEN GURION: We will send you the official reply we have given. We said, first of all, that if the two main recommendations were carried out, the abolition of the White Paper and the immediate admission of one hundred thousand Jews, we would be willing to sit down with a committee of the Government to discuss a long-term policy, because we had there two policies: Short-term policy—what should be done immediately; and long-term policy. But we will send you a copy of that memorandum.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Thank you very much.

Mr. BEN GURION: May I add that you will also receive a supplementary memorandum. You have been presented with the Jewish case, with all the material submitted to the Anglo-American Committee more than a year ago. Tomorrow you will get a memorandum which supplies all the happenings and developments since then up to now. You will find there all the things in which you are interested.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): My next point is this. I remember that the Jewish Agency told the Anglo-American Committee last year that the Agency was not constituted, in its representative bodies, just as it has been laid down in its constitution, because of the war and because several members of the different bodies have died and no new elections have been held. I would like to know how this is now. Are the representative bodies of the Jewish Agency now in accord with the constitution? Especially, I would like to know whether the non-Zionist organizations have an influence now in the executive bodies, and whether they are represented too. Can Mr. Ben Gurion and his colleagues give the views of the non-Zionist organizations too? What is the position today?

Mr. BEN GURION: I will tell you three things. One, in the Mandate, it was laid down that the Zionist Organization is the Jewish Agency. This is according to the Mandate. There, the Jewish Agency is requested to secure the co-operation of all Jews who want to assist in the building up of a national home. Then, in 1929, on our own initiative, we had a conference to which we invited many Jewish organizations which are officially non-Zionist. But the term non-Zionist

does not mean that they are not Zionists. They may be Zionists, but the organization is termed non-Zionist. For instance, the Jewish Community is a non-Zionist organization, but almost every Jew in that organization is a Zionist. The same is true in other countries. The Board of Deputies in England is 90 per cent Zionist, but they are organized in their capacity of a Jewish community in England and not as Zionists. We made our constitution. It was not the Mandate which required us to do it; it was an internal Jewish matter that required that the Jewish Agency should be based of fifty per cent representatives of Zionist organizations, as such, and fifty per cent of other organizations whether they are or are not Zionist. In the meantime, something happened. For instance, there were a number of communities in Europe which should be represented. They do not exist any more. In America, it was based on a personal basis. A number of Jews in America—there were no democratic elections—a certain number of Jews, Mr. Marshall and Mr. Warburg were designated, taking into account that they enjoyed a large popularity among American Jewry. Many of them died. This, unfortunately, ruined the whole structure as it had been laid down in the Constitution. But either people, as individuals, died, or entire communities were wiped out. However, the Constitution still remained as it was. It is still composed of Zionists and non-Zionists, although some of the non-Zionists are living in America and do not actually take part in the work which is being done here. We have now decided that the next Zionist Congress will call together a Council. What Zionists call a Congress, non-Zionists call a Council. We will call together a council of those organizations since the old Constitution cannot be carried out because the reality behind it does not exist anymore. When we call together such a council, the enlarged Agency may be reconstituted. For the time being, we have the old Constitution, but the old Constitution does not correspond to the reality.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Are there any non-Zionists in the executive body here?

Mr. BEN GURION: There are in America. There was one here in Palestine, but he resigned because of social differences of view. There are three in America who are officially members.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Will we be in a position to get the views of non-Zionists?

Mr. BEN GURION: Oh yes; I am sure you will be. I can tell you this: that before, in the Anglo-American Committee, and also in our work before the United Nations in America, we co-operated with two large American-Jewish bodies, the American Conference and the American Jewish Committee. The attitude of the American Jewish Committee on this question differs in one respect from ours. They are in favour of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine; they support a Jewish state in an adequate area of Palestine. They do not associate themselves with our full programme of Palestine as a Jewish State. I believe they sent you a memorandum, while you

were still in America, on behalf of the American-Jewish Committee.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): We got several.

Mr. BEN GURION: As far as I know, the Jewish Board of Deputies in England, which has democratically elected representation of English Jews, also identify themselves with the attitude of the Jewish Agency.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lisicky has asked to put some questions. Before I allow him to do so I would like to know whether there are other Members who also want to put questions.

(Several Members signified a desire to ask questions.)

CHAIRMAN: Before we go on, I think we can suspend for ten minutes.

(The hearing was suspended for ten minutes and then resumed.)

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

Mr. Lisicky has asked to put some questions.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): My first question is in connection with the quotation mentioned on page 11 of Mr. Ben Gurion's statement. It is a quotation from the Report of the Palestine Royal Commission. The quotation reads as follows:

"The Commission found that though the Arabs have benefited by the development of the country owing to Jewish immigration, this has had no conciliatory effect. On the contrary, improvement in the economic situation in Palestine has meant deterioration of the political situation . . . The Commission thought that the obligations Britain undertook towards the Arabs and the Jews some twenty years ago have not lost their moral and legal right through what has happened since, but the trouble is that these obligations proved to be irreconcilable. The mandate is unworkable."

In another connection, if I remember, Mr. Ben Gurion mentioned that Sir Alexander Cadogan, at the last session of the General Assembly, admitted candidly—whether candidly or not candidly, it is a matter of taste—that the mandate is unworkable. It is a quotation brought forward by Mr. Ben Gurion. It was not refuted in his statement. I should like to know what is his appreciation of the facts mentioned in this quotation.

Mr. BEN GURION: I tell you in that respect we more or less agree with the view expressed by the Permanent Mandates Commission. I would say that there were on that Commission people with very great experience in that matter.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): You mean the Peel Commission?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations—the International Commission.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): But what I quoted is from the Peel Commission.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes. They discussed this view of the Commission, and they said, whether the obligations in themselves are reconcilable or

not, there may be a different view from the Commission. In their view, the obligations are reconcilable, but as the mandatory said, the mandate is unworkable, because a mandate must be worked by the mandatory. If the mandatory said the mandate is unworkable, then the mandate became unworkable.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): So you agree on this question?

Mr. BEN GURION: I say they said it, and we saw that the mandate, since then, became, in fact, unworkable. The mandate was not workable, and this was the reason why they accepted the other conclusions of the Committee, that the solution is a compromise, and a large part of the Members also accepted the same and were ready to consider it. But the fact is that the mandate, since then, was not workable because the mandatory said it was not workable, but we do not admit that obligations are unreconcilable. We do not see any conflict in the obligations, but the mandate became unworkable. That is a fact, and one must admit a fact.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): So you admit the fact that the mandate is not workable?

Mr. BEN GURION: It became unworkable. Not that it must be unworkable. We admit the fact that the mandate became unworkable, not that it had to become unworkable. I take a different view. I do not think it had to become unworkable, but the fact is it became unworkable, and you must admit a fact.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I am satisfied with your answer.

I see on the next page that when discussing the conclusions of the Commission, if I understand rightly what you said there was some hope of accepting the conclusions of the Commission under the condition of some changes, it means if Negeb should be included, it was a situation as in 1937. Are you in a position to tell me what the situation is now?

Mr. BEN GURION: The position, I told you, is in writing; there were some incorrect quotations by the press, stating that I was against the decision. That is nonsense. The view I expressed myself, on the last occasion, regarding the form of government, we stand by the attitude we took last year, that we will be ready to consider the question of a Jewish State in an adequate area of Palestine, and that we are entitled to Palestine as a whole. We would be ready to consider such an offer as a Jewish State in an adequate area of Palestine.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Am I right in understanding that you are not opposed to the idea of partition?

Mr. BEN GURION: That means we are ready to consider it.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): On page 31 of your speech I read this: "The original intention of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate could have been achieved and the Jewish commonwealth would have been an accomplished fact before the Second World War if the manda-

tory had implemented its mandatory obligations resolutely and consistently."

That is one part of my remarks. The second is that I see in the statistics of immigration that the number of Jewish immigrants in the years 1927 to 1931 was as follows: in 1927, the number of Jewish immigrants was 2,713; in 1928, 2,178; in 1929, 5,249; in 1930, 4,944, and in 1931, 4,075. Does it mean that the low number of immigrants in this year was the result of the prevention by the Palestine Government of a larger immigration?

Mr. BEN GURION: I will tell you. You raised a very relevant question, and it is a very legitimate question.

There are two main factors concerning Jewish immigration into Palestine: one is the position and the need of Jews to immigrate. Before the First World War some 3,000,000 Jews immigrated from European countries. This was one factor. The second factor is the attraction of this country to a Jew. Palestine, as a country, in itself is not a place of immigration, it was a country of emigration. People left the country. Many Arabs—especially Christian Arabs who had a little higher standard of living—left the country to go to South America and other countries.

How could Jews immigrate into Palestine? We had to create a new economy. In the existing economy scarcely a single Jew was absorbed. There are some hundreds of Arab villages, and we will find there not one Jew. There are many Jews in agriculture. We had to build a new economy. If we develop a country we make a place for immigrants, so the question of immigration into Palestine is organically tied up with the question of building and development. We made a claim against the mandatory power. It was almost entirely passive and did not assist in the development. The less they could develop and build, the less there was room for immigrants. And we had to do all the development, almost entirely, and had little material means to do it. This is why the mandatory power did not help us more, for our sake and for the sake of the people here.

Here we see that there is no conflict between the two obligations. We do not admit the obligation to the Jews and the Arabs are irreconcilable, so I will leave out the question. We were not assisted in the building up and development of the country. You must build houses, you must develop land by irrigation, you must build factories. You heard yesterday the story of our economic effort and how much that was assisted.

If, from the beginning, the Government had been assisting in the development of the country as we were, the whole history of Palestine would have been changed. Of course, we cannot prove that—you can never prove a supposition. This is our conviction and is not enmity to the Government. We have no enmity. It is not merely guesswork. We say that because we know it. We did the work and we know what can be done. Take the question of the Negeb. With our poor means we could not undertake the irrigation of

it. We could not make arrangements to bring water from afar, because we must have the authority. The land is not ours. The Government has the authority and they never tried. They could easily bring water to the land, and make it possible for large-scale Jewish settlement. They did not do it. There you see our position.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): So it means that there was no prevention on behalf of the Government for immigration, but you state that they did not encourage it?

Mr. BEN GURION: There was the other thing, too. We made an investigation of the economic requirements of the country every six months, before the White Paper was published. Every six months the Government fixed a schedule quota for immigrants. The quota was based on the examination of the economic needs, mainly, of course, on Jewish economy. We came to the conclusion we needed 25,000 workers. We received three thousand. There was a discrepancy.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): There was a restriction of immigration even before the White Paper.

Mr. BEN GURION: Theoretically there was not, but in fact we did not get the number of people we needed, and therefore many Jews could not come. When we asked in 1939 it was for a very modest figure, three thousand, and we only got three hundred. We had to refuse that. We could not manage to supply the needs of the people that wanted to come.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): But I see in 1931 you had four thousand.

Mr. BEN GURION: That was general. Before the White Paper there were different categories of immigrants. There were capitalists—people with means. There were relatives, pupils and there was a labour schedule. The labour schedule was fixed every six months. The figures you have here are a total number of immigrants, but I refer to them as labour schedule. For every six months they were newly estimated and decided.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia). And now for your conclusions. You are refuting the international trusteeship of United Nations. You are refuting the bi-national State, and the reason for your refuting of a bi-national State is the submission that a parity in the Government should be necessarily a permanent deadlock. It means you have no confidence in the possibility of co-operation with the Arab part of the Palestine population as far as they are in equal numbers or in majority. But if I understand you well, you have great confidence about the prospect of this co-operation once the Jewish part of this population will be in majority. There is another aspect which does not seem to me to be entirely consistent with your pessimistic views about the possibility of co-operation with the Arabs in Palestine. In your conclusion you are asking the United Nations for help in accomplishing three objectives: the immediate abolition of the White Paper; the establishment of a Jewish State, and the promotion of Jewish-Arab alliance. I am asking would it not be useful to start with the

promotion of the Jewish-Arab alliance in the country and not outside, and if you think that there is no prospect of this alliance in the country, should this prospect for this Jewish-Arab alliance outside the country be greater than in the country?

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, you asked me really a very relevant question. I must apologize to the Chairman for having to repeat one part of the question which I said before. Perhaps you did not hear what I said. You must distinguish between Arabs as human beings in their community, as one thing. A Jew is a worker and an Arab is a worker. A Jew who has an orange grove and an Arab who has an orange grove, will have common interests, and they work together as such on many occasions. This does not prevent them, and they do not act as a worker or as an orange grove owner, but as an Arab in these concerns having different and conflicting political problems. Now I come to the question of co-operation with Arabs in Palestine, and in co-operation with Arabs outside of Palestine. While there are Arabs who from the beginning were in favour of Jewish immigration, and there are still Arabs who are in favour, not a single Arab will come out publicly for Jewish immigration. I don't blame them. I don't say that the Arab is dishonest; he is under the pressure of his community. There was even an example which I am not going to mention—a group of Arabs who had not taken the orders of the Mufti. I regard this as more or less the conditions that human beings are living under. Human beings are not angels. It is more or less a normal thing. As long as the Arab community will be able to prevent the growth of Jews in Palestine they will do it, because there will always be a group of people who will be strongly against it and they will prevail, especially when they have behind them also the policy of the Mandate Power.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): By what means will they prevail?

Mr. BEN GURION: Among their own people they will impress their programme because it is easier to raise anti-Jewish feeling and anti-foreign feeling in the country. I say as long as they can prevent it, they will prevent it. However, once it is an established fact many who follow now one lead change their view. I will give you a concrete example based on experience. In 1937 these proposals were made by the Peel Commission to establish a Jewish State, and also an Arab State. It was accepted by the Government. For the first time in recent history the official leader of the Arabs who was all the time our bitterest opponent, who before the Peel Commission even refused to promise that the four-hundred-thousand Jews who were taken into Palestine would be accorded their full rights, submitted to us through intermediaries proposals for a Jewish-Arab agreement. The proposals came to us in London through an Englishman and a Jew. The Jew was Haymson and the Englishman was Colonel Newcombe. He was a friend of the Arabs. In Palestine it came through Dr. Magnes.

We ask them who was behind these proposals. In London and here we were told the Mufti. This was the first time in recent history that this happened. We said that while the proposals, themselves, are not satisfactory we are willing to meet the Arabs and discuss them.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): But at the time, if I understand well, there was no question of a Jewish State for the whole of Palestine?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, you are right. We said we were willing to meet the Arabs and discuss proposals. Time passed and receiving no answer we asked where the people were. They said that they went back and that they refused to discuss it. What happened? In the meantime, between which these proposals were submitted to us and their refusal, a new policy was formulated by His Majesty's Government. They scrapped the policy of the Peel Commission. They scrapped the policy of having two states, which means having a Jewish State. Then the people who came to us said, "Why should we come to terms with the Jews? There is no need." So, we think as long as they will be able to prevent us they will. Their wish and policy will prevail among the Arab communities. Since this is in our view a matter of right and wrong it should not be decided only by the Arabs, but it must be decided by a Higher Tribunal. We say you are the Tribunal.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Now, you are in the absolute. Now, do you know the definition of politics? Politics is the art of the possible.

Mr. BEN GURION: The only question is what is the possible. We say once this question is decided they cannot prevent any more, neither our being here nor our being equals. It means independence. Then, knowing human nature, knowing especially these people, we know them, we live among Arabs—my colleague, Mr. Shertok, when his father came and settled in an Arab village was the only case, as far as I know, of a Jewish pioneer settling in an Arab village. My colleague, Mr. Shertok, was brought up in an Arab village, still has friends there, and when he is sick or having a child they come to congratulate him. I worked, myself, with Arab workers in Jewish fields, in Jewish villages. We know these people. We live with them, together. We also have certain historic indications from recent history, from the last war, when the question was decided. It was decided by the Allies, by the Associated Powers, as they called themselves, in the League of Nations. The Arab world accepted them. When did the opposition of Arabs begin? It wasn't in 1917, 1918 or 1919. Then all the Arab representatives, Feisal, the Syrian Committee who came to Versailles, the Shaorif of Mecca, all accepted, were in favour of, and wanted an alliance. When they began to see that they did not mean it seriously, I do not think that Mr. Balfour or Mr. Lloyd George did not mean it seriously, but the people here did not, and they had indications that they did not. I do not want to go into this. It is a very sad history. I have only mentioned 1920. It was

under military occupation. There were many troops here. I, myself, was still a soldier in the British Army. I happened to be in Jerusalem. It was the Jewish Passover. There was a pogrom which lasted three days in the Old City of Jerusalem. I could not understand why it was. There were sufficient troops. The Arabs being not as sophisticated as Europeans said to themselves "ed Dawlamaana" which means "The Government is with us." Then they said, "If the English are against it why should we not be for it." When they doubted the sincerity, I think they had no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Government in London, but seeing what was going on here they said, "Why should we agree?" But, when they knew that a decision was given, they accepted it. Therefore, I say we have a reason to believe. It is also when you talk about certain things you cannot be absolutely sure, but as far as you can foresee things, given human nature, given a world decision, given a fact, given a living interest, when a Jewish State will be established that State will be in as good relations with the Arab State as any other State in the world with its neighbours. We have an example in the Middle East, Turkey and Greece. There was perpetual war between Turkey and Greece. Once a decision was made, and Turks were transferred to Greece, back and forth, I mean the last war, they became the best of friends. There is more reason here to become good friends because we are not Greeks or Turks, and they are not Greeks or Turks. We will live here. There is a kinship among us. We need each other. As I said, we have things that they have not and they have things which we have not. We need what they have in abundance. They need what we have in abundance. If we can benefit them and they can benefit us there is no reason in the world why this should not be done, if the fact that we are here free and equal is established. That is as far as human beings can foresee. I say that is the most reasonable thing. There is another factor: we know we will do it with the best intentions in the world. Since we came to Palestine we are trying to do it. I can tell you from my personal experience that when I came to Palestine, as all other Jewish pioneers, I came to work on the land. It was forty-one years ago when Palestine was ruled by the Turks. I had to go to work on the land with a rifle on my shoulder because there was lawlessness in the country. Arabs were shooting Arabs and especially shooting, if they could, Jews. We had to defend ourselves. We had a special organization which we called "The Watchmen." It was the policy of that organization to create the best relations between us and our Arab neighbours. We succeeded. We taught them to respect us. When they found that the Jews could defend themselves, although they were few, and could use a rifle and take care of themselves as good as or maybe better than they, then we tried to make friends and were successful. The same people who attacked us before became our best friends. We believe this will happen on a larger scale once we are established and independent.



Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): As a majority?

Mr. BEN GURION: Of course, only as a majority. You cannot have a State with a minority. Then there will be an alliance between the Jews and the Arabs. The world can help us with that if the Arabs know that it is the wish of the world. They are Members of the United Nations. There is now a general inter-dependence. Even the greatest powers need each other. It is one world. There is a general inter-dependence, and when we speak about independence it cannot mean absolute independence. There can be no absolute independence. We will be a Member of the United Nations. They are Members of the United Nations. The United Nations can help us to accelerate the process which will come by itself of Jewish-Arab friendship.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I see your point. Your case is based on a strong belief. We are in a land of a strong faith.

Mr. BEN GURION: Sir, you would not survive if you would not have that faith.

CHAIRMAN: Any more questions, Mr. Lisicky?

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): No.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I may, to attempt to secure more of a decision on a point which has already been touched on this morning. In fact, it was touched on most recently by Dr. Blom in one question, to which Mr. Ben Gurion replied, spoke of the transitional period—the interim period involved in the proposition which was outlined in general terms by Mr. Ben Gurion. That is to say the creation of a Jewish State looking to the early accomplishment of the Jewish majority. In reply to that earlier question Mr. Ben Gurion stated that in his view the supervisory arrangements connected with that period could be regarded as a detail, and he further indicated that in the planning, which has been carried out by the Agency in this respect, no particular consideration had been given to that aspect. I note, however, that in page statement which we heard last week there are in fact real indications of an attitude regarding the provisional arrangements for supervision. You stated, for example: "We are against the continuation of a Mandate, whether a British Mandate or a United Nations Mandate." Further down we read: "What a single Mandatory cannot do, a joint trusteeship will be able to do far less."<sup>1</sup> Further, if I may continue to quote: "Intensive development and large-scale immigration require a dynamic administration, constant initiative, quick decisions and continued action." That statement touches on a very vital aspect of the whole issue. I would like Mr. Ben Gurion if he could address himself again to that point, to try to indicate to us exactly what sort of supervision he would envisage for that transitional period. It is a crucial point in our consideration of this question. There is nothing, at present, laid down in the United Nations Charter or any associated document which clearly and specifi-

cally foresees that sort of contingency or provides for it in any practical way. There are certain articles of the Charter to which reference could be made, but they are in such general terms that no real help could be obtained from them. To sum up, could Mr. Ben Gurion indicate again what possible proposals for this transitional period he would put forward, if asked to put them forward. I repeat, in a proposition of this nature the onus of proving the feasibility of the whole proposition devolves on those who put it forward, and the feasibility really depends on the nature of the interim arrangement.

Mr. BEN GURION: It is really the same question, and I understand why the same question occurs. It is quite legitimate. I will try to make myself as clear as possible. I will not enter again into why we are against the continuation of the Mandate. It failed. It was admitted. It was said ten years ago. We do not think it will change. Then you ask if it is necessary to have a transitional period. What is the difference between what you call non-Mandate and transitional? Again there will have to be some Mandatory power here. I might say there would be two very important differences which will change the entire nature of the temporary supervision. One is there will be a clear assumption that what we claim is right and is approved by you. If not, and you do not approve it, the question does not arise. The question that Mr. Blom and you put to me arises only on the assumption that you admit our claim is right and should be approved by the United Nations. Then the first very important difference would be that there would be in existence a clear-cut decision by the highest tribunal in the world for a Jewish State in Palestine. That is one thing which is of great importance. Then the second point, which is of no less importance than that: the Jewish Agency, representing both the Jews who are in Palestine and those who are to come after the United Nations have examined their plan for development and settlement of one million Jews—that is after you have accepted and approved the plan which we must first examine of course—the Jewish Agency would be given authority, under these conditions to carry out the plan of development and settlement which involves bringing over, in the shortest possible time, one million Jews. That is question number two. Then comes the question (and you must envisage the questions only under these two conditions otherwise your question does not arise at all) when you reach such a decision and the Jewish Agency is given this authority to proceed with the approved plan of settlement, immigration and development in the shortest possible time, the question will arise as to what will happen in the meanwhile. The decision is there. The Jewish Agency has the authority, but Palestine can not yet be established as a democratic independent State. We say that for that short time and under those conditions there will be a supervision by the United Nations. I know, sir, there are no provisions in the Charter because when

<sup>1</sup> Document A/AC.13/PV.16 Pages 92–93.

this Charter was formulated it did not have in mind such a unique problem. It had in mind the needs of all the peoples in the world and it did not bother with such a problem. However, I do not see that it is beyond the statesmanship of the big and small nations of the United Nations to lay down definite conditions, in this special case and for a very short period providing for such an international supervision as will ensure, first the carrying out of these two decisions of the United Nations: to have a State and to have the Jewish Agency carry out that plan. Secondly, to provide for administering the country until it is able to be a democratic independent country, and to ensure peace and justice for everybody in that country, which will be the problem of the transitional period. The details how to do it I admit we did not work out. When it comes to that, we will take part in it. We will make our proposals. However, I do not think there will be any great difficulty. Once you have decided on these two great principal questions, when this will be admitted, then there will be no difficulty at all and you will be able to devise a special regime for a certain period to fulfil that special function under those conditions.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That would be regarded as the paramount interests of the inhabitants of the territories, as mentioned in Article 73 of the Charter.

Mr. BEN GURION: You are raising another question from the one Mr. Hood raised.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): In your reply you referred to the fact that the United Nations was not concerned with special questions and was laying down general principles. I was trying to draw your attention to the words which apply to the present case also, and as to how you would reconcile your statement in the presence of those words.

Mr. BEN GURION: First of all this applies to trusteeship. I do not propose trusteeship. Secondly, it is not only Article 73; there is also Article 80, and Article 80 was adopted for this very special reason of Palestine. Article 80 speaks also about trusteeship agreements: "... until such agreements have been concluded ..."—and they are not yet concluded, and we do not offer to conclude a trusteeship agreement—"nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties." This is the special Article of the Charter which applies to Palestine. It was introduced only because of Palestine. What you ask me implies another question—whether or not we have a right. I tried to answer that question. Mr. Hood did not raise that question.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I would like to ask whether or not Mr. Ben Gurion would expect that during this transitional period some means of enforcement would have to be provided or to exist—whether police functions would have

to be provided for, and whether that provision would have to be made even if never used for the maintenance of law and order.

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, of course. I would say for peace and justice—it does not matter what you call it.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Would that be the same authority within Palestine as would exercise these functions referred to in Mr. Ben Gurion's statement? That is to say, the functions of dynamic administration, initiative, quick decisions, etc. Would it be the same?

Mr. BEN GURION: No. This would be the carrying out of the development scheme. It would be the Jewish Agency. I believe they will have the dynamic quality.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): In that case would the Agency be acting for the whole population of Palestine, or for the Jews only?

Mr. BEN GURION: I said, if the Arabs would accept it. I cannot speak for them really. If they co-operate in that scheme of development they will also, with the Jewish Agency, take part in it.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I am trying to clear my mind on this. I should like to put one further question. Does Mr. Ben Gurion not see difficulties of a profoundly constitutional nature in having a divorcement, at it were, of the real State power—that is to say the enforcement of law and order—from the specific administration, the day to day handling of the policy?

Mr. BEN GURION: Certain difficulties may arise, but not of a nature which cannot be surmounted, having the authority of the United Nations.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): A question on a different point. Would it be contemplated that the Jewish State should be eligible for membership in the United Nations from the initial period, or after the transitional period?

Mr. BEN GURION: As soon as it is established. I do not say as soon as there is a decision to have a Jewish State, but a representative of a State which has been established should be admitted. But on that the United Nations must decide. It should be admitted as soon as possible because I think this is one of the greatest injustices done by the entire world which ought to be remedied.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I want to clarify in more concrete terms what Mr. Hood was speaking about. As I understand your programme for immigration and expansion of capital, it involves the protection of an outside power, whether it is the United Nations directly or some delegate of the United Nations. That is the sum of what you have told us.

Mr. BEN GURION: That is it. I must add something. If there had been no United Nations there would be no Mandatory now. You asked me whether we could have done it twenty years ago and I told you that we would have been wiped out, as the Assyrians were in Iran—although not so easily. If there were no United Nations and, assuming for a moment that England says: "I walk out tomorrow," or that the United Nations

would say: "I have nothing to do with Palestine," I think we would manage. It would be difficult. We would manage to bring in Jews, and as our work in Palestine is in its nature constructive, we would do it—under difficulties. We would try every day to come to the Arabs and say: "Let us have an agreement and settle the question by ourselves." We would be willing to listen if they would, in a spirit of co-operation, discuss a compromise. But if they said: "No," we would go on by ourselves as far as we could. But there is a United Nations; there is a will in the world—I do not say it is really a fact, but there is an ideal embodied in the world Organization. This question was referred to that Organization by the Mandatory Power, which also has a certain meaning. Why did the Mandatory Power go to the United Nations? Last year they tried only to go to America; now they have gone to the United Nations. They also recognize that there may be a higher authority, which may have a higher moral authority. Therefore, we come to you and say, if you admit that we are right, say so; if you admit and say that we are right, and should that right be accomplished, as you are trying to do it in every place in the world—as the Court of Justice is doing—if it decides that Mr. A is right, then although Mr. B said "No," the right of Mr. A is enforced. But if you leave us alone we will do what we can alone by our own means. We will defend ourselves by all means and we will build by our own means. We will bring Jews by our own means. We will not give up.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): We will go back to that discussion later, because before that I would like to ask you a few questions about pages 15 and 16 of your paper. You speak there about the Land Regulation in 1940 and you said the racial law was a breach of international obligations under the Mandate. How was that law enacted?

Mr. BEN GURION: It was enacted in this way. One day we were informed by the High Commissioner—it was, I think, in February 1940—that at six hours on a certain day, in the afternoon, such an ordinance would be promulgated. I went immediately to see the High Commissioner and asked him if he could postpone the promulgation for a few days and give me the facilities to apply to London, because it would be a disaster. I also know that there was a promise given to the Labour Party by Mr. Chamberlain's Government that no new step would be taken under the White Paper to which they objected so strongly, and I know they were not consulted. The High Commissioner said: "I cannot do it; I have my orders that at six o'clock today, or tomorrow, it has to be promulgated." Then I received after a few hours a call from the Chief Secretary that they were called through from London to hold it up and he asked me what was the matter. I said: "Do you want me to explain why your Government held it up? I can imagine why it is"—knowing the promise given to the Labour Party in London. I said: "I can imagine that the Labour Party made a very

strong protest, and therefore it was hold up." He told me if there was any new development he would let me know. He said: "Keep yourself ready the whole night; perhaps there will be a call." In the morning he rang me up and told me he had got a call from London to carry out the White Paper. It was promulgated in the Palestine Gazette that from now on, with retroactive power to May 1939, a Jew could not acquire a tree, water, a piece of land, a building outside five per cent of the zone which is called free. That is the story of the land law.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): On what legal grounds could the High Commissioner enact this law?

Mr. BEN GURION: I prefer this question to be put to our legal advisor; I am not a lawyer.

CHAIRMAN: I think that was explained to you by Sir Henry Gurney at the first meeting we had.

Mr. BEN GURION: I prefer this question to be put to our legal adviser, who will appear before you.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I do not know why we need to call on the opinion of legal advisers. The law is there and every one of us is entitled to form an opinion on the law. Mr. Granados, or I, or Mr. Lisicky can get as many opinions for our benefit as we like, but we have to form our own opinions and declare what, in our opinion, is the law. I do not think the opinions of lawyers would be of any use to the Committee as such.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): I am following my interrogation, and not yours. I hope the Jewish Agency will present their lawyers. We will go back to the other question you were discussing with Mr. Hood. On page 34 you declared that you were against a bi-national State. I must assume that is true. Now, as a last resort there would be partition, or some other way out. At any rate, whether it is partition, or some other way, it should not be a National State according to your wish. In that case what would be the necessity of a transitional period and of having an administration appointed by the United Nations? Could not the Jewish people, if they are going to form a Jewish State, take up immediately and carry on the administration by themselves and defend themselves with their own resources?

Mr. BEN GURION: I think you put the question in case you decide on partition and a Jewish State.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Or some other way of creating a Jewish State that would not be bi-national.

Mr. BEN GURION: I will answer each part of the question separately. Assuming that it will be satisfactory, there is no need for any transitional period. This can be established tomorrow.

As far as defence goes, I think the decision of the United Nations, on the one hand, and on the other hand the ability of the Jews to defend themselves will be sufficient.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Regarding the question put by Mr. Hood, or by Mr. Blom, about an international police, do you not think that in hearing the case the United Nations would appoint an administrator here? Would that administrator not find among the Jewish people support enough to defend that administration and carry out its program?

Mr. BEN GURION: Even the Mandatory Power, when it wanted, always found sufficient people among Jews to volunteer to defend the country.

CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. García Granados, that you overlooked one factor in Mr. Ben Gurion's previous answer. This transition period was aimed at creating a Jewish majority, and that is the reason for the supervision.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): That is why I would like to ask you whether it refers to the whole of Palestine or to part of Palestine—the transition period, I mean.

Mr. BEN GURION: I said that in a part of Palestine we do not need any transitional period. If it is the whole of Palestine, we may need a short transitional period.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): When you say a United Nations Administration, do you mean that that administration would be through any particular country, or that the United Nations would appoint a group of individuals to carry out the administration.

Mr. BEN GURION: I used the word "supervise"—not "administration." I did not go as far as that. I did not lay down whether it should be an administration or not. I said it was a provision to ensure two things—peace and justice for the country. Whether they will entrust one man to do it and to organize his forces—this is, so far as we are concerned, left to the United Nations. We have no definite plan on that.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Do you favour one man, or one country?

Mr. BEN GURION: I think that should be left to the United Nations. I cannot give you the answer to that question on behalf of the body I represent. We did not discuss that question.

CHAIRMAN: The question of Mr. García Granados suggests to me another question. What are the relations between the Jewish Agency and the Hagana?

Mr. BEN GURION: The relations between the Jewish Agency and the Hagana are the relations between the Jewish Agency and the Jewish population in Palestine.

What you call the Hagana is groups of Jews who have been organized for at least the last forty years. When I was younger I was myself a member of it.

CHAIRMAN: It is an independent organization?

Mr. BEN GURION: It is the Jews in Palestine established in an organization for defence.

CHAIRMAN: Is the Hagana armed?

Mr. BEN GURION: I hope they are.

CHAIRMAN: How large is the group?

Mr. BEN GURION: I cannot tell you, but I am sure if you want to see the people of the Hagana

they will gladly appear before you, and they will be able to give you the actual information. I am not sure that they will be able to appear publicly because it is not quite under existing Palestine laws. I am not sure that it is a legal organization.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): So there is not organizational connexion between the Hagana and the Jewish Agency?

Mr. BEN GURION: The Hagana is a Palestine Jewish affair.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I would like you to be precise in your answer to the questions I will put. They will be definite questions. I have been hearing your discourse with great interest and attention, and I would like you to confine your answers to my questions. I do not want a discourse. My questions will be such that they will require short answers, and you can give me short answers. I will break the question, for your advantage, into bits.

I find from your statement before the Anglo-American Committee that you did not and do not, base the Jews' right to Palestine on what has come to be known as the Balfour Declaration. Have I understood your answer correctly?

Mr. BEN GURION: I must be given the freedom to answer in the way I believe I can answer.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I think there is only one answer.

Mr. BEN GURION: If I have to answer, I have to answer in my own way. If I cannot, I will not answer.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have I understood your position?

CHAIRMAN: I think I shall have to decide whether the answer is an answer to the question or not.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): My question is a simple one. I have put to him that his statement before the Anglo-American Committee and the statement which he made here led me to think that he does not base the right of the Jews to Palestine on what has come to be known as the Balfour Declaration. Have I understood his position correctly or not.

Mr. BEN GURION: Not correctly. What I said was that the Jewish right to Palestine was prior to the Balfour Declaration. I do not think that is the same thing. Our right was existing for 3,500 years. The Balfour Declaration was merely a recognition by a Great Power of that right. The right existed before. That is what I said, and I maintain it now.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I will try to find out a little more about that historical association from Rabbi Fishman and any other gentleman you would like to produce. I will not burden you just now with regard to Biblical references. But I will take you into another part of the case for the time being. Is it true that before the making of what has come to be known as the Balfour Declaration, many different versions of the suggested formula were drafted by various members of the Zionist Political Committee

shortly after the interview between Mr. Balfour and two highly respected Jews, Dr. Weizmann and Baron Rothschild?

Mr. BEN GURION: There are several drafts, it is true.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are two of those drafts correctly printed as pages 163 and 164 of Jeffries?<sup>1</sup>

Mr. BEN GURION: There is one person, as far as I know, who can answer.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Dr. Weizmann is coming. I only ask you the question. If you are unable to answer the question, say so.

Mr. BEN GURION: I think that as Dr. Weizmann is taking that part, I would not take it upon myself to answer questions of a historical nature of which I have no first-hand knowledge. As the person who knows it will appear, I think it is best to put the question to him. I was not there. I was in the army when the Balfour Declaration was written.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You have made a large number of statements of facts of which you did not have personal knowledge, but it is up to you to say whether these drafts are wrongly printed. I take it you do not know.

Mr. BEN GURION: I do not know. I have not read it, so I am unable to tell you what draft is there and what is not. I have not seen all the motions and all the drafts of the Balfour declaration.

CHAIRMAN: Let us ask these questions of Dr. Weizmann.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That will be my function to decide. If I think it necessary, I shall do so. I am only asking him to read them. If he refuses to read them. . .

Mr. BEN GURION: I am reading them.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (Interpretation from French): A point of order. I should like to ask the Chair to request the public in this hall not to express their opinions pro or against any side here. We are in the presence of a very difficult problem and it is very disturbing if the public expresses a preference for one or the other side.

Mr. BEN GURION: May I associate myself with the wish expressed by the representative of Iran?

CHAIRMAN: I also associate myself with that opinion and request the public not to give vent to their feelings.

Mr. BEN GURION: I am reading, and I am sorry to say I cannot tell you; I have no reason to say it is not correct, or that it is.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is quite enough for me. Could you say that Mr. Edwin Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, Sir Philip Magnus, and their associates in British Jewry were opposed to the Balfour Declaration?

Mr. BEN GURION: Very much so.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): They did not want the establishment of even a National Home?

Mr. BEN GURION: No.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Much less a National State.

Mr. BEN GURION: They knew it was a National State and they were against a Jewish State and a Jewish National Home and against Jews being Jews. They are assimilated Jews.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You have just now seen these drafts. Assuming that these drafts are correctly printed, do you find that the words "National Home in Palestine" were replaced or substituted in the Balfour Declaration as it was printed for the words "Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish people?"

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, I know that in the White Paper of 1922 it is pointed out that it did not say "Palestine as a National Home," but "A National Home in Palestine."

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am only trying to draw your attention. Do you find any difference between those two expressions?

Mr. BEN GURION: As far as the draft is concerned I told you I had not read them all.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am only asking if you see any difference in the fact that formerly the draft was "Palestine being a National Home," while the real Balfour Declaration as it came out in November 1917 said the "National Home being in Palestine." Do you find any difference between the words "Palestine being a National Home" and the "National Home being in Palestine?"

Mr. BEN GURION: As far as the draft is concerned, I have told you, I cannot tell you.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am asking the meaning of those words "Palestine being a National Home" and "A National Home being in Palestine."

Mr. BEN GURION: I have told you I cannot say whether there was or was not such a draft. Possibly there was.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Leave the drafts out.

Mr. BEN GURION: The Balfour Declaration says "National Home in Palestine"—not "Palestine as a National Home."

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you find any difference between the words "Palestine being a National Home" and "A National Home being in Palestine?"

Mr. BEN GURION: I do not see any difference except that when you say "Palestine as a National Home," it may be interpreted to mean that the Arabs should be transferred from Palestine, and they did not want this, and rightly so.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The words "National Home" were not defined and they were not known to international law until then.

Mr. BEN GURION: As far as I know, they were not. I am not an international lawyer.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was Mr. Bentwich a Jewish international lawyer?

Mr. BEN GURION: He is still a Jew and, I think, still an international lawyer.

<sup>1</sup> J. M. N. Jeffries. *Palestine the Reality* (1939).

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did he define "National Home" in his book<sup>1</sup> on the Mandatory System? Would you please read it?

Mr. BEN GURION: Do you want me to read it now? I cannot give you a judgment on what I am going to read now.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am only drawing your attention to Mr. Bentwich's definition of a National Home.

Mr. BEN GURION: I think the best thing would be for you to read what he says.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is it written there? I am just drawing your attention to that book. It defines National Home as a territory in which a people without receiving rights of political sovereignty has nevertheless a recognized legal position and the opportunity of developing its moral, social and intellectual side. Is that how Mr. Bentwich understands that term?

Mr. BEN GURION: I will tell you what I understand it to mean. If you ask me to say whether these words are here, you do not need to because they are here. If you want to ask me what I understand by them I will tell you. If you do not want me to, I will not.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Since you are not an international lawyer I will not trouble you.

Mr. BEN GURION: If you want to draw my attention, I want to say what is my contention.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to shorten the discussion. We are here to gain information and it is perhaps not necessary to ask the opinion of the Jewish Agency on everything that is written on this subject. We can discuss it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): No, that is not the case. The answers of Mr. Ben Gurion have been given in a certain strain and they assume that the words "National Home" mean a "National State." I am trying to draw his attention to the fact that Jewish international lawyers who have written books have meant otherwise: that is all. It is for your benefit, for my benefit, for everybody's benefit.

Mr. BEN GURION: May I again tell you what is my view, because I believe you tried to draw my attention to something which is not there, and because I believe the first part of it says when the Balfour Declaration was given it did not signify that it gave the Jews sovereignty of the country. The Jews until now had no sovereign rights in Palestine, but it gave the Jews who were not here the right to come back and develop it. That is, as far as I gather it, what you mean. Secondly, maybe Mr. Bentwich has views different from the views of others. I do not see why Mr. Bentwich is not entitled to have his own views and why his views need to bind anyone else. I think the people who formulated the Balfour Declaration knew as much about the meaning of it as Mr. Bentwich. The same thing is true for the Royal Commission. There are also lawyers among them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): According to Mr. Balfour, this Declaration was in the nature of an adventure. He himself said so; is that not right?

Mr. BEN GURION: Maybe. If you have read it. I will take your word that he said so. You asked me whether he said so.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Yes.

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, I will say, if you tell me that Mr. Balfour said so; I trust you, I will take your word for it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): All right. Can you point to any document to show that there is any reference to the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine which was made to Mr. Balfour or to the British Cabinet, before the issue of this Declaration?

Mr. BEN GURION: Before the issue of the Declaration? This is what was proposed to them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was any claim in regard to Palestine becoming a Jewish National State ever brought to the notice of Mr. Balfour or to the notice of the British Cabinet?

Mr. BEN GURION: Again I must tell you that, if you mean the British Cabinet at the time of Mr. Balfour, or before that, that I am not really the person who can give you the historical evidence. I was quite young then. I was not elected to the Cabinet. I was simply a private in the army.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have you seen any documents up until now?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, I have not seen any.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): In the statement which Mr. Shertock made to the Committee, it was pointed out that any notion of the Jews in Palestine being as Jewish as the England is English is wholly wrong. Is that correct?

Mr. BEN GURION: That is correct.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you know that Lord Balfour made the following speech in the House of Lords on the twenty-third of March 1922: "I cannot imagine any political interests exercised under greater safeguards than the political interests of the established population of Palestine. Every act of government will be jealously watched. The Zionist organization has no attribution of political powers. If it uses or usurps political powers, it is an act of usurpation. Whatever else may happen in Palestine, of this I am confident, that under the British Government, no form of tyranny, racial or religious, will be permitted."

Mr. BEN GURION: That is a fact, of course. They had no political power in 1922. They have none now.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was the First World War still going on when the Declaration of 1917 was made?

Mr. BEN GURION: It was still going on, yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And there was more than one reason for making this Declaration?

<sup>1</sup> N. Bentwich. *The Mandates System* (1930).



Mr. BEN GURION: Really, I cannot answer as to their reasons.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is it not a fact that Jewish soldiers were in those days fighting for Germany and the Axis powers?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Mr. Shertok being one of them.

Mr. BEN GURION: Jews in Germany?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Yes.

Mr. BEN GURION: You asked me; let me answer. Jews in Germany fought for Germany. There were no Axis powers in 1917. The Axis powers arose long after the First World War, and your question does not apply. Jews in Germany, as German subjects, fought, and I think bravely, for Germany. And rightly so.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I agree that the Axis powers came into being later, in the next world war, but I meant Germany and Turkey. Were Jews fighting for Germany in those days or not, in that war?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes. It is a matter of fact. There is no need for those questions here. Jews in Palestine, who were in the Turkish Army, fought in the Turkish Army. My colleague was an officer in the army, my colleague Mr. Shertok. I was expelled by the Turks, although I protested against it. I wanted to stay in there and I was expelled by Jemal Pasha. I told them I would come back as soon as possible. They said we know you will try but you will not come back. I was expelled with my colleague who is now the President of the Jewish Community in Palestine, Mr. Ben-Zoi. We were expelled together. We both came back as volunteers to fight against Jemal Pasha. We did not find him here any more.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Since you came to Palestine some forty-two years ago, you must have come to know that Arab nationalism had begun and was actually growing very much in 1914 and 1915.

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, I know a little differently. I came to Palestine, to be exact, forty-one years ago. I lived with Arabs. I must say that I lived mostly with the common man, with workers and peasants, because I was an agricultural worker. I did not find anywhere, among those Arabs with whom I had any contact, any political opposition or any political movement against Jews. But to tell you the whole truth, I must tell you that even then there was published a paper in Haifa, *Carmel*, published by a Christian Arab who tried to stir up anti-Semitic feelings against Jews. But among the Arabs I knew there was no political feeling, although there were quarrels and there were shootings between Arab villages and Jewish villages. But the feeling naturally grew because the Arabs are the same as any other people in the world, and the national movement arose among the Arabs. And

I was watching its rise and growth among the Arabs.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did they decide to break away from the Ottoman Empire in 1915 on account of that rising nationalism?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, not the Arabs in Palestine. At least, not those I knew. The Arabs in Palestine fought with the Turks. And I do not blame them; it was natural that they should fight with the Turks.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): In Arabia, Syria, in Transjordan, was the nationalism growing among the Arabs in those places?

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, I happen to know the story of the First World War in these countries. I happen to know it from personal experience; I was living here. There were only a small number of Bedowins who, from time to time, attacked Turks when the opportunity offered itself. I have not seen any Arabs fighting against the Turks, neither here, nor in Transjordan, nor in Syria, nor anywhere else. I do not want to imply by that that the Arabs in Syria did not want to become independent of the Turks. But the fact is they did not fight against them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was a *Jehad* declared by Turkey, by the Ottoman ruler since he was the Caliph, and was it not resisted by the Arabs in Arabia, in Palestine, in Lebanon, in Syria and in other places, and was a declaration made by King Hussein?

Mr. BEN GURION: Sir, you are far from the reality in these countries when you think that a *Jehad* was needed to bring a Palestinian Arab to fight in the Turkish Army. He had to go into the army, and he had to fight. He was not asked whether he liked it or not. It was not necessary to ask him, nor did he have any view. He never heard of *Jehad*. He knew he had to serve in the army, and he served in the army, as he had served for centuries. The Arabs have been serving in the Ottoman armies for centuries without a *Jehad*. There was no need for a *Jehad*.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Not only the Arabs. When the war was declared, every Moslem was bound to fight.

Mr. BEN GURION: No Moslem fought, except those who served in the army.

CHAIRMAN: Do you think you will finish with your questions by two o'clock?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): No.

CHAIRMAN: Then, I think we shall have to adjourn the hearing and continue the discussion of certain matters we discussed yesterday in the private meeting.

The hearing is adjourned until tomorrow morning at nine o'clock.

*The hearing adjourned at 1.15 o'clock.*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem,  
Tuesday, 8 July 1947, at 9 a.m.*

### *Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The agenda for today's meeting contains three points: adoption of the agenda, public hearing of Dr. Weizmann, public hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency. I think we can adopt this agenda. Adopted.

### Hearing of Dr. Weizmann

Will you, Dr. Weizmann, come up on the platform, please?

*(Dr. Chaim Weizmann took a seat at the table).*

DR. WEIZMANN: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I am grateful for the opportunity to speak before you on the ideals and principles which underly the movement and the work in this country which you have come to examine. I may be forgiven if I am somewhat slow. My sight is impaired and I have to refer to the document, and it is of necessity a somewhat slow and disagreeable process.

I was privileged to be amongst the group of people which negotiated with the statesmen, during the First World War, more or less from the period of 1915 until 1918, and subsequent years, on the issuance of the Balfour Declaration. I was particularly associated with Mr. Balfour who was, together with the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, instrumental in giving effect to this Declaration, and so I am perhaps somewhat competent to speak of the meaning of the Balfour Declaration which is, I understand, a matter of considerable heart-searching and controversy. I also would like to say that I stood at the centre of the activities which followed after the publication of the Declaration, and subsequently after the drafting of the Mandate, until quite recently. And even now, although I hold no office, and I speak on my own behalf in my private capacity, I believe I know more or less what the Jewish people think of the position, and I believe I understand the mind of the British Government—at least I have been trying to do so for all of my life. Therefore, without trying to be in any way boastful,

I would like to submit to you, Sir, and to you, Gentlemen, that I speak as a result of a lengthy period of experience of trial and error, of mistakes, having suffered and paid for these mistakes.

I should like to begin my statement—and I do so from the bottom of my heart—by expressing in the presence of you gentlemen and of the public sitting here my sincerest gratitude to the Mandatory Power, to Great Britain, for having inaugurated this policy and for having, throughout many years, tried to go along with us in the implementation of this policy. There is no question, whatever may be the position today, that if we see today a great and interesting and thriving community in Palestine, it would not have been possible without first of all the conquest of Palestine by the British Army and the rule of Great Britain in this country. And that is a sincere tribute of gratitude, whatever else may have happened since. I consider that what is going on now—the deterioration of the relations between us and Great Britain, which, together with a great many Jews, I deplore, is merely a temporary thing which, in the light of the historic perspective in the past, is an unpleasant intermezzo.

Although the initiative of the Balfour Declaration came primarily from Great Britain, it is common knowledge that Great Britain had at the time the support of the Allied and associated powers of France, of Italy, and, above all, of the United States of America; and subsequently the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration and the whole of the Palestinian Regime were, so to speak, a child of the League of Nations, and Great Britain was a trustee on behalf of the League. It had to account for its actions annually to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League. The Permanent Mandates Commission was to draw up an annual report, and this report was to be submitted to the League Assembly, which took the opportunity of expressing its approval or disapproval, wholly or partially, of the stewardship of the British Administration in Palestine. It went on like that for almost a quarter of a century, until the year 1939, until the publication of the White Paper which interrupted this work and which broke our existing relationship with the British Government, with the Administration of Palestine, very much to the regret of all the well-wishers of Palestine. The last act of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations in 1939 was to declare the White Paper incompatible with the spirit of the Mandate as it was interpreted all this time, and that was by a majority, I think the unanimous opinion of the members of the Permanent Mandates Commission. A majority of the Permanent Mandates Commission said that the White Paper was not compatible with the Mandate, and here the matter was left because war broke out and all systematic work and the League itself disappeared in the vortex of blood and sorrow.

The Mandate, in my humble opinion, had two main purposes, and perhaps I will be per-

mitted before I enter upon the subject to say a word about the motives which have moved Great Britain, and perhaps some other friends of both Great Britain and of the Jewish people, at that time to issue the Balfour Declaration. I know that a great deal of—if I may be permitted, for lack of a better parliamentary expression, to use the word—nonsense is being spoken about it, and perhaps this is the time and the place to put it right, at any rate on behalf of one who, I think, was closely connected for many years with this period of Jewish and international history.

Like every human deed, the Balfour Declaration had two main motives. There was no question but that it had an ideal motive. The statesmen of that time, Mr. Balfour and Mr. Lloyd George, amongst them, primarily wanted to manifest a certain amount of restitution to the Jewish people for the contribution which the Jews have made in these thousands of years to the civilization of mankind which, you know, is common knowledge. Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour were deeply religious men and knew the Bible, knew the value of the Bible and the effect the Bible had on the character and on the life of the British nation, and they could not help and were only too glad to connect this influence with the others of the Bible or with the nation in the midst of whom the Bible was born.

I remember very well in the first talk which I had with Mr. Lloyd George—that was long before there was any talk of a Declaration or similar action—that he said, in a way half-jokingly and half-seriously—"You talk to me about Palestine. That is the only geography which I know, and I am acquainted with the geography of Palestine almost better than with the geography of the present front." He was proud to be associated with this work, and there was no doubt an underlying ideal motive which moved the statesmen of that time—primarily the two foremost statesmen—to issue this Declaration.

There was, as I said, another set of motives and they were utilitarian; not utilitarian in a gross or purely materialistic sense, as I am going to explain in a moment. We were—I mean the British people and those who were associated with the British, and I was associated with the British nation and proud to be so—all engaged in a war of life and death, which meant the existence or non-existence of the Commonwealth of Great Britain. A great deal depended upon America. In America there was a powerful Jewish community which was at that time, for some reason or other—I do not agree with this reason, but it was more or less current opinion in Great Britain at that time—either very neutral or inclined to be pro-German, some of them, the powerful German Jews, or the Jews of German ancestry. It was thought that by this act of restitution—at any rate a form of declaration—this might swing the opinion of a powerful group of American Jewry.

There was also another group—the Zionist group—which was never pro-German. It was always anxious to see British victory. But we wanted to have a united Jewish community of America standing behind the great war effort and behind President Wilson, who was carefully preparing his nation for entry into the war, for taking upon themselves a great ordeal, and it was thought that the Balfour Declaration might help to swing the opinion of this community. I believe it had some effect, and I believe that in that respect it has fulfilled the purpose which was intended at that time.

There was also another community at that time which played a great part in the war—another Jewish community—and that was the Russian Jewish Community. It was, you remember, before Russia was divided and before Poland was re-established, and the Russian Jewish Community was the largest in the world. It was six million strong, and also the opinion of the Russian-Jewish Community was of considerable value in that constellation of circumstances. There were two purposes: one was purely idealistic, and the other partly utilitarian, in the sense in which I have tried to describe. I hope I may be forgiven for having dwelt on it at such length, but I thought now is the time, and I am advanced in years and I may not have the opportunity of clearing it up again, so I am taking the opportunity now of resubmitting it to you, gentlemen.

The nations of the world realized, particularly the British, American, French and Italians, that a great deal of the trouble, worry and persecution which has beset the Jews throughout their history is due to the abnormal position of the Jews in the world. What is the abnormal position of the Jews in the world? What is it characterized by? It is characterized by one thing: I think this word from what I can see from reports, has been used here quite often. I used this word for the first time in speaking before the Royal Commission. It is the "Homelessness" of the Jewish people. To that I must add a comment. I do not mean the "homelessness" of individual Jews. There are groups of Jews in the world who have very comfortable homes—the American Jews, the Jews in a great many of the Western and Northwestern countries, the Jews in Sweden, Denmark, France, and also, there was in Germany—but as a collectivity, as an ethnic group, they are homeless. They are and they are not. They are a people and they lack the props of a people. They are a disembodied ghost. There they are with a great many typical characteristics, many strong characteristics which have not disappeared throughout centuries, thousands of years of martyrdom and wandering, and at the same time they lack the props which characterize every nation. We ask today: "What are Poles? What are French? What are Swiss?" When that is asked everyone points to a country, to certain institutions, to parliamentary institutions, and the man in the street will know exactly what it is. He has a passport. If you ask what a Jew is, well, he is

a man who has to offer a long explanation for his existence. And, any person who has to offer an explanation as to what he is is always suspect, and from suspicion there is only one step to hatred or contempt. I am trying to put it as lightly as I can. I do not want to describe it as the tragedy which it really is. This has rendered the position of the Jews in the world abnormal and, as a very logical consequence of this abnormal position, their relation to the outside world is abnormal.

Palestine is in the process of upbuilding, having a thriving community here, yet even today there are Jews, I do not know how many, but quite a few who would deny (a) that there are Jews; (b) that they are Jews; (c) that there is Palestine; (d) that it is necessary to have Palestine. All that confuses the Gentile mind, which does not understand. And, if you do not understand somebody, you begin to suspect him. And, if you begin to suspect him, there is only one step left from suspicion to hatred. It was thought this position must be remedied by normalizing the position of the Jews and by rendering them as normal as anybody else, and giving them those props and those material attributes which they lack. Hence the attempt and ardent desire of a great part of Jewry to build up a normal life of their own. And where could we do it except in this country?

I think I have, it is my duty, although I never thought it should be necessary, to try to explain "Why Palestine?" Why not Kamchatka, Alaska, Mexico, or Texas? There are a great many empty countries. Why should the Jews choose a country which has a population that does not want to receive you in a particularly friendly way; a small country; a country which has been neglected and derelict for centuries. It seems unusual on the part of a practical and shrewd people like the Jews to sink their effort, their sweat and blood, their substance into the sands, rocks and marshes of Palestine. Well, I could, if I wished to be facetious, say it is not our responsibility—not the responsibility of the Jews who sit here—it is the responsibility of Moses, who acted from divine inspiration. He might have brought us to the United States, and instead of the Jordan we might have had the Mississippi. It would have been an easier task. But, he has chosen to stop here. We are an ancient people with an old history, and you cannot deny your history and begin fresh. And the proof of what I am saying, which may again, perhaps be too abstract, is the following: almost parallel, simultaneously with the colonization of Palestine began another project of colonization in another part of the world far removed from here, nearer to a great many countries from which some of the distinguished representatives who sit here come from, that is the colonization in the Argentine. The colonization of Jews in the Argentine began, as I say, almost simultaneously with the attempt to colonize Palestine. Now, compare these two countries: Argentina is a vast country with virgin soil which had a benevolent government. There was no

opposition. On the contrary, the government was anxious that the Jews should come in—at any rate then, I do not know what it is now. Usually this anxiety does not last too long—but there it was, and the Jews went to the Argentine. They went there under the guidance of a powerful committee, which was endowed with a great many funds, something to the amount of ten million pounds, gold pounds. At that time it meant more than probably fifty or seventy-five millions now. They began their work under the best possible auspices. Today, the colonization of Argentina represents a few Jewish settlements. They are quite good, and they are decent people who work hard on the soil, but it is just a few Jewish villages. The younger generation of many of the Jewish settlements is drifting gradually to Buenos Aires where they become lawyers and doctors, the usual process which we know is the economic and social development of a Jewish community surrounded by a majority of non-Jews.

We began in this country at the same time. You have seen it. You have seen it now. How, in a great many parts it looks attractive. It is covered with trees and grass. But, I remember when I first came in 1908 and then in 1918 when I travelled with General Allenby, a great Commander-in-Chief who conquered Palestine—I travelled with him from Rammalla, from Tel-Aviv to Jerusalem, and we travelled through a derelict, barren country. There was not much green, and he turned to me and said: "I thought you were a reasonable fellow. Do you really think anybody will come and settle in this country?" All I could say to Allenby, for whom I had a profound respect, was "Well, General, let us wait another twenty years and perhaps we will be granted the opportunity of meeting again and we might re-discuss the subject." We did meet again, and we did re-discuss the subject, and he did change his mind, and he did announce the change publicly. Now, this progress is due to the fact that it is Palestine. Palestine, for reasons which I need not labour, releases energies, activities in the Jewish people which are not released anywhere else. As soon as a Jew comes into contact with this country he begins to feel as if he has returned. I shall not say that every Jew feels it. I am not going to say that he feels it at once. But these are sentiments which grow, which grow in everyone of us, and the rocks, marshes, and sands of Palestine became a precious possession into which we pour our sweat, blood, effort and ingenuity in order to make it what it is.

I gave some of the reasons for the Balfour Declaration in 1917. They were, as I said, ideal, and they were what is called "utilitarian." They also came as a result of a conception that the position of the Jew would be altered and his suffering allayed if he had a place to go to. And, if these reasons were valid in 1918, they *a fortiori* are one thousand times more valid today. I am afraid that the reasons which prompted us to make a prognosis of the Jewish problem in the years 1904, 1905, and 1906, for which we

were looked upon as dreamers and star-gazers who were trying to get something impossible—all these prognoses as to what was going to happen to the Jews, unfortunately more than came true. There are six million Jews dead in Europe, and hundreds of thousands of Jews are languishing today either in D.P. camps or in countries where they are not wanted. It is proof that the situation demands speedy remedy. I say emphatically, gentlemen, speedy remedy. I took upon myself the liberty, perhaps it appears somewhat formal, last year to warn the Anglo-American Commission that time is of the essence. I am old enough to issue that warning again. Time is of the essence. We have lost so much blood, we cannot afford to lose any more. For us it is a question of survival: it brooks no delay. The position of Jewry today in the world is sombre. In Palestine it is somewhat different, and here are features of the situation which give us confidence. I would not like to appear to you as a prophet of evil or of sad things. I never believed that we would build Palestine with Jeremiahs.

We have some comforting hope in the attitude of the United States, the attitude of British public opinion (in spite of what I said about the temporary difficulties, and I am sure they will pass) and the attitude, last but not least, of the Soviet Union. We were happy to read President Truman's message to Ibn Saud which, in very clear terms, gave expression to the attitude of the American Government to the development of the Jewish National Home. I was equally pleased to read and grateful for the statement of Mr. Gromyko in his thoughtful speech which could have been, I do not want to impart anything to him which is not so, but it could have been made by a Zionist. I am sure he is not a Zionist. I do not want to offend him that way, but the speech, nevertheless, was a good Zionist statement.

There is another feature of the situation which no doubt has drawn your attention. So far, the ability, finance, and all that you have seen erected here which constitutes the National Home, has been created with our own hands. That is something to which I would like to call the specific attention of this Committee. One of the greatest reproaches which is usually levelled at the Jew is "Oh, yes, he may be a very good fellow and all that and no doubt when you come into a country you are law-abiding, you pay your taxes, you do not steal, and so on. But you see there is something about you which we do not altogether relish. You always come when things are ready. You come into the second floor of the building. The foundation, the dirty work which you need in digging and laying the foundation, putting up the bricks and stones, and all that has been done by others. When it is all ready, and the rooms are nicely painted, and the pyjamas are on the bed, you step in and you hire an elegant suite, and here you are. We do not like it."

This is the reason why Jews are usually branded as parasites: parasites not in the ordi-

nary sense of the word, but in this particular sense.

Well, here in Palestine there were marshes and we have drained them; there were stones and we have planted over them; there were no houses and we have built them; it was ridden with disease and we have cleared it. All that has been done here, from the modest cottage of the settler to the University on Mount Scopus, is the work of Jewish planning, Jewish genius and of Jewish hands and muscles, not only of money and initiative. This gives us a certain amount of pride and confidence. Given a dog's chance, we could do as well as anybody else. I do not think we are better than anybody else; I do not think we are worse than anybody else. I think we are just as good and just as bad as the others. But the chances are different. And here was a chance, a remedial chance, a chance of political circumstances. I believe, and I want to underscore this, we have made, under the circumstances, the best of that chance.

There is something else to be said, and I am saying it in all humility. Other peoples have colonized great countries, rich countries. They found when they entered there backward populations. And they did for the backward populations what they did. I am not a historian, and I am not sitting in judgment on the colonizing activity of the various great nations which have colonized backward regions. But I would like to say that, as compared with the result of the colonizing activities of other peoples, our impact on the Arabs has not produced very much worse results than what has been produced by others in other countries. In fact, it is admitted, even by the administration of Palestine, which cannot be suspected of over-bias in favour of our work today—you see I am trying to be as careful as I can, I could have used a more severe expression, but that is not the point today—that the Arabs have benefited by the work of the Jews. It admits it in the Blue Paper which I have tried very hard to read before appearing before you. This Paper says, yes, you have done quite well, but you have created something which is very very wrong; you have created a disparity between you and the local population. Work in a country, colonizing activity, building up of a country, creating of social conditions is not like a convoy of ships which usually moves with the speed of the slowest. Every nation moves on its way of progress with the speed which is a result of its qualities, of its abilities, of its conditions. You cannot artificially suppress these particular qualities in order, so to speak, not to create a disparity. A disparity is always there when there are two strata of population. I admit that these create certain difficulties for the Administration. I have no doubt that the Palestine Administration had difficulty. I am ready to admit it. We have created quite a considerable amount of difficulty for the Palestine Administration. I am very sorry for that. I have tried to mitigate these difficulties, but human beings are there in order to create difficulties for each

other. If the world were run smoothly, like a class of pupils who are always obedient and "goody-goody," well, the world would be a terribly dull place and no one would want to live in it. Difficulty is there. It is life, it is struggle. It is a clash between various conceptions and interests. The Administration would like us to go slow. I admit it is perhaps easier for the Administration if people go slow. But we were driven by all the furies of the world. We could not afford to be slow. Every slowing down of our progress meant so many dead and so much destruction. Every Jew whom we saved out of this hell of Europe was to us a gain, a double, triple, tenfold gain. Therefore, our conception of speed and the Administration's conception of speed are, of necessity, different. Talk of disparity in that sense is, at least, not quite just.

I would like to deal with one other subject which is again a matter of considerable controversy. What is a National Home? What does it mean? Was it meant to make a state out of the National Home or not? I may perhaps for one second as a quasi self-appointed historian of the Zionist movement—which I am not—deal with the question of how the words "National Home" came about. You see we came here in 1917 and we had the problem of building up the country. We were expected by His Majesty's Government to build up Palestine. Neither the British Government nor we, perhaps, realized all the difficulties which we would have to face in doing that. It was essential to create something which would serve as an instrument for this building. In olden times, such backward countries were built up by charter companies. All of you will remember the East Indian Charter Company. But charter companies were hard to fashion in 1918, the first quarter of the twentieth century. The Wilsonian conception of the world certainly would not have allowed a charter company. Therefore, we had to create a substitute. This substitute was the Jewish Agency which had the function of a charter company, which had the function of a body which would conduct the colonization, immigration, improvement of the land, and do all the work which a government usually does, without really being a government. We had all the difficulties of a government and none of its advantages. The Jewish Agency was given a special position in the Mandate. It was not much of a privilege; it was a great burden. And I can say this out of the bitter experience of many years.

We were told by various people in the British Government that we were acting too quickly. We were told by the Jews that we were acting too slowly. I have felt it all my life. I still feel it now. I am constantly being reproached: why do you not ask for immigration of 100,000 or 150,000? We could take them in; it is only the British Government which is wicked and does not let them in. You are not strong enough: you must knock on the table and impress the British Government that you have got to do it. Well, I am not going to tell you what my

answers were. They are all on record. But I broke my neck repeatedly. It is a very difficult task to be between the hammer and the anvil of two such contending forces. But that this work will go on, we all believe. If we are able to acquire land, if we are able to bring in Jewish immigration, whether it is a large immigration or not, whether it will correspond to the needs which are inherent in the position of the Jews or not, eventually, in the fullness of time, in God's own time it will become a Jewish State.

There was no doubt about this point in the minds of the statesmen of that time, nor in the minds of those who worked with them—and I did try to work honestly and conscientiously and in harmony with all the elements concerned: we all believed it would result in a Jewish State.

The difficulty again is in the speed. Some British people used to tell me, well, you are pushing too hard; a State may come in fifty years, sixty years, or seventy years. We thought it may come sooner. We were in a vicious circle and I would like to explain what I mean by that. In order to perform the work which we were expected to perform under the Mandate, we had to have land, improvement of the land, reclamation of desert areas, bringing in masses of people—masses of from 20,000 to 40,000 per year—settling them, educational problems, social problems, hospitals, and so forth. You really must have governmental powers because our work, our speed of immigration depended on the absorptive capacity of the country. Now, there was no absorptive capacity of the country. Absorptive capacity does not grow on trees. You cannot find any absorptive capacity on the hills of Jerusalem. The hills of Jerusalem are very beautiful, but you cannot live on them unless you develop them. Therefore, we were placed in this dilemma: in order to create absorptive capacity on the scale which we require, you need governmental powers in order to have governmental powers, you need more or less of a majority in the country. We needed immigration and development on a scale which only government could give us. On the one hand we needed the government; on the other hand we could only get the government when we brought the masses in the country. This was the vicious circle in which we moved and which we tried to break through with our poor heads. Very often, we broke our heads but did not break the circle.

I think I have dealt with what we conceived to be the function of the Agency. I have dealt with what I call unjust governmental criticism of the disparity. I have pointed out that disparity is a natural phenomenon which cannot be avoided. You can only avoid it if you stop working altogether, and that means stagnation.

At this point, I would like to say that, to some extent, this disparity could have been avoided, if the other part of the population, the Arab population, had been ready to co-operate with us in the same degree in which we were ready to co-operate with them. But they stood



aside. Very often I heard from quite benevolent Arabs—they did not mean any evil, we were quite friendly—you Jews are queer people; you have come to Palestine and you have in your hands the best land in the country. In fact, some of them whom I know—I do not want to name them—said, well, you have really cheated us; we have sold you this and that piece of land very, very cheaply; if we had waited another ten years we could have sold it to you at double or triple the price. The Arabs like money just as much as the Jews do. It is not a particularly Jewish trait. My answer to them was, gentlemen, you seem to have forgotten that we have made it into good land; we have made it into good land because we have sunk so much effort into it. If you would do the same, your land would be just as good if not better than ours. Do not reproach us for having improved that part of the land which you have sold us because you could do nothing with it.

There is another reproach levelled on us, that we disturb the status quo. Naturally, every administration—and the British Administration does not differ from a Dutch or a French Administration in that respect—is reluctant to disturb the status quo. They like to keep things going smoothly and nicely. When an administrator comes into a backward country, he has a certain cliché which he applies to the country. The British, for instance, whom I know best in that respect—come to a backward country and what do they do? They clean up the country from disease; they establish a measure of justice; they create means of communication; they give to the population a certain modicum of education. All this is done nicely, quietly, not too dynamically. They are not too static, but they do not like this dynamism of the Jews who are always in a hurry and always upset the routine of the Administration. It is perfectly natural for an administrator to feel this way. A friend of mine has repeatedly told me, well, these damn Jews are troublesome; they can never take no for an answer; if you throw them out of the door they will come in through the window. My answer to him was, we cannot afford to take no for an answer, we have no time. If you refuse this, that, or the other, to us it means the loss of so many hundreds, of so many thousands of people. It is a question of life and death for us. A little water here, a little piece of land there, means to us a great deal in terms of human life. To you it simply means one fraction of a vast territory which you possess, and which you have possessed long enough, and which you keep. You are safe, but we have no assurance of our future.

Therefore, we are sometimes not preferred, I do not say that we are discriminated against, although certain laws, as adumbrated in the White Paper, do constitute a discrimination. But it is more of an attitude. The British Administrator would like to be just to both parts of the population.

As far as we are concerned, this slow tempo is not enough for us. It may be enough for the

British; it may be enough for the Arabs. I believe—and I am saying this in the light of what is going on in Great Britain—that this slowness of tempo is not enough even for the British people now.

Look at the difference which has been created between the Mandate and the White Paper. The Mandate encourages settlement of the land; the White Paper not only discourages it, it stops it. The Mandate encourages intensive colonization; the White Paper discourages it. The White Paper nullifies the Mandate. That is why we have to oppose the White Paper with all the strength at our disposal.

I would like to say that the White Paper had two fatal effects. It had an effect on the relations between Jews and Arabs. Why should the Arab listen to overtures on the part of the Jew if he knows that with the application of a little violence, as he did in the years 1934 and 1935, and 1936 to 1939, he can get what he wants and more. All our effort to try to persuade them that it is in the interests of both parties that we should come to an agreement failed at the moment when the British Government broke our back, so to speak, by the White Paper.

The White Paper also had another fatal effect. And I say this with all the force at my command and in all solemnity. The White Paper released certain phenomena in Jewish life which are un-Jewish, which are contrary to Jewish ethics, contrary to Jewish tradition. "You must not kill" is something which has been grained in us on the Mount of Sinai. It was inconceivable ten years ago that the Jews should break this Commandment. Unfortunately, they are breaking it today, and nobody deplores it more than most of the Jews. I hang my head in shame when I have to speak of this fact before you, gentlemen. I hope that international action, in concert with Great Britain, will clear out this disease from our midst.

The Mandate was born out of hope. The White Paper was born out of fear. The fear which was brought into the world by Hitler, by Nazism, by all this darkness which has covered the bright horizon of Jews before the war. This fear has found expression in a great many forms, particularly in the form of the White Paper. This fear was a result of the appeasement policy: appeasement of Germany; appeasement of the Arabs. The British nation has paid dearly for this appeasement policy. It has paid dearly in a bloody, devastating war. She will have to suffer from the effects of this war for many years to come. Every one of us had to suffer from it. The Jews in Palestine have paid for this appeasement in the form of the White Paper. The worst of it all is that the price you pay is useless. All this appeasement only bring Dead Sea fruit, nothing else.

At the last Congress which took place in Basle, I said in my opening address, and I think it stands repeating before you today: "Whenever a new country was about to come under Gestapo rule we asked that the gates of the National Home be opened for saving as many as possible

of our people from the gas-chambers. Our entreaties fell on deaf ears; it seemed that the White Paper was more sacred for some people than life itself. Sometimes we were told that our exclusion from Palestine was necessary in order to do justice to a nation endowed with seven independent territories, covering a million square miles; at other times we were informed that the admission of our refugees might endanger military security during the war. It was easier to doom the Jews of Europe to a certain death than to evolve a technique for overcoming such difficulties. When human need, the instinct of self-preservation, collided with the White Paper, the result was the Struma, the Patria and Mauritius."

Perhaps you are entitled to ask what were the attempts to which I alluded several times in my remarks, which were made in order to come to terms with the Arabs. I can speak for myself, and I am sure I am including a good many of my Zionist colleagues or ex-colleagues, when I say that from the very first moment, two months after the Balfour Declaration, this was one of the first tasks to which I devoted myself—and some of them collaborated with me in getting into touch with Arab leaders. Even earlier—it is not true and I say so advisedly, what is being affirmed by Arabs and their quasi-friends, that the Balfour Declaration was given behind the back of the Arabs. Not only was the Balfour Declaration a public act but of the gentlemen who conducted the investigation prior to the Balfour Declaration, foremost among them was the late Sir Mark Sykes, a man who knew the Arabs, and whom I knew. The records in the British Foreign Office would confirm it: He reported every step in these negotiations to the then representative of the Arabs, King Hussein, Sherif of Mecca at that time, subsequently King Hussein. He was kept fully informed about what was going on. That was still previous to the issuance of the Balfour Declaration.)

After the Balfour Declaration was issued in November 1917, I came to Palestine, and to Egypt, early in March 1918, and for weeks I was trying to get in touch and meet with all sorts of Arab leaders, beginning with Mr. Nimir, the venerable editor of the "Mokattam"—I think he is ninety-six — finishing with the learned Sheikhs in the Al Azheer University, and many other Arab leaders of Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine who were then living in Egypt, because the rest of these countries, and part of Palestine itself, was still under Turkish rule and in a state of war.)

When I came to Palestine in June or July, 1918, with the consent of the Commander-in-Chief, General Allenby, I took a long and hazardous journey into the desert. You could not go to Transjordan as comfortably and quickly as you can do now. I had to go through the desert. I almost went the same way as my ancestors did four thousand years ago, and finally got myself in to Transjordan in order to meet the man who was then standing on the right

flank of the Arab armies in Transjordan, at the head of a group of, I think, about three thousand Arabs helping in the fight.

I entered into conversation; I explained to him exactly what we wanted to do, what we would like to do, how we could help him if he wanted us to, and I would like his support if he could give it. This conversation led to many more. I refer to Emir Feisal, afterwards King Feisal of Iraq. This condensed into friendship which lasted the rest of, unfortunately, the short life of King Feisal. Parenthetically, I might add that since then I visited Transjordan many times and Transjordan sheikhs visited us in Palestine.) These sheikhs were astonished to see the development in Palestine, and naively suggested that if I would go to Transjordan I could probably do the same thing there. Well, I said, there were just a few obstacles in the way. We had better not talk about it much. But there was not a trace of unfriendliness in them.

There is a gentleman for example in Syria, who is very loud today in his protestations against Zionism and Zionist activities. I think he is the Prime Minister of Syria. His name is Jamal Mardam. Now this gentleman, Jamal Mardam, is an old acquaintance of mine. I am sure I am embarrassing him by saying that. He is probably the type of gentleman who would say we were friends but would not salute me in Piccadilly. He would not like to point out publicly that he knew me. But Jamal Mardam at that time—it must have been during the first premiership of Mr. Leon Blum—I have not the exact day in my head, but it was comparatively recently—wanted a treaty between Syria and France, and he appealed to me for help. I gave that help. I did my level best. If the treaty was broken later, I do not think, with your permission, I should be held responsible.

That is one example. There are many more. I do not want to bore you or to burden you with enumerations, but there was never a year when an attempt was not made to come to some understanding with the Arabs. It is the fault and the responsibility of one small group of men, headed by the Mufti or Grand Mufti. He bears a heavy responsibility in that he never allowed the situation to come to a head.

Even now—you have been able to ascertain that yourself—in many domains of economic activity, like the Citrus Board, the Dead Sea concession and many other activity, Jews and Arabs are trying and striving to work together, as in some of the municipalities. Haifa is an excellent example of a mixed municipality of great commercial importance, the most important town in Palestine. Here the two elements seem to be working in harmony, until some devil will step between them and break it up. So far the devil has not succeeded, but devils are active in Palestine quite often.

These attempts to bring about friendship have never stopped and will not stop until we begin to understand each other. One of the most important prerequisites for such friendship is to

establish a definite, clear and equal status between the Jews and the Arabs.

CHAIRMAN: Do you wish for a rest?

Mr. WEIZMANN: If I could have five minutes, I would be very glad.

CHAIRMAN: I suspend the hearing for ten minutes. I ask the public not to go out, as you may have difficulty in re-entering when we start in ten minutes time.

*(The meeting was suspended for ten minutes).*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I mentioned the treaty of friendship with the then Emir Feisal, subsequently King Feisal of Iraq. I should have explained a little more by saying that we drew up a treaty of friendship. This record of the treaty is part of the general record of the Peace Treaty of that time, and no doubt among the documents which are before you you will find a copy of this treaty. A postscript was also included in this treaty. This postscript relates to a reservation by King Feisal that he would carry out all the promises in this treaty if and when he would obtain his demands, namely, independence for the Arab countries. I submit that these requirements of King Feisal have at present been realized. The Arab countries are all independent, and therefore the condition on which depended the fulfillment of this treaty, has come into effect. Therefore, this treaty, to all intents and purposes, should today be a valid document.

I would also like to remark that this treaty was drawn up with the help of the late T. E. Lawrence, certainly one of the best friends of the Arabs, also a man not unfriendly to our aspirations.

I now turn to another subject which apparently is, or was, invoked since the appearance of the White Paper. The White Paper is justified by some people on the ground that the National Home is already built up; it is a finished product. Therefore, there is no necessity of going on much further with the work.

I contend that that is a meaningless assertion, wrong in theory, wrong in fact. The National Home as it stands today, even in its limited form, battling against great difficulties, is a living organism. A living organism is never finished. It only finishes when it dies. Even old countries, like England, or Belgium or France, are not finished. They go on. They develop. They evolve. Something new may happen in this country that may give a different turn in its history—I hope a favourable turn. But to speak of a country that is finished means to doom it to death. Is that the intention of the White Paper and the interpreters of it? Then we shall resist it with all our might. We protest against it with all our strength.

Another affirmation, or dictum, which has been born recently out of the White Paper atmosphere is the benevolent advice which is given to us sometimes: why should the Jews not devote their intelligence and their experience to helping build up Europe, specifically

to build up Germany. We have heard this advice given to us by distinguished British statesmen who play a great part today in the concert of European affairs. With all respect to these statesmen and to the opinions they may have about British affairs, I must tell them they do not begin to understand the reaction of the Jews to such a suggestion. We are tired. We are tired of building up Germany and other countries in order that they should destroy us again. We have had this experience for a good few hundred years, and if the gentlemen who offer us this very benevolent advice do not know it, they only have to open any text book of Jewish history. Life would not be worth living on this earth if we accepted advice of this kind.

I have warned the various Commissions before whom I have had the honour to speak. I hope I will not have to do it again, not that I do not appreciate sufficiently this honour, but I hope it will not be necessary. I told them in 1936: there are in this part of the world—meaning Central Europe, Germany, and other countries—people who are pent up without being able to move; the world for them is divided into two parts, the countries where they cannot live and the countries they cannot enter and they are doomed. This sombre prophecy of 1936 came true in 1942. Therefore, in the face of this terrible fact, to advise us to turn again to live among the hatreds of the present and the tombstones of the past is asking too much from flesh and blood. Only recently there has been a conspiracy discovered in France which aimed at the overthrow of the French Republic, probably by the French Nazis. One of the projects which was discovered was a detailed programme of how to exterminate the French Jews on the pattern of Hitler and his Nazis.

It is, therefore, for us no more a question of refugees alone. It is very important to save refugees. It is very important, as I pointed out, to save every Jewish soul we can, particularly now, when every Jew alive is a precious possession to us. But there are higher things at stake, and that is the survival of the Jews as a people, and this can be achieved only through independence in a Jewish State in this country—in part of this country.

There is another assertion: that the Mandate is unworkable. In fact, some people went so far as to say the Mandate was unworkable *ab initio*. One might be tempted to ask, if you know that the Mandate was unworkable *ab initio*, why have a Mandate at all? But that is *post factum* wisdom, which is always somewhat dangerous. I contend that the Mandate was not unworkable; it was rendered unworkable. It was rendered unworkable because a great many people who were in charge of working the Mandate had no faith in this policy, had perhaps little sympathy with it, and therefore exaggerated the difficulties which were inherent in this policy. I would be the last man to deny that this policy has not had, and has, many difficulties. If anybody knows the difficulties, it is we, because we have experienced it on our

skin, on our body, on our soul. But difficulties are there in order to be overcome. If you throw off the burden at the appearance of the first difficulty, naturally every instrument which is merely a product of the human brain, full of faults and difficulties, will become unworkable. Besides, this Mandate was tested and reported upon to the Mandates Commission. This Mandates Commission, I venture to submit, consisted of gentlemen not only of high integrity, but also of high wisdom and experience. It contained also a distinguished Britisher, for example, a man of the calibre of Lord Lugard, a great administrator who made a mark in his life in the administration of the African dependencies of the British Empire. I have never heard, and I have never seen in the records of the Permanent Mandates Commission any statement to the effect that the Mandate is not workable. They pointed out the difficulties; they pointed out the methods of surmounting the difficulties, but nobody ever referred to the Mandate as unworkable in principle. It has become unworkable since the appearance of the White Paper of 1939.

Perhaps it will interest you if I read to you a letter written by a soldier who was Military Administrator in Palestine in the early stages. His name is General Louis Bols. He was supposed to have been not particularly friendly to us. I do not know on what this reputation is based, but his letter speaks for itself. In fact, it is a letter to General Allenby, who was his Chief and who was then in London. I was going to London and he asked me to carry the letter to General Allenby. I did not know its content then but I know it now:

"The country is in need of development quickly in order to make the people content. At present we are suffering from being forced to make the budget balance. The moment the Mandate is given we should be ready to produce a big loan, part of which should be subscribed by inhabitants. I want Sir Herbert Samuel here for advice on this matter, and I want a much bigger financial adviser than you have been able to send us as yet. With such a loan, say 10 to 20 millions, I feel certain I can develop the country quickly and make it pay and gradually the population should increase from the present 900,000 to two and a half million. There is plenty of room for this. The Jordan Valley should hold a million instead of its present 1,000. But we must have water. The northern and eastern frontiers must be arranged to ensure control of the Litani and the Jordan. These matters are of no use to our northern and eastern neighbors and they are essential to us."

This was the opinion of a soldier at a time when Palestine was more or less a desert. One of the reasons why the Mandate seemed unworkable was that the policy, in the execution of the Mandate, was never a firm one; it was always vacillating. Whenever the Arabs made a fuss or a little pogrom the Mandatory Power

retreated and the Arabs learned that violence pays.

I now turn to the problem of the solution. But before doing so I should like to quote two opinions which were held at the time of the issuance of the Balfour Declaration by His Majesty's Government. One is expressed in a telegram which the British Ambassador in Petrograd—then Petersburg—received from the Foreign Office. This telegram reads:

"The British Government has issued an official declaration regarding the re-establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine." Note the word "re-establishment."

Then a quotation which comes from Mr. Lloyd George's history quoting an opinion expressed by Mr. Balfour in the Cabinet previous to the publication of the Balfour Declaration:

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

The same opinion was expressed by Mr. Churchill before the Royal Commission. So, in my humble opinion, there is no doubt that what the British Government had in mind was that, through effort and in time, there would evolve a Jewish State in Palestine. At that time Palestine meant not only Western Palestine, but also Palestine and Transjordan. Transjordan appeared on the historical stage only in 1922 or 1923. These quotations refer to the years 1917 and 1918. What is, therefore, the solution of the thorny problem which you gentlemen are called upon to adumbrate? It may appear to you somewhat daring if I make a tentative proposal, but my experience and my contribution to the building of Palestine emboldens me to speak on the subject. There is no question about it that when Palestine was promised, when the Declaration was given, when the Mandate was written—and I should like to say that the Mandate was written not only when Mr. Balfour was Foreign Secretary, it was completed in its present form under Lord Curzon, and I am quoting Lord Curzon because Mr. Balfour might be considered as biased in favour of the policy in which he is the main author. By no stretch of the imagination could Lord Curzon be accused of any bias in that direction. Still, at that time by "Palestine" was understood "Palestine and Transjordan." Then Transjordan was cut off. As you know, the size of Transjordan is much greater than that of Palestine—more than three times. It was cut off, so to speak, at a moment's notice. And here is a sort of irony. First you amputate Palestine. You cut off a country which is three or four or five times the size of Palestine, and then you turn round on poor Zionists and tell them, you are a small country; you cannot bring any population there; you must displace others, and we cannot allow that, and so on. I do not think it is cricket. I do not think it is fair play. Either you do not cut it off, or if you have done it

you cannot throw it in our face that we are trying to bring a population into a small country. In fact, what we have been trying to do since that time is, by ingenuity and scientific development, to increase the size of the country, and as you cannot increase it materially, or geographically, we have tried to increase it in such a way that we are trying to make two blades of grass grow where one blade has grown before; in fact, to make four tomatoes grow where one has been growing before, by intensifying—sometimes over-intensifying and utilizing every little knot and every nook and cranny in Palestine and making it produce human sustenance. That has been our business since Palestine has been amputated. But it has been done, and I am not harking back to it, and I even realize that today in order to have peace in this country, stability in the Middle East—and the Middle East is important not only for Jews and Arabs, but also for the whole of the civilized world—we have great responsibility not to disturb the peace in this part of the world.

Knowing all that, we are—I think I am speaking the mind of a great many Jews, after a great deal of hardship, after a great deal of testing, after a great deal of evaluating the possibility of what we can do, for a form of partition which would satisfy the just demands of both the Jews and the Arabs. We realize that we cannot have the whole of Palestine. God made a promise; Palestine to the Jews. It is up to the Almighty to keep His promise in His own time. Our business is to do what we can in a very imperfect human way. I do not like to play on the sentiment of the distinguished Indian representative who sits here. I should say partition is *à la mode*. It is not only in small Palestine; it is in big India. But at least there you have something to partition. Here we have to do it with a microscope. There you can do it with a big knife.)

What are the advantages of partition? It has, in my opinion, two great advantages. It is final and it helps to dispel some of the fears of our Arab friends. I am not saying that you would dispel easily all fears. Fear is not a matter of logic. It is a matter of emotion, and emotional reaction cannot be dispelled by logical performance. But at any rate we can do all we can in order to help in future to mitigate their fear. If it is final the Arabs will know and the Jews will know that they cannot encroach upon each other's domain. To us it means something else. It means equality of status with our Arab neighbours: the most important requisite for good relations between us and them. As long as they consider us inferior in political status they will not be anxious to make peace with us. Therefore, it is a desirable solution, although it represents, as I have already pointed out, a new and great sacrifice on the part of the Jewish people. It cannot be whittled down, it cannot be bargained down, and the part of Palestine which would remain after partition must be something in which Jews could live and into which we could bring a million and a

half people in a comparatively short time. It must not be a place for graves only, or graveyards, or, as you sometimes see on very full trams, "standing room only." Therefore I have a plea to make to this distinguished Committee. I respectfully pray that you will come to a decision of this kind, and above all see that this decision is carried out—and, carried out quickly.

Perhaps at this stage I might read to you a letter which I received only two days ago from one of the two survivors of the authors of the Balfour Declaration: it is a letter from General Smuts. He writes as follows:

"My dear Doctor,

". . . . . I can imagine your anguish in a world which was so full of hope, and today has nothing but despair to show for itself.

"We cannot undo the past, and can only try to find a better way to the future. As I told you in London last year I see now, at this sad stage, no escape except by way of Partition. I was long for an undivided Palestine, but after all these failures and missed opportunities I see no other way out of the present impasse. Only yesterday, speaking in our Parliament, I expressed myself publicly in favour of this solution—if solution it is. Palestine never was undivided in the great past, and perhaps a fair share of it for Jewry may once more be the nucleus of a National Home and a Holy Land. Now that a United Nations Organization Commission has been appointed to assemble the facts and search for recommendations, my expression of opinion, as one of the original authors of the Balfour Declaration, may carry some weight with the Commission. At any rate it is something concrete and definite, and not another and further postponement of a decision which can brook no further delay.

"It must be a heartbreaking misery for you to live amid all that scene of frustration and suffering—of lawlessness and counter-lawlessness. You who have laboured so hard and so long to enter upon the Promise. . . . .

"I blame no one, I praise no one. I only pray that the Great Mercy will once more come, and wash out even the memory of these years. . . . .

"Ever your affectionately

Jan Smuts"

I have almost finished what I wanted to say. However, before finishing this chapter of the solution I would like to emphasize once more with all the strength at my disposal that one of the foremost prerequisites for the solution and for the establishment of an atmosphere in which a solution can be found is to wash out the White Paper—to scrap it—to throw it unto the heap where it belongs. I do not know a single document which is responsible for so much trouble and so much evil as is the White Paper.

One would be tempted now to go into de-

tails on the side of the partitioned area, if one speaks of partition. I shall not burden you with details. If I am given the opportunity of answering questions, I may go into a little more detail. The area must be sufficiently adequate to absorb something in the nature of a million and a half people in addition to the present population. That is the size of the problem which is urgent at present. It must be an area which can be worked. And, I believe, speaking in general terms, if you will take a somewhat improved Peel Line (I understand that all of you have had before you the Peel Report and the "Line" which the Peel Commission offered as a basis for a Jewish State.) I say, advisedly, a somewhat improved Peel Line. This Peel Line was not fixed by the Peel Commission. It was simply an indication as to how their minds ran. They were prepared to discuss improvements, alterations, and modifications. If to this Peel area is added the area of what is usually called the Negeb which I think you have visited and which in its greater part is a desert, a desert which I daresay will never be worked except by us because for us it is again a struggle of life and death to open up this area—then I think you will have created a part of Palestine which may in the future, with God's help, become a land flowing with milk and honey and give nourishment and sustenance to a sorely tried people—the Jewish people. Further, I would like to add, in my opinion, that it will also help the future development of the Arab population. I may be asked—I cannot foresee all the questions—I may be asked: "will it be troublesome? Will it produce friction and trouble?" It would be foolish on my part if I were to say, "Oh, no, it will go off quite smoothly." Nothing goes smoothly. And, nothing worth doing is done without trouble. But I do believe that a great many thoughtful Arabs if they feel that this project is set into motion with all the authority, dignity and force, (I do not mean military or physical force: I mean moral force) which the United Nations command, I think the Arabs will eventually acquiesce. Probably the Mufti will not acquiesce, and some other extremists on our side may not acquiesce, but I do not think that will present an unsurmountable difficulty. Therefore, the prerequisite is to sweep away the White Paper and give us a chance to bring in a considerable population. I named a figure of a million and a half. Give us a chance of developing the derelict part of Palestine which is today the Negeb. And do it, I pray with the utmost possible respect, quickly. Do not let it drag on. Do not prolong our agony. It has lasted long enough and has caused a great deal of blood and sorrow on many sides.

I am almost at the end of my statement. I have spoken of Great Britain, of its management of the Mandate, and of the subsequent policy of 1939. I would like to say publicly that I have spoken more in sorrow than in anger. I am still convinced that the normal and good relations of Great Britain, who has been consistently a friend of the Jews and even a friend of Zionism for the past three hundred years,

long before the Balfour Declaration was made, may be restored to its old glory and that we may look upon this episode as something which was of a transitory nature. I have spoken of our own work. I submit with a certain amount of pride, but not boastfully, that, if we are given a chance, we can make our contribution. And you, gentlemen, and those who have empowered you to enquire into the facts have it in your power to put the keys of co-operation into our hands—co-operation with the Arabs, co-operation with the other people in this country, and make our contribution to the revival and rejuvenation of the East. God has chosen the small countries as a vessel through which he sends his best messages to the world, and it is perhaps not too much to think that once strife is at an end and peace and the work of construction begins, and the old wanderer comes back to his old inheritance—perhaps once more a message of peace will come out of this country to a world which stands sorely in need of such a message.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Weizmann. Will you allow us now to put some questions to you?

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: First, there are some questions which were put yesterday to Mr. Ben Gurion which I should like to put to you. The first set of questions concerns the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate. Is there, in your opinion, in those documents anything in express words or by implication which indicates any reservation in the undertaking? First, I refer to the rights and the position of other sections of the population. Will you please answer this question?

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes, it is in the Balfour Declaration. It is not merely implied. It is explicit in the Balfour Declaration that the British Government views with favour the establishment of a National Home for the Jews and then goes on to make the provision that the rights and the position of the other parts of the population—I forget the exact wording—will be safeguarded.

CHAIRMAN: Would that, in your opinion, under certain circumstances make the Mandate unworkable? Do you think that it came to a stage where the rights and position of the other sections of the population were so prejudiced that it made the Mandate unworkable?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I do not think so, sir, because of the following reason. It may be so interpreted by people who wish to put into it such interpretations, but what has happened is that under the dispensation of the Mandate the Arab position, if you speak of the economic, material, and monetary position, has not become worse but better. To that everyone will agree. Politically the Arabs have never had a position in Palestine. They had a position in Baghdad, Beirut, and in Mecca. There was the home of the political aspirations of the Arabs, not Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: Would the Mandatory have the obligation to carry out the undertaking in the Mandate regardless of the resistance it met?

Mr. WEIZMANN: No, I admit that you are



asking a very intricate question. It is very difficult for me to say what the Mandatory would think at a given moment. What I do think is that the Mandatory should have proceeded with firmness and determination from the very beginning: then it would not have had to use force. I tried to indicate to you that the Arabs were quite friendly when they saw us coming into Palestine. The moment they saw the vacillation, uncertainty, then they began to utilize this position and certainly make the position of the Mandatory difficult. So much so that the Mandatory could say, "Look here, gentlemen, I am very sorry. I did not bargain for this and I cannot do it." My intention, if the Mandatory would say that it is so (and I do not say that it does say so) but if it says so now, then it is the duty of the Mandatory to produce an alternative solution.

CHAIRMAN: Now I would like to ask you a question with regard to the agreement you made with Emir Feisal. In that document was inserted the condition that the undertaking of Emir Feisal would be void if the promises given to the Arabs were not carried out. Emir Feisal and the Arabs have contended that by later events the undertakings were not carried out. I suppose it referred then to the events which took place in Syria; was that not so?

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes, the promises were not carried out at the time. He was expelled from Syria, he had to go to Iraq. What I contend now is that the Arabs have obtained all the independence they had been claiming under Feisal.

CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask you the question whether Emir Feisal, after he had been driven out from Damascus, was entitled to consider the agreement made with you as void?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I think he was. I think he was, and this agreement was never pressed.

CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask you a question, which is perhaps a legal question, and that is whether the agreement can be revived by further accomplishment of the condition he had put?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I really believe, sir, that it can be revived under new authority, under new conditions; since then much has changed.

CHAIRMAN: I have still another question regarding the solution. You touched upon the possibility of a compromise, and in your suggestions you referred to partition. I should like to ask if you have heard of any scheme which is not a definite partition, but is a dividing up of the country into different parts and keeping it together in a kind of federal State: have you heard such a scheme discussed?

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes. There are all sorts of conditions and conclusions that have been passing through one's head all these years, and if I, personally, came to the conclusion that partition is the best, I did so by a process of elimination. I know that one speaks of a bi-national state; of a sort of federal solution; of what is usually called the Morrison Plan. I do not think that they have advantages of partition which is final,

definite, and crystallized. Anything that will leave an uncertainty will leave room for pulling by the two forces. The Jews will want to get something better. The Arabs will want to push us out of what we have. Therefore, I believe although partition means a sort of Solomon's judgment, it is under the circumstances perhaps the better.

CHAIRMAN: What is, in your opinion, the main objection to such a scheme as a federal state? Do you object to the vagueness of it, or do you believe that it is not possible for Jews and Arabs to work together in political matters?

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes, I think the Jews and Arabs would probably work together, but a federal State would mean again in another form a third party. There may be a sort of federalization on a great many points. There are a great many interests in common: railways, customs, means of communication. All these things really lead eventually to economic co-operation in a great many domains. But it would be better to be separated politically and leave it to the gradual processes of evolution to unite economically.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Dr. Weizmann, I may tell you India stands for love and peace, and when I am putting these questions to you I am only putting them with the intention that love and peace may be promoted in this country. You have referred to the unfortunate partition in India itself. I hope you have read Mr. Gandhi's statement which came out this very morning in the papers. It is that very thing which I am trying to avoid, if possible, because I fear it may lead to further friction. (A line of partition, a line of demarcation, is not a permanent thing. If the Arabs have more force they will try to rush in and break in that line of demarcation. If the Jews have more force, they may do so. Would that be a permanent solution which would promote love and peace in the country?)

Mr. WEIZMANN: I think it would, eventually. I am not so foolish as to think that if you proclaim partition on all these passions to which you refer will die out. I agree there will be certain Jews who will try to rush in, and certain Arabs who will try to rush in. But, on the whole, if you, with the authority of the United Nations, proclaim this the solution and make this appeal to the Jews and Arabs and say, "gentlemen, you must not break it: it is a sacred covenant," you will find that on the whole it will prevail. I do not want to be a prophet. I told some of your colleagues before that it is very difficult to be a prophet in Palestine. The competition is too great here. I do say that your business is to create a maximum of conditions under which the eventuality of a violated solution will be impossible and time will work its way out. After all, what has happened in India is also the end of a long road of suffering, and may God grant you that it should be the end.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I hope it is the end.

Mr. WEIZMANN: But no human being can guarantee that it is the end. I read every day

that somebody is killed here or there. Of course, it is but a drop in the ocean in India. But for us a drop of blood goes a long way. It takes time. Give us time. Give us benevolence. Give us the possibility of turning around and of making friends in the surrounding Arab countries, and I think in time it will be all right. Nobody could guarantee that it is enough to proclaim a solution and that it will go right on without any trouble.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Dr. Weizmann, I am very sorry to see that even the Jews have started certain rules of discrimination which have probably led to this trouble which exists now. I need not go into the details with you. You know them, and I know them.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Perhaps you will specify?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Take for instance the Zionist congress in regard to non-Jewish labour, and things of that kind. They rancour. They produce a kind of hatred. It may have been very good for a community, but from the point of view of country it was probably a very unwise thing to do. I refer to things like that which create dissension and hatred in the minds of people. That kind of discrimination of which Mr. Ben Gurion has been complaining has really come from your side of this country.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Well, I know to what you refer, and I would like to answer it in the following way. There are three sectors in this country. There is an Arab sector, there is a Jewish sector and in between stands the British sector. They are all employers of labour. Now, in the Jewish sector we employ a great many Arabs. In the Arab sector no Jew is being employed. In the British sector there is considerable employment of Jews, but perhaps not as much as we think we are entitled to. Now, what are we doing? We come into this country and try to bring in men. We are told you can bring in "A" and "B" only if you find work for them. In order to find work for them, employment for them, we must spend some money on development. This money is collected from the pennies mostly of poor Jews. Now it is different. But ten years ago the poor Jews gave the money. The rich Jews thought it was better to give money for a hospital in Berlin, or for a dental school in Berlin, and not for something in Palestine. Therefore the obvious contention is to say that all the money which is given for the employment of the Jews and for the bringing in of the Jews should be employed by Jews. I submit to you that once the Arabs begin to employ Jews, the Jewish rule too will be relaxed. I cannot promise it for all the others, but if I were in command, I would try to do it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I know you would.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I realize there is a great deal in what you say. But you ought to realize, and at the same time, that we have been so much discriminated against, so often throughout our

history, that for once we have a chance not to discriminate against Arabs. After all, we do employ masses of Arabs. If you would come to the place where I live, you would see it, or if you would go to Palestine Potash.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Palestine Potash and Kadimah are the only two things that I know employ Arabs.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Come to the orange belt.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): There are very few institutions, two or three at the most.

Mr. WEIZMANN: But they employ masses of Arabs. You cannot point to a single institution which employs Jews among the Arabs, except possibly a doctor. When an Arab is very, very sick and he must be operated on, and he cannot be operated on by any doctor but a Jew, he will try to get a Jew. Then he is glad, for the operation is usually successful.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am very sorry to trouble you.

Mr. WEIZMANN: No, you do not trouble me. I am here for that. I would only like to tell you, sir, with all respect, that it is much easier to ask questions than to give answers. But I am doing my best.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I know. Unfortunately, I have been asking questions all my life and getting the answers.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I am doing my best.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Well, in any case, (since you were really responsible, or at least one of the gentlemen who was responsible for the Balfour Declaration, I could get better information from you than from anyone else just now. A number of drafts of these declarations came into existence before this one came out, is that correct?

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And some of them were considered by the Zionist Congress?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I would like to correct you, sir.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): By its Political Committee?

Mr. WEIZMANN: There was no Congress at that time.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The Zionist Political Committee?

Mr. WEIZMANN: There was a Zionist group which helped. We all co-operated. Of course, all the drafts were considered by them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have you, by any chance, those drafts printed in Jeffries' book? <sup>1</sup>

Mr. WEIZMANN: No. I have seen Jeffries' book, but my eyes are sufficiently weak so as not to read all of Jeffries. I have read some of it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I just wanted to know if you had seen them.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I know exactly what you want to know.

<sup>1</sup> J. M. N. Jeffries: Palestine the Reality (1939).

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are those drafts, as printed there, more or less correctly printed? That is all I was trying to find out.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I know that there is one draft. I do not know whether it is printed in Jeffries. There was one draft which was submitted to Mr. Balfour and to Lloyd George, which said that His Majesty's Government favours the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish National Home. Is that all you want to know?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. WEIZMANN: There was not much of this qualifying sentence to which you refer. But if you want me to complete the history, I will do so, if I may trouble you for a moment. This draft was given in by me. I brought it to Mr. Balfour. He initialled it. In fact, somewhere among my archives, which I had sent to Canada during the war, there is still this original draft which was given to Lloyd George. He initialled it, and here the matter ended. I was away from London at that time. Then suddenly, there appeared a letter in the "The Times" signed by twelve what you would call important Jews. They were important mostly to non-Jews: they were not so terribly important to us. But they were important by weight of their position in the non-Jewish world, by the weight of their bank account and various other qualities. They published, as you probably know, the famous letter in "The Times," disassociating themselves from all Zionist activity, saying that it would harm Jews—meaning it would harm them. The Government was perplexed. The British Government did not want to perform an act against the will of the Jews. At that time, it had not tested the weight and the value of these particular interests. I have nothing against them personally, but I think their public performance was at that time too highly assessed by the British Government. Of course, they were people who had a very high social standing and occupied a high position in the British world. They were the British Government's Jews; they were not my Jews.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): One of them was Mr. Montague.

Mr. WEIZMANN: No, Mr. Montague was not sitting there. Mr. Montague was inside the fortress. He was a Cabinet Minister and he had every opportunity to sabotage the Balfour Declaration, and he did his best. So, as you realize, the fight was not a very equal one. On the one side, these Jewish grand dukes, so to speak, with all their weight in London; on the other side, I represented the poor Jews. We were submerged, we were not vocal: those who left the ghettos of Poland and Russia could not speak English, even if you tried to make them. It was a very unequal fight. And it speaks enormously for the intuition of Great Britain that they have chosen my Jews and not theirs. I am trying to put it very bluntly.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You were reported to have said in "The Times" of 1 March

1918 that "We do not aspire to found a Zionist State. What we want is a country in which all nations and all creeds shall have equal rights and equal tolerance."

Mr. WEIZMANN: I may have said that; I do not know. I have forgotten it. You must never quote a public man's speeches which have been made twenty-five years ago, because in those twenty-five years a great deal has changed.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I only quote them because you have quoted what happened twenty-five years ago. It is only relevant in that connexion.

Mr. WEIZMANN: That is quite right. We did not want to speak of a State then. We spoke of a National Home. But the characteristic of the thing, whether it is a National Home or whether it is a State, remains the same. We think that in the Jewish State all peoples will live in amity and freedom.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was Palestine included in the Feisal agreement?

Mr. WEIZMANN: No, definitely not.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): So, the immigration in Palestine was included but the liberty of people living in Palestine was not included?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I do not quite get it. It was not included in the sense that it was not considered by Feisal as an Arab country, as a country on which he had a claim.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): He had no claim at that time to any country.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Oh, yes. He laid claim to Arab countries. He was ready to exclude Palestine from that claim.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): But there is no mention of the exclusion of Palestine in the agreement?

Mr. WEIZMANN: No, but if he allowed immigration into Palestine—that we should conduct it and we should support it and develop it—it means that he lays no claim to Palestine as an Arab country.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is all.

Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala): I should like to go back to the question of the solution. I think in one of your answers you did not stress enough the only advantage that partition might have, and that would be independence right away. This is the only advantage, as stated before. But nevertheless, I think you disposed a bit lightly of the question of a federal State. I see a few advantages in federal States. The first one would be a way of disposing of minorities. Then, that the economic integrity of the country would be kept intact. Furthermore, you are aware that a certain part of the Jewish population oppose partition. Some of them, because they want more, others because they believe that there is a possibility of collaboration with the Arabs. Now, I should like to refer to your answer given before to the Chairman, and I should like to have you make more clear the real disadvantages of a federal State that might be created, that would be governed by a council

appointed by the United Nations and parts of it appointed by the proper States, with each State to legislate for itself and, of course, trying to give to the Jewish people all the territories that now are not populated or are under-populated. I should like you to give consideration to this question and to give me an answer.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Would you mind, sir, if I defer my answer for a few hours. I am prepared to come again and give an answer. I am not prepared to answer on the spot.

Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Very well.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I thank you very much for the question. It will open certain horizons for me.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I have just one question. I would like to know whether Dr. Weizmann remembers at what time he heard for the first time of the Hogarth Message.

Mr. WEIZMANN: I met Professor Hogarth in Palestine when I first came in 1918. I came out first to Egypt and then to Palestine. I met Professor Hogarth there and I had the opportunity of discussing this whole policy with him. I knew that Hogarth had a mission with the Arabs, but I did not know what it was. I was not told what it was.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): You heard what this mission was. You heard it also when these letters were published in 1939, I think, for the first time?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I read about Hogarth only when it was published, but I did not know at the time what he was about in Palestine.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): That was in 1939, you think, that his letters were published for the first time?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I read them only when they were published, although I had met Hogarth long before. I did not know what his activities were. I knew he was working among the Arabs. I do not know that he was particularly enchanted with the Balfour Declaration policy. I cannot say that. He was rather reserved about it.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): What I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is whether Dr. Weizmann, when he saw these Hogarth letters printed for the first time, whether he thought they were in contradiction to the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Well, I cannot answer for the contradictory messages which the British Government sent to various people during the war. Perhaps there is an element of contradiction. I do not know. It is not a contradiction which we have introduced. I am grateful that you are giving me the opportunity of making this statement in response to your question. I do not want to evade this question: I cannot answer it. It is not within my province. It is quite possible that there have been cases, not only in the British Government but in many other governments, particularly during the war, where one department does not know what another department is doing. It has happened before. It happens even in the Zionist Organiza-

tion, which is not a government yet. But we have seen that divergence many a time. What I do know is this: whatever Hogarth's message was, if it did contain any contradiction, we were informed about it. We were given a Declaration and told that it was for us to make good. We were told to proceed with the Mandate. The Mandate laid down, as you know, all the ways and means of putting into effect this Declaration. We took it *a la lettre*. On the strength of that, on what we were told repeatedly, we sunk our money, our energy, our men into this country, and we made out of this country what it is. Whether, *ab initio*, through Professor Hogarth's message, there was some contradiction, I do not know. That applies equally to all the contradictions in McMahon's letter, which you no doubt know.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I have one question. Have you read a letter from Marshal Smuts? Do you think that the opinion of Marshal Smuts on the whole question of Palestine and the Balfour Declaration is included in the letter you have just read?

Mr. WEIZMANN: I think it represents the opinion of Field Marshal Smuts.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): There are other opinions in Marshall Smuts' letter on the historical aspects of the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Yes. Well, I know something. I used to meet Marshal Smuts quite often. Marshal Smuts identified himself with the Balfour Declaration and with the meaning of the Balfour Declaration, as Mr. Balfour gave expression to it. Marshal Smuts thought that it would eventually lead to a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine. And as you see now, he considers the partition as what the French call a *pis-aller*, as the least of the evils.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Thank you, Dr. Weizmann.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN: Then I thank you, once more, Dr. Weizmann. I hope we have not tired you.

Mr. WEIZMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you gentlemen. You have been very kind and very generous to me.

(Dr. Weizmann then withdrew from the table.)

### Continuation of hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency

CHAIRMAN: We will now go on with the third point on the agenda: the hearing of the Jewish Agency. We will continue the questioning of Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Shertok by Sir Abdur Rahman.

(Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Shertok took seats at the table.)

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Mr. Ben Gurion, do you wish to make any comments on the following declarations or statements on behalf of the British Government: 1. General Allenby's declaration, soon after the Turks were defeated,

to the effect that he "reminded the Emir Feisal that the Allies were in honour bound to endeavour to reach a settlement in accordance with the wishes of the peoples concerned and urged him to place his trust wholeheartedly in their good faith"; 2. Commander Hogarth's statement to King Hussein in January 1918 to the effect that the British Government were determined that insofar as it was compatible with the freedom of the existing population, both economic and political, no obstacle should be put in the way of the return of the Jews to Palestine; 3. Bassett's letter dated 9 February 1918, to King Hussein, to the effect that His Majesty's Government has hitherto made it their policy to ensure the Arab's liberation and it remained the policy that they are determined unflinchingly to pursue by protecting such Arabs as already are liberated from all dangers and perils, and by assisting those who are still under the yoke of the tyrants to obtain their freedom; 4. the Anglo-French Declaration made on 7 November 1918 to the effect that the goal envisaged by France and Great Britain in prosecuting in the East the war was to secure the complete and final liberation of the people who have for so long been oppressed by the Turks and the setting up of national governments and administrations which should derive authority from the free exercise of the initiative and choice of the indigenous populations, and to further and assist in the setting up of indigenous Governments and administrations in Syria (from the Taurus range to the Egyptian frontier and Mesopotamia) which had already been liberated by the Allies, as well as in those territories which they were endeavouring to liberate, and to recognize them as soon as they were actually set up?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, sir.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you know anything about the Haycraft Commission which had been appointed to inquire into the Palestine disturbances of 1921?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, sir.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have you read their recommendations?

Mr. BEN GURION: I believe I read them at the time.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did the Arabs ever raise any objections to the Jews visiting Palestine or even to moderate immigration arising out of religious zeal before 1917?

Mr. BEN GURION: Before that they had nothing to say in Palestine. It was the Turks.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was Jewish immigration the cause of Arab riots and bloodshed in Palestine?

Mr. BEN GURION: There was Jewish immigration, and there were riots. Maybe one was the cause of the other. It is a fact that there were both. Maybe there were other causes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Could you give me any other cause?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, a very serious cause was the Axis powers who sent money and instruc-

tors to arrange for a terrorist campaign against Jews. This was one of the causes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When was this?

Mr. BEN GURION: 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): There were no riots before 1936?

Mr. BEN GURION: There were.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): What were they due to? What was the cause of them?

Mr. BEN GURION: There were many causes. This was one of the causes. One cause, for instance, was that in 1929 there was a false accusation made against us by some people that we attacked the Mosque of Omar, which was just as truthful as the accusation made against the Jews that they are drinking the blood of Christian children for ritual purposes. That was a very serious cause of disturbances in Damascus in 1940, where many Jews were murdered by the population for such an accusation. An accusation of that kind was made in 1929. This was the cause of serious riots when the entire Jewish community of Hebron, where there had been no immigration, was exterminated.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was the extent of immigration between 1931-1939 in Palestine to the extent of 218,000 while, in the whole of the United States of America, Brazil, Australia and the Argentine, an area two hundred times larger than Palestine, the immigration was only to the extent of 207,000?

Mr. BEN GURION: Those are facts, yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): What do you know about the Jewish State of Birobidjan?

Mr. BEN GURION: I have heard about it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): As a foreign State?

Mr. BEN GURION: I think it is an autonomy, but I really cannot give exact details.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have you had no chance to see this before?

Mr. BEN GURION: I think there are a number of things which you have seen and which I have not. No, I have not seen this.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am placing it before you. So you do not know whether it contains about thirty thousand square miles or only about one hundred thousand Jews?

Mr. BEN GURION: I know that Soviet Russia is such a vast country that it may contain such a large area as you say, but really, I cannot tell you.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you know if it is really a State?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, as far as I know it is not. It is an autonomy, and it is loyal to that autonomous condition. There is only a Jewish minority, as far as I know, but I do not know. I am not an expert on it, and I do not know why I must give this information.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I just wanted to know whether the official language of that place is Yiddish.

Mr. BEN GURION: So far as I know it is not. I think this is the only place in the world where the official language is Jewish.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Palestine is sacred to Christians, it is sacred to Moslems; therefore would you permit all the Moslems and all the Christians to come and settle down in Palestine on the same basis on which you want to settle down in Palestine?

Mr. BEN GURION: There is a difference. Of course it is sacred to Christians. You are a Moslem and you say it is sacred to Moslems. I take your word for it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You do not know about it?

Mr. BEN GURION: Your authority is sufficient for that purpose. But Jews are coming to Palestine because it is our country, it has been our homeland for 3,500 years. In addition to that it is sacred to them because it is the centre of their religion. I know that Rome is sacred to Christians, and no Christian will ask the right to possess Rome. There is nothing like that here. We are here on the basis of the fact that it is the country of our people; we were dispossessed by force and we did not give it up. We are coming back to our home.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I will come to that part a little later. I just wanted to know because you know that the Moslems used to turn to the holy area of Masjid Aqsa as their Kaaba until the Prophet ordered faces to be turned towards Mecca at the time of prayer.

Mr. BEN GURION: I am really afraid to contradict you, but the history which I know regarding Moslems is that at the beginning the Prophet of the Moslems called them to turn to Jerusalem and there were other things which he accepted in Jerusalem, but later on, when the Jews were living in Arabia, they refused to accept it, and many of them, especially Jews of the Medina died for it, because they refused to accept him as a prophet. He told his people to turn to Mecca, but so far as I know it has nothing to do with the reconstruction of Mecca.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That was the Kaaba in Mecca. . .

Mr. BEN GURION: This is a discussion which does not concern me as it is a religious matter.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I just wanted to know. How many synagogues were there in Palestine before 1939?

Mr. BEN GURION: I have not the information.

CHAIRMAN: I repeat my request to the public to keep silent.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did the President of the Tenth Zionist Congress, held in June 1931, make the following speech: "Only those suffering from gross ignorance or actuated by malice, could accuse us of the desire of establishing an independent Jewish kingdom. The people who allege this seem, so far as they are honest, to confuse Zionism with the Messianic belief. Our boundless love for Palestine owed its origin also to this belief, but it has never oc-

curred to us modern practical Zionists to introduce Messianic tendencies into our movement."

Mr. BEN GURION: Well, the President was here just now. I think you should have referred to him this question.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): No, I did not know that Dr. Weizmann was actually presiding at that congress.

Mr. BEN GURION: He was not the President of that congress. So far as I know, no such statement was made by the President who presided at the time.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was it made by anyone else?

Mr. BEN GURION: I do not know. You asked me if the President made such a statement. As far as I remember, the President at that congress made no such statement.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You cannot say whether anyone else made that statement? I am just trying to be clear in my mind about the question, but it may have been someone else.

Mr. BEN GURION: All kinds of persons made all kinds of statements, and I really cannot be requested to remember everyone of them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Apart from the Zionist's attempts, have any other Jews made attempts to gain political sovereignty in Palestine? Have any other persons made any attempt to create a sovereign State in Palestine?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, Jews throughout history—before the Crusades, during the Crusades—all the Jews were exterminated in Palestine. After that, in the time of the Turks, they made these attempts by going back to Palestine and trying to build it up, because they believed that by building up they were re-establishing, as they called it in their language, a Jewish kingdom. We do not now use the word kingdom, but what they meant was a State. There was a time when a kind of chapter was written by one of the Turkish soldiers, a high official in Turkey, on the movement to build a part of Palestine as a Jewish province.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How far is the southernmost Jewish colony in the Negev from the Egyptian frontier?

Mr. BEN GURION: I imagine it is some ten kilometres. I cannot give you the exact figure. I do not know, although I have travelled there. Perhaps twenty kilometres.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And are there any Jewish colonies near the Syrian frontier?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, there are.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How many and how far? Just give me the figures.

Mr. BEN GURION: There are many Jews on the frontier. There is one colony outside the frontier of Lebanon. There is a colony where the frontier is in the middle of the colony.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was any picketing ordinance passed legalizing picketing by the Jews of Arab labour in 1940 or thereabouts?



Mr. BEN GURION: No, there was picketing at many times, and there was a time when I had the privilege of taking part in it. Then Jews were excluded from work in Jewish colonies.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was the picketing ordinance passed?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, the picketing ordinance was passed.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was it sometime in 1940 or thereabouts?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, before that. To what ordinance do you refer?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The picketing ordinance.

Mr. BEN GURION: No, not picketing, not in 1940. It was long before that.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is it possible for you to imagine that any country in the world—Canada, Australia, the United States of America, South Africa or England—will permit Jewish immigration in unlimited numbers if they are exposed to the risk of being outnumbered?

Mr. BEN GURION: I do not feel any need to imagine such a thing. If you mean to ask why we want to come to Palestine, I have told you it is because we are coming back to our country. But I do not know why you want me to imagine such a thing could happen except in our country. Of course we do not imagine, we could not imagine, such a thing. On the contrary, I told you in my opening speech that we were offered space in another country, in Africa: we refused it on that account, because we did not consider it our country.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you imagine the friendship between the Jews and the Arabs will increase if unlimited immigration is permitted in Palestine?

Mr. BEN GURION: I imagine that when the Jews are re-established as an independent nation they will establish good relations between themselves and their neighbours. Without it, no. There will be trouble with the Arabs who think they could do with the Jews what the Europeans did with them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have the relations between Arabs and Jews been very strained since the Mandate?

Mr. BEN GURION: As I said, relations between individual Jews and individual Arabs were often very good in Turkish times, and they are very good now, but political relations between Arab communities and Jewish communities are not so good, and this is because they have been brought into opposition.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Who was in possession and occupation of Palestine as it is known today before the Israelites?

Mr. BEN GURION: There were a large number of people who came here; there are many names.

CHAIRMAN: Before whom?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Before the Israelites.

Mr. BEN GURION: The names are supplied in our Bible.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): All of them have died out?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, all of them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): All of them and their descendants have died out?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, they disappeared.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And the fellaheen who exist in Palestine today, are they descendants?

Mr. BEN GURION: I do not think so.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you know that Abraham had two wives—at least, two wives with whom we are concerned—Hagar and Sarah. Sarah was the first and Hagar was the second. Ishmael was the son of Hagar; Isaac was the son of Sarah. Is that correct?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Now it was predicted in the Bible—when I refer to the Bible I mean the Old Testament, I do not refer to the New Testament at all—it was predicted in the Old Testament that twelve tribes would spring from Israel.

Mr. BEN GURION: No, it is not true.

CHAIRMAN: Sir Abdur, will you please direct your questions this way?

Mr. BEN GURION: It is said in the Bible, with regard to these two children that to "Isaac and the seed of Isaac I will give this land."

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When did the Jews leave Palestine?

Mr. BEN GURION: They never left it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): They have always been here?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, except in the period of the Crusades, when all Jews were entirely exterminated.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When was that?

Mr. BEN GURION: You know it was the 10, 11 and 12 centuries.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How many Jews—did Titus deal very cruelly with the Jews?

Mr. BEN GURION: You can rely on the historical documents which are there. I mean that he was cruel. He destroyed the Temple, expelled their leaders, put them to death in circuses in Rome, sold them as slaves.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And that also was first century A. D.?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, but he did not expel all the Jews—130 years after that the Jews made war on the Romans, and 600,000 Jews, according to the Apostles, were killed by the Roman legions.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When was that?

Mr. BEN GURION: That was 130 A. D.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Coming now to more mundane matters, can you give me an idea as to how much of the budget is being spent—I do not want the actual figure, if you will only refer me to the Administration Report—I only wanted to have an idea from you how much in proportion to the whole income was being spent on public security?

Mr. BEN GURION: I will refer you to the Report, and I refer you to our witnesses, Mr. Horowitz and Mr. Bernstein.

CHAIRMAN: We will reserve questions on the economic matters for the hearing of Mr. Horowitz and Mr. Bernstein.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Now one thing more. I am giving you a list of the Arab villages which I am told were wiped out, and I ask you whether this is correct or not: Shatta, Afuleh, Jeidah, Tab'oon, Jinjar, Mejdal, Jisr al-Majme, Tel Adas, Jallood, Sasafeh, Tel Esh-Shamaam, Al-Hartiya, Sheikh Breik, Hrief, Defna, Khan ed-Duer, Madekhel, Khayyan al-Walid, Cofarta, Jadra, Kirdana, etc. Have these Arab villages been erased? Do they exist now as Arab villages?

Mr. BEN GURION: I am grateful to those who gave you this material, that you gave us the opportunity to speak about that. I want, not only yourself, but the whole Committee to know about it. One of our witnesses will tell you the whole story of it, and not merely in a way of "yes or no" as you require.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You give me the information later on.

Mr. BEN GURION: You will get the information later on, and I am very grateful that you raised the question.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): As statements were made by Jews that no Arabs had been displaced and by Arabs to the contrary, I wanted to verify it and to verify this.

Mr. BEN GURION: It is your job to do that.

CHAIRMAN: Will you please go on.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Now is it correct that, in spite of the restrictive measures, the Jews have been actually acquiring lands from the Arabs?

Mr. BEN GURION: Yes, in a restrictive way. It is correct, for the last few years since 1939.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Will you kindly give me all the figures on the division of lands acquired in breach of the regulations?

Mr. BEN GURION: I am sorry, we could not discuss them. It was not in breach of the regulations. It was in accordance with these regulations. You will get all these figures for all these years from 1939 until the present moment. It is a pity these regulations could not have been dropped; it was in accordance with the regulations.

CHAIRMAN: Have you more questions on the political issue?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Yes. Do you think that politically there is room in this country both for the Arabs and unlimited number of Jews?

Mr. BEN GURION: First of all, there is no such thing as unlimited number of Jews. There is a limited number of Jews.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Unlimited number of immigrants, then?

Mr. BEN GURION: They are limited. I believe—and I am convinced; it is not a matter of belief—

that for the last 40 years I have done nothing but study this problem because it is a matter of life and death for me and my people. I say it is a conviction, and not merely a belief, that there is room in this country for every inhabitant in Palestine who is here already, whether Jew, Christian, Armenian, Arab, Moslem or any other, and several millions of Jews to come in. I am not able to fix the exact number, because this depends on a number of factors, mostly on the degree of development, and the degree of authority to have such a development.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I hope you remember my question. I am not, talking economically, but politically.

Mr. BEN GURION: Then I do not understand quite what you mean. You ask me about room; that is, whether there is room, and that is an economic question, but if you ask me about it politically, then it is no question at all. Politically, for instance, I can imagine a vast territory where not a single Jew can enter, although there are millions of square miles of land. They are two different questions, and politics has nothing to do with room.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): As a matter of information, were exports of various commodities stopped from Palestine in 1920 or thereabouts?

CHAIRMAN: Is not that also in the economic domain?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): It was a question pertaining to economics, and I will leave it. I am leaving out all the economic questions.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions on the political issues?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): No.

CHAIRMAN: Then I think we shall have to adjourn and thank you very much.

Mr. BEN GURION: Everyone has finished with me?

CHAIRMAN: We will continue at a later hearing to question Mr. Horowitz and his colleagues.

Mr. BEN GURION: I mean that all the political side is finished?

CHAIRMAN: I might put some questions, and that is the same question that we put to Dr. Weizmann. What about a federal state? I do not imply by that we are specially interested in a federal State. We just want to explore the possibilities.

Mr. BEN GURION: I am ready to answer that now if you want. We will not consider any settlement which excludes complete independence and equality as a nation with Arabs in this country. If in any way a settlement is made where we are not in a nation, and which would deprive us of equality as a nation, we will have to be against it, because we consider two things as vital for our very existence and our human dignity, the belief that the Jew has self-respect as a people and as human beings, and these two vital issues are these: one, the right of the Jew who is unhappy, uncomfortable, oppressed,

discriminated against—or for any other reason cannot stay where he is and there is economically a place in Palestine for him—that he should have a right to come and settle here; and the second is that the Jewish people as a whole, in their own country, should have the same status as any free people in the world. If the world will abolish separate sovereignties, we will bless it, because if the human family were to be one, even then the world cannot abolish self-government—but whatever regime there will be in the world for any other free nation, we claim for our people—not less and not more. We will be against any discrimination against the Jewish people, but if you will ensure our independence and equality as a nation, which also includes Membership of the United Nations, for the welfare of those who are in the country and for the welfare of our neighbors, it will be necessary—we believe that it will be necessary—that the Jewish State, and I told you yesterday what we mean by Jewish State—a State where Jews are in the majority and are all equal—that such a State should co-operate with the neighbouring States. We are the first to welcome it, even if that co-operation will not limit itself merely to economic, social and cultural matters.

If our neighbours are willing to co-operate politically as a regional organization, we will welcome it, and ties will be created between these and the neighbouring States, as agreed upon between them freely, and as desired by the United Nations. This may be the main consideration, but the condition is we should be an equal partner and that we should have mutual interest which should be desired by the United Nations.

So an independent Jewish State does not exclude it being part of a larger Jewry, the co-operation either of sympathetic States or Middle East States or any other foreign States. It does not exclude. It is possible that what we need is this co-operation, essential for our really endless work.

CHAIRMAN: Do you give preference to a federal State or a partition scheme?

Mr. BEN GURION: We want to have a State of our own, and that State can be federate if the other State or States is or are willing to do so in the mutual interest, on condition that our State is in its own right a Member of the United Nations.

CHAIRMAN: One other question which has not been raised before. Do you think the Holy Places would require a special arrangement for Jerusalem?

Mr. BEN GURION: Absolutely. Not only in Jerusalem; all the Holy Places should be so safeguarded internationally that the religions who have a special interest in those Holy Places should have free and unfettered access to them and, as far as possible, the custody should be placed in their hands. I cannot go further because I know what trouble it may make among Christian communities, but this ought to be

left to a higher authority. But certainly there must be international guarantees for the freedom and sacredness of all the Holy Places in Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: Do you think trusteeship or something of that kind with regard to Jerusalem would be necessary?

Mr. BEN GURION: No, the question of the Holy Places is really a mixup. The Holy Places are only a few places in Jerusalem. They are not Jerusalem. They are in the Old City also because there are differences of views, but that is not a matter for here. But you should not identify the Holy Places in Jerusalem with any other city in Palestine. They are in certain places. There is a Holy Place in Bethlehem for the Christians. There is a Holy Place in Nazareth. There are Holy Places for Jews, Christians and Moslems in Jerusalem. Here in Jerusalem "Holy Places" means only a certain spot of Jerusalem, but Jerusalem itself is not a part of those Holy Places, and therefore for the safeguarding of those places you ought not to include Jerusalem as a whole, outside of the Holy Places.

Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR (Peru): I do not know whether the point I am going to raise has been raised already. I sincerely believe that the Jewish people wish to live peacefully with the Arab people and to co-operate with them for the common good, but the situation in Palestine does not seem to be leading that way. Both peoples seem to be leading separate lives. In a normal life there are towns like Tel-Aviv, for the Jewish, or Gaza, or Hebron, which are only Arab in population. All of these are either wholly Jewish or wholly Arab. The schools too are separate. There is a school for Jewish children and a school for Arab children. There are separate technical schools for both of them, and even the University is practically a Jewish University. In industry, Jewish industry employs Jewish labour, and Arab industry employs Arab labour. Even the trade unions are separate. Do you not think that this physical and spiritual separation is making more and more difficult co-operation in the future, the co-operation that you want and that everybody wants?

Mr. BEN GURION: I think what you mentioned is a fact, and a very important fact, in the life of this country—that there is a separation or, I might say, a distinctness in economic life, in habitation, in culture, in schools, as you enumerated. It is true. But I do not think this precludes future co-operation between Jews and Arabs, just as I do not believe that because England and France have a distinct economy, language and tradition, they cannot co-operate. And although they quarreled, for many centuries they regarded each other as their main enemy, since, I believe, 1940 there has been a very strong and growing co-operation between these two countries. So the fact that people are living separately and distinctly must not preclude co-operation. On the contrary, we see the opposite phenomena: peoples having the same language and the same state of culture quarrel-

ing among themselves and fighting each other. It does not follow necessarily that people, in order to co-operate, must use the same language; it does not follow necessarily that people using the same language cannot quarrel and make wars against themselves.

There are deep reasons why the Jews had to build new villages and towns. There were two main reasons. I am afraid I may enter into a rather long explanation, which I would not care to do at this late hour.

One reason was that they did not want to take away anything from the people who are here. Secondly, they could not live on the same level. But this does not mean that the Jew living in his village and speaking Hebrew, and the Arab living in his village and speaking Arabic, cannot co-operate in having the same conditions, to guard against thieves, against plagues, against all other things. And there are cases of such co-operation. But this is on a small scale. We are convinced that as soon as the Jews are equalized on the plane of statehood, perhaps not in one single day, but owing to the necessity of both peoples and the two established facts, there will be co-operation between them in spite of the fact that they live their own lives. They live their Jewish life, and they live their Arab life. We do not see any difficulty in co-operating because of that.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran): (Interpretation from French): I have only one question, but before I put it to Mr. Ben Gurion, I should like to tell him that I was very much touched by his allusion to the Emperor of Persia and it was at that time Persia who rendered a service to the people of Israel.

The question I have is as follows. As I see it, Mr. Ben Gurion admits to only one solution, and that is an independent State of Palestine. It is quite evident that on that point Mr. Ben Gurion and the Arabs are in full agreement. Both want an independent State, and both want a democratic State. I insist on the words "democracy" and "democratic State" because, in the first place, it is a fashionable and popular expression at present, and also because it means rule by the majority. The only difference between the Arabs and Jewish people on this point is that the Arabs say "establish that independent State now;" whereas the Jewish people say "don't do it now, but wait until we have a majority in the country."

If we admit that Palestine is a special case and might need special treatment, can we at the same time accept under the question of delay the principle of self-determination? It seems to me that it is difficult to admit at the same time that you must delay until an independent State is established and also admit the principle of self-determination. This is the question I have.

Mr. BEN GURION: I want first of all to tell the representative of Iran that while we have to forget, and we do forget, all the evils done to us, we never forget the good things which have been done to us, and it is not only in rela-

tion to Persia, although our relations with Persia really were the most temporary relations as between the Jewish people and the great empire which was on the border of Palestine.

As to the question of the representative of Iran, it really raises the whole issue. But I want first of all to say that it is not quite the same thing, even assuming that we talk about a democratic State. We conceive a democratic State as a State where all citizens are absolutely—here I can use the word "absolute" because either it is equality or it is not; you cannot have equality of 99 persons because then it is discrimination—equal, whatever they are: Jews, Arabs, Moslems, or any other nationality or religion; while the State required by the Arabs, as expressed officially by the Arab delegation and by the Arab League, is one in which they want to have one discrimination—against the Jews, that they should not be free as equal citizens to settle; not the Jews outside Palestine, but the Jews who will be citizens in a so-called democratic Palestine State should not be able to settle wherever they like. So it is not quite the same. From the beginning they want to build a State on racial discrimination. But this is the real issue. It is not a question merely of time. They want it now, and we want it after a certain period. Formally, it may look so, but I think it would be unfair on my side to make the whole question merely a question of time, to say we also want to have a democratic State, but not now—after a certain number of years. It is quite a different thing. What we say is that here we Jews and we Jewish people have a State and have a right. No State, no political regime can be created in accordance with justice, with history, and with international law which recognizes this Jewish State and this Jewish right, which will preclude the realization of our right. And our right consists of two things: our right to immigrate into Palestine as our right, not as a Jew immigrating to America. When I immigrated into America, America was free. I myself was expelled by the Turks from Palestine and went to America without a passport—I had not got a passport because all my papers were taken from me. I came to America in 1915. Even then the Jews, or any other persons from Europe, could immigrate freely into America. They did not immigrate as of a right because America could say, yes you are free to immigrate, or America could say, no. There was time when she said yes, and there was time when she said no. But the French Government, or the English Government, or the Persian Government cannot say to a Persian or French national you have no right to come back as of right. This is our right in this country, and in this country only. I am giving you our view, which I believe is the view of international law and of human conscience, as far as we knew it until now. This is our right, and we say it will be wrong to create such political conditions that will rob us of our right. This is done in many countries. I will give you an example, although it is not quite the same.

In the District of Columbia in the United States there are people living—and there are over a million, more than the number of Jews in Palestine—and they have no right of self-determination. They have not the right which every American has in every American State to elect their own Governor. They were deprived for a more general reason. This is the central place which belongs to all the forty-eight States in America, and because they have the privilege of living there they have not the right which the citizen of Ohio, or of Minnesota, or of any other State has. So it is not always absolute.

When there is an over-riding right which may displace that right of self-determination no country will recognize—neither Persia nor France—the right of self-determination, let us say, of one of their dependents to be independent. There are certain rights of self-determination, and when I say the right of the Jew to come back to his country and the right of our people to be here as equal partners in the world family, it is an over-riding right which applies to Palestine, and therefore no regime—not only an Arab State, should be created, even no trusteeship, no mandate should be created—which will make that right impossible of realization. This is why we oppose it. It is not a matter of time only, but given sufficient framework, it can be safeguarded only if there is independence and the Jews are in the majority. Then the Jew will be able to come back if he is persecuted. I am not naming any country—let us say Patagonia—but if he is in danger of being murdered or persecuted there he will be able to come back if there is a place for him because the majority will see to it. And the Jewish people as a whole—not every Jew—will enjoy the same status as any other people. This is the crucial point, and not the matter of time.

Mr. LISICKY: (Czechoslovakia): I presume that Mr. Ben Gurion has listened to the statement of Dr. Weizmann, which was acknowledged with enthusiastic applause by the public. This statement favours a partition of Palestine into two states. I should like to hear the opinion of Mr. Ben Gurion on this scheme—not his personal opinion because it is more or less known, but the opinion of the Jewish Agency. I am not asking for an immediate answer. I should prefer very much a considered opinion of the Jewish Agency after deliberation. If I may ask, I should like to see included in this considered opinion the point of view of the Jewish Agency on the possible federate scheme of these two States—a Jewish State and an Arab State—in Palestine after the partition. I do not mean any rigid federation, but rather a sort of loose confederation, a sort in which the independent character of the Jewish State should be completely set forth. I put the question, but I am not asking for an immediate answer.

Mr. BEN GURION: I will make two remarks on that. One is that Dr. Weizmann is thought so well of by the Jewish people and occupies such a place in our history and among us that

he is entitled to speak for himself without any public mandate. You heard his views. I also had the pleasure of listening to them. As you do not insist on my giving you the answer now about the scheme of partition. I will not do it, but I will tell you what we told the Government last year and this year while we believe and request that our right, at least to the Western part of Palestine should be granted in full and Western Palestine be made a Jewish State, we believe it is possible. We have a right to it, but we are willing to consider an offer of a Jewish State in an area which means less than the whole of Palestine. We will consider it. But I am glad you do not want me to give a complete scheme.

On the question of federation I made it clear before that it depends really on what you mean by the word "federation." When you say "federate State," you mean that the Jewish State would be an independent State. I will give you an example, in Australia, for instance. Although Australia belongs to the Commonwealth of Nations, Australia is independent. When England makes war, Australia may remain neutral; and when Australia makes war England need not make war. It has its own representation and its own representatives, although it is tied up with a larger group in a free commonwealth.

If you mean that the Jewish State should be federated with other states while remaining an independent State with Membership, than we are perfectly willing. In fact, we would welcome it if this were for the benefit of all the peoples in this region and if this were the desire of the United Nations. But if you mean that there would be a federate State as, let us say in the United States where there are forty-eight states—New York is a state, but really it is one state; the United States is as much a single State as France, or as the United Kingdom, although there is Wales and Scotland and England. If you mean the Jewish State should be a part of a federate State as New York is a part of the United States, that is a denial of the Jewish State and Jewish independence. We would be against this. Such a scheme as this means not a Jewish State.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I think you did not hear when I spoke about a loose confederation.

Mr. BEN GURION: I say we will be ready to enter not a loose federation, but a much closer federation with free and equal status as a free and equal people, whether confederate or federate. This does not preclude the federation of a Jewish State with some of the neighbouring States.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else wish to ask a question? If not we shall have to adjourn the hearing until tomorrow at 9 a.m.

Mr. BEN GURION: Will you allow me before I leave to express my gratitude for your patience and your kindness—everyone of you—in asking your questions and listening to my answers. I know you want the truth and, as far as I and

my colleagues can, we want to help you, and I am grateful for your patience and your kindness.

CHAIRMAN: We thank you, Mr. Ben Gurion. The members of the Committee will now retire to a private meeting.

*The meeting adjourned at 1.25 p.m.*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem,  
Palestine, Wednesday, 9 July 1947, at 9 a.m.*

### *Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order. The agenda for today's hearing contains two points: Public hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency and public hearing of representatives of Vaad Leumi.

I think we can adopt this agenda.

It is adopted.

### Continuation of Hearing of Representatives of the Jewish Agency

Then we are going on with the questioning of the representatives of the Jewish Agency. First, I might ask if anybody wishes to put any questions to Rabbi Fishman.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I have one or two questions.

MR. KAPLAN (Representative of Jewish Agency): Rabbi Fishman is not here. He was not informed that he was to be questioned.

CHAIRMAN: Then we will postpone those questions. Will Mr. Horowitz, Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Bernstein come to the table.

*(Mr. Horowitz, Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Bernstein took seats at the table.)*

CHAIRMAN: For my part, I only wish to repeat my requests for the maps we spoke of during your address.

MR. KAPLAN: The scheme was sent to you, in eight copies. The other maps will be sent to-morrow.

CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to ask any questions?

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Yes.

In compiling data on infant mortality, did you calculate the rate of immigration among people

in different economic strata or in different economic groups of Arabs and Jews?

MR. HOROWITZ: My data on infant mortality was based on Moslem population. We did not give any data on the Jewish population, where the decrease is also very pronounced, but what it was intended to prove was that the infant mortality of the Moslem population decreased concurrently and in exact correlation with the increase in the share of the Jewish population. The data were given only for the Moslem population of Palestine. Although there is some immigration of Moslems into the country, it is so small that it could not affect the final figures to any considerable extent.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is not the answer to the question.

MR. HOROWITZ: Maybe I misunderstood the question; please repeat it.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did you calculate the rate of infant mortality in the different economic strata or in the different economic groups of Arabs?

MR. HOROWITZ: We took Moslem rural infant mortality. That represents the most representative crosssection of the Arab population, and the poorest one, the Arab fellahin, which represents about two-thirds of the Arab population of Palestine.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I do not think then that you have calculated infant mortality with reference to the grouping of each family.

MR. HOROWITZ: No, there are no data for such an analysis. Moreover, we did not think that this was in any way relevant to the case.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did you calculate the economic returns from the capital that is being sunk in for the purpose of increasing the absorptive capacity?

MR. HOROWITZ: Yes, sir.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is the increase of the present economic absorptive capacity commensurate with the vast amounts of money which have been invested for that purpose or with the return that you get from these investments?

MR. KAPLAN: The cost of colonizing Palestine is less than the cost of colonizing in most other countries, for example, in Australia. If you take the cost per person or per family in Australia and Palestine, or in Canada and in Palestine, you will find that we invested here less than the Government or other agencies invested for colonizing there. Since you ask the question, certainly we are spending quite a good sum of money for colonizing, but otherwise, the Government should have done that. But if you ask me if the cost of colonization is commensurate with the increase in the absorptive capacity, my answer is yes.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India): To what extent are the Jewish colonies indebted to the Jewish National Fund? I believe some figure was given by you to the Zionist Congress.

MR. KAPLAN: When you say Jewish National Fund, there are two: One is with regard to land.



With regard to land, there is no question of indebtedness because they are paying only for the lease and they are paying a certain percentage in accordance with the cost of the land and the productivity. In the agricultural field it is mostly 2 per cent. The indebtedness to the Palestine Foundation Fund and the other agencies connected with it is approximately four to five million pounds.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was that the figure that you gave the Zionist Congress?

Mr. KAPLAN: No. You asked me what the indebtedness is to the National Fund. At the Zionist Congress, I discussed the total question of the agricultural debts of the Jewish Settlements in Palestine. That includes quite a lot of private loans and commercial loans.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): What was the extent of that loan.

Mr. KAPLAN: My approximate estimate now is about 11 to 12 million pounds. It may be of interest to add that it is less now than the agricultural products per year. If you take the agricultural output and compare it with the indebtedness, it is less than the agricultural output of one year.

CHAIRMAN: What is the difference?

Mr. KAPLAN: A very small one. Our estimates of the agricultural output of last year was about 14 million pounds. I am speaking of the Jewish mixed agriculture.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are you not getting very large sums of money from America and other places and are you not concentrating your efforts to get Palestine as a Jewish State, regardless of the monies which are being spent on improvement of the country.

Mr. KAPLAN: I will have to divide that question into quite a few parts. I answered to the first part in my statement, and I do not intend to repeat it. May I remind you that I said in my statement that the collections made throughout the Jewish world are very substantial and they are made in order to absorb new immigrants and to increase the absorptive capacity of Palestine. Among these countries, the United States plays a very substantial role. There are now five million Jews in America. It is the largest Jewish community and the richest. Therefore, we now receive the greatest part of our contributions from America. If you ask me whether we collect money in order to absorb immigrant and develop our country, the answer is yes, certainly. If you ask me whether we have taken into consideration the cost, if the implication is that we are investing or spending money without paying any attention to whether the cost is fantastic or not, my answer is no. We are trying to save the cent and the dollar and to invest it under the existing conditions in the best possible way. And we are giving an account to our contributors throughout the world, and to the Americans, in order to show, from our point of view, that it is quite a good investment. It is an investment to revive the Jewish people.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are there any Arab villagers who are entirely landless?

Mr. KAPLAN: I will call your attention, in connection with this question, to the Government Survey prepared a year ago. There is a chapter entitled Displaced Arabs, and there is quite a lot of information with regard to the registration conducted not by us but by the Government with regard to the displaced Arabs. You will find there the figure, which has been arrived at after long investigation, after years and years, the total number of acknowledged displaced Arabs are 666. The Government made certain facilities in order to resettle them. Only half used these facilities; the other half refused. You may receive more detailed information on this from Mr. Shertok, who will also answer to the question that the representative of India raised yesterday. But all the figures that I am stating now can be found in the Government Survey. I mentioned the total a few moments ago, 666. Only half of them used the Government facilities to be resettled. The others thought it was not worth while because they found other occupations or sources of livelihood.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any indication of what became of the half that did not use the facilities of the Government?

Mr. KAPLAN: There are certain indications in the Survey. But we have some additional material that Mr. Shertok will prepare for you.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you consider that the average Arab holding is adequate for the maintenance of the Arab family at a reasonable standard of living under present conditions?

Mr. KAPLAN: I tried to give quite a detailed answer in my address. I do not wish to go into the matter but I will say, if you compare the Arab holdings in Palestine and the Arab holdings in Transjordan, and if you will compare the standard of living, you will find that the condition of the Arab fellahin is much better. If your question is whether the position of the Arab farmer or fellahin is a satisfying one, I will say no, but it is not connected with the question of the size of the land. His position was worse twenty years ago. It is in connexion with the question of the use of the land. I may call your attention to what I said previously when I went into this at great length. I do not wish to repeat it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): In view of the existence of a deficit and the gradual increase in the Arab population, which doubles its numbers in approximately twenty-seven years, is it not necessary to adopt a land policy to safeguard the rural population?

Mr. KAPLAN: Again, it is the same question that we are discussing. I am trying to make my point clear. Perhaps I did not succeed. First of all, the Arab agricultural population increased during the twenty-seven years. I do not know the exact figure for the twenty-seven years, but I can give you the figure for about fifteen years. In my figures, the agricultural population increased by about 30 per cent. What I am trying to say is

that it is not a question of land reserve. There are large land reserves in Palestine. They are now either uncultivated—they are even called uncultivable—and we have to convert them into cultivated land, or they are cultivated very extensively. If the bedouin in Negeb is using 499 dunums of land, he is conducting a miserable living. He can conduct quite a good living if he will improve the form of use of the land and if we introduce irrigation. Therefore, there is a question of land tenure. I have also stressed the question of what I call the necessity of land reform. It is not a question of quantity. It is a question of legislation and a question of the use of agriculture. You have tremendous reserves of land in Transjordan and Iraq that has probably been under cultivation for hundreds of years. What is the situation there and what is the situation here?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was Palestine industry able, before the war, to compete with foreign industry?

Mr. KAPLAN: No, but I think Mr. Bernstein can give that answer, since he is the person to whom to address questions on industry.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: Palestine industry before the war was chiefly for the local market and could compete with foreign industry to the extent that this industry produced a good bit sold here in the country. Industrial export did not exist at that time. There was a certain margin between foreign produce and Palestine produce, but the margin was not so big that the local produce could not be sold here.

Mr. KAPLAN: One moment, I would like to correct myself. I did not follow the question. I thought when you said before the war that it was the first war. Then there was no industry, so the question was the one to which Mr. Bernstein gave the answer.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Have Lebanon and Syria developed during the past twenty-five years?

Mr. HOROWITZ: I do not know if we should deal with Lebanon and Syria, but there was a certain progress—however, in no way comparable with that of Palestine.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): One more question, and I shall have finished. Were the Jewish settlements in general self-supporting before the war?

Mr. KAPLAN: I have one remark with regard to what we call the method of our colonization. The method of our colonization is that a group organizes itself and negotiates with what we call national institutions. The national institutions, together with the group, prepare the so-called co-ordination scheme, but the group is absolutely independent in fixing the form of its life. The execution of the agricultural colonization plan takes time. It is not a question of a year. Sometimes it takes quite a few years. When the scheme was executive, and they had a full colonization loan—because we do not give grants, but only loans—all the settlements were self-supporting, before the war.

CHAIRMAN: Before the last war?

Mr. KAPLAN: Before the last war all settlements were executive and they received what we call the full body or full loan for equipment, and were self-supporting. There were many settlements in the process of colonization.

I will give you an example. If it was a question of orange growing, establishing an orange grove takes five years, each year you have to invest additional funds. They were receiving the additional part of the loan. But to the question that you asked me, my answer is yes. I say that in the last years we were trying to make general the total income and expenditure of Jewish agriculture. There was net surplus of income.

CHAIRMAN: Have you exhausted your questions?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Yes.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): This is only a question related to the point just mentioned by Mr. Kaplan. Could we have some precision and rather more details on the term "self-supporting"? Would you, for example, include on that side the repayment, at ordinary rates, of capital invested?

Mr. KAPLAN: I shall try to give a few additional remarks. Maybe it will be of interest to state that of the payments due on the loans to the Jewish Agency in connection with the colonization mentioned a moment ago, about 85 per cent were paid on time.

May I add a second remark, that hundreds of our settlers paid during the war, despite the fact that they were entitled to repay the loans ten, fifteen or sometimes twenty years later, and they settled the whole at once.

When you ask the question of being self-supporting, it is a very simple one. The question is, when we say we are taking the income, we are taking the expenditure. Then we are taking the payments, to be paid as interest due in the first stages; the question is, does the income cover expenditure, and have they certain reserves for payments of their debts? Is that clear enough?

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): You mentioned on page 8 of your evidence a draft law called the Irrigation and Water Bill, 1947. Would you consider that as restrictive and not creative? Would you describe in general terms the provision of this law and the means of implementation provided by the Government of Palestine?

CHAIRMAN: Which laws?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): The Irrigation and Water Bill. Do you consider this law as restrictive and not creative?

Mr. KAPLAN: First of all, I wish to say I said it is a draft of a law, and we still consider submitting to the Government our criticism in detail, in writing, with the hope that this law may be changed. We consider it bureaucratic and restrictive. As I said, there is no recourse to the law. The officers are identified for what they may do. They cannot be asked for identification

if it was ascertained that there was, say, some omission or some mistakes by depriving a person of water. You have no way of approaching anybody. There is only one possibility of appeal, to the High Commissioner of Palestine, and we cannot appeal directly, but through the Irrigation Officer, and his decision is final. You cannot explain, you cannot discuss it. There is a proposal to have a kind of advisory committee, but it is the right of the gentlemen in authority to ask the advice of the Committee or not to ask it, to accept the view of the majority or not to accept this view. In accordance with the law, the officer may decide how far you can use the water—sixty kilometres per hour, eighty, one-hundred, one-hundred-fifty—it does not depend upon the work, it depends upon his decision. He can prescribe to you how to use the water. You should use the water from your own well, or somebody else will use the water. You must give the water to the others. You see, it gives to the Government, or the Government authorities, very large powers, and as I said, on the strength of our experience we often meet doubts, because of the uncertainty. You cannot keep this part; you cannot use it; you cannot transfer the water.

Because of this experience we are afraid that the law will be used in a restrictive manner and not for development. If the law becomes a part of a large development scheme under public supervision, we would discuss it in another way.

CHAIRMAN: Did I understand rightly that this point is on a draft law?

Mr. KAPLAN: I said in my statement it was a draft law.

CHAIRMAN: So it has no immediate interest, but for the future?

Mr. KAPLAN: I hope it will not have.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I have another question, but addressed to Mr. Bernstein. Is this the moment for this question?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, if it is on the subject under discussion.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): In connexion with your remarks on page 15 of your statement about oil concessions, is it possible to know the date on which those oil concessions were granted, to which companies and under which conditions?

Mr. BERNSTEIN: I do not have all the particulars here among my papers, but the information may be found in the Gazette of the Palestine Government.

Mr. HOROWITZ: There was a special Gazette published at that time. It was under Sir John Chancellor. It gives the concessions, the concessionaires, the dates and the names of the companies are clearly elucidated and set forth as well.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): May I obtain that Gazette?

Mr. HOROWITZ: Certainly.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Will you supply it to me?

Mr. HOROWITZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Can you indicate the approximate

dates when these concessions were given? Was it at the beginning of the Mandate?

Mr. HOROWITZ: No, it was under Sir John Chancellor, between about 1928 and 1933.

CHAIRMAN: Does anybody else wish to ask any more questions?

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask a question about the absorption of immigrants. I would like to know how the prospective immigrants are selected at the present time within the small quota provided by the regulations.

Mr. KAPLAN: A part of the so-called permits or certificates are appropriated directly by the Government—now, quite a substantial part—and therefore the selection is made there by the Government itself. A part is appropriated for displaced persons in the British zone. There the selection is made by the British Military representatives in consultation with the representatives of the Jewish Agency. A third part is now allocated for our people in Cyprus. The selection in Cyprus is also made by the Government Authorities in consultation with our people. We are trying to give first priority to children, especially orphans. Then there is the question of whether they have relatives, the question of their fitness for the country. The Government sometimes tries to allow older people to immigrate.

CHAIRMAN: How many are taken monthly from the Cyprus camps?

Mr. KAPLAN: About 750 per month.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): About 50 per cent of the quota?

Mr. KAPLAN: Yes, and about 375 from the British zone. The others are mostly chosen by the Government.

Mr. HOROWITZ: Certificates are also deducted for soldiers and soldiers' wives. People who enlisted in the British Army during the war and fought during the war against Hitler, if they were not legalized—they were admitted to the Army, but not to Palestine—they had to get special certificates which were deducted from the quota; certificate for soldiers who fought in the British Army but came to Palestine before the war or during the war, without a legal certificate—they get a certificate now and it is deducted from the monthly quota.

Mr. KAPLAN: I am ready to submit to you in writing the exact distribution of the certificates for the last five months or for the last fifteen months, in accordance with the categories, if you like.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask this: in all the documents and calculations about the economic absorptive capacity of this country, all the data concerned with conditions in this country are very carefully calculated and laid out, but my point is, do these calculations also take into account the average physical and mental ability and the standards of education of the prospective immigrants?

Mr. KAPLAN: Yes. Should I elaborate upon it? At one time we had quite a large training system in the different countries. Now we are trying to re-establish this training system and are trying

to train people as much as possible, even during their stay in the countries of Europe, for their future work in Palestine. Sometimes we call the process of training a process of rehabilitation. It is a double process today. It is first of all what we call a human rehabilitation, because it is not an easy problem to bring people, after years in concentration camps back to an ability and a desire to work, to do hard work because they want to do so and not because they are compelled by Nazis or others.

One of the parts of human rehabilitation is a physical rehabilitation, a good many of them suffering because of what has happened to them.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Are they suffering mentally too?

Mr. KAPLAN: For the moment I speak of the physical side. There is quite a large work of selection and medical aid. Please remember that it is by no means perfect. There is a great deal to do. We are trying to do our best but there will be many failures.

We are trying also to organize what we call a scheme of employment, even in the camps, together with the Joint Distribution Committee. By chance last week we were negotiating with the Government of Palestine to organize such a scheme of vocational training and employment in the Cyprus Camps in order, as far as we could, to prepare the detainees. But we must recognize that there will be a certain percentage of people to arrive as invalids—what we call social cases, perhaps because of age or illness—and we will have to take care of them. But I can say that our experience lately—I mean after the time of the Nazis—is quite encouraging, especially amongst the youngsters. I would estimate that of the able-bodied people about 75 per cent or 80 per cent succeeded in finding work and integrating themselves, as I said in my address more or less into the economic life of the country. That does not mean that the work is finished. We are facing difficult problems but we are trying to meet them, and the result is quite encouraging.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Do I understand that the Agency realizes that there will be, as a consequence of the sufferings most of the people went through, a certain percentage—difficult to estimate—of people who will not be able any more to do a work of full value?

Mr. KAPLAN: Perhaps, but it is for the time being a small percentage. Among the refugees here there are quite a lot of people who are skilled workers, even because of the hard work, in the camps only the fittest were able to survive. Therefore, among them there is quite a number of skilled workers and the process from the point of view of retraining will bring quite a number of refugees into the building trade. There was a scarcity of building workers, and we succeeded in bring a large number of them in a short time into the building trade and thus expanded our labour force.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Does the Jewish Agency at the moment have any reliable estimate of the total number of Jews from Europe who

want to immigrate into Palestine, and do you know how many of them are living in Assembly Centers?

Mr. KAPLAN: I think you will find all the figures in our book, "The Jewish Case."

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): That was a year ago.

Mr. KAPLAN: I do not think there has been any substantial change. There were changes in two directions—I may say opposite directions. The number of people in what you call detainees camps, or maintenance camps—I mean displaced persons—has increased. It has not decreased but increased by infiltration of the people from Poland, from Hungary, and partly from Roumania. Mr. Earl Harrison, who was sent by President Truman about two years ago to investigate the situation in Germany—immediately after the war—thought that the number of displaced persons who were in need of settlement and desiring to go to Palestine then was about a hundred thousand. Now the figure, as Mr. Ben Gurion told you, is more than two hundred thousand, and the military occupation forces face this time, from the Jewish displaced persons point of view, a more difficult problem than two years ago, and our people already face the prospect of a third year.

With regard to the other countries, again there is a difference. There are many countries—and I do not wish to put any blame—where the number is still very great—say Roumania. The number of Jews who are willing and need to leave Roumania is not less today than it was two years ago. In the smaller countries perhaps a part of them succeeded in the meantime in settling or resettling. I do not think there is a change in the total figure.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): That was my point—whether there are substantial changes after, say, the last year.

Mr. KAPLAN: I regret to say no.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I have a few questions to put to Mr. Bernstein. Mr. Bernstein, on page 3 of your address you said, "Jews regard themselves as entitled to a fiscal policy employing the gradually growing taxable capacity of the Jewish Yishuv for the benefit of those who were creating that capacity by their labour and investments, as well as for the benefit of those large sections of world Jewry who need and desire to immigrate to Palestine."

I was wondering whether the policy claimed here would really be a wise policy in any country—to use the taxes paid by one part of the population only for the benefit of that part of the population.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: I cannot say whether it would be a wise policy or not. At any rate, the policy was not conducted, so it is a hypothetical question. I only tried to indicate what were, at the time, the main differences of opinion with regard to conducting business or carrying out of the mandate.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): It says here that the Jews regard themselves entitled to this fiscal policy.

Mr. KAPLAN: According to what we could expect from the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, and if we take into account the process of colonization, I should like to remind you that we are asked a lot of questions—perhaps not all here in this room—in connection with the extent to which the Jewish Community was self-supporting, and we have heard a lot about the money which is coming from abroad. So if you ask yourself, how can a community which is being established, which is growing cover its needs and its services, then we must say that this must come from the growing taxable capacity of this community. The net result of investment and labour finds itself expressed in a growing taxable capacity, and it is only natural that if you embark on colonization you employ this taxable capacity for the community you are establishing. The fact that we were forced by Government policy to transfer a large part of this taxable capacity to another sector, had as consequence that we had to rely on foreign money for a part of our own services. But perhaps I did not fully understand your question.

Mr. HOROWITZ: Could I amplify the statement? The situation is such that the statement does not mean that the whole amount of additional taxation must be used only for Jews; it is a different problem. If a third of the population pays two-thirds of the taxes and gets less than one-third—something like one quarter—of the services, the disparity is too pronounced and a part of the additional taxes is not really paid from income but from import of capital in the form of customs duties on various means of production. Therefore, a part of the capital which would be used for colonization and expansion of machinery for production, was transferred to the Arab population. That point of taxation is highly controversial if you consider the disproportion between the two sections, one-third of the population paying two-thirds of the taxes and using only one-quarter of the money. If it were entirely from income it would still be debatable, but it is partly a kind of taxation on import of capital which develops the country to the benefit of the two sections of the population. That part is to a certain extent unjustifiable. It hampers the process of colonization.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): We know that the declared policy of the Jewish Agency is to raise the standard of living of the Arab population here, and I think therefore that this statement was perhaps put in too absolute a sense.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: It is a formulation with regard to retrospective criticism of the policy that was conducted. If I had to formulate what it would have to be, the formulation certainly would be less absolute.

I should like to add that the question depends to some degree on the general political situation. You asked whether it would be wise to follow that policy. As I pointed out, it would be wise in the sense that then, of our own free will, we could have transferred a part of this taxable capacity to the Arab sector. What I tried to point

out in this passage was the fact that all these advantages came to the Arab sector quasi as a gift of the Administration and not as a consequence of Jewish colonization, not mentioning the goodwill which the Jews probably could have obtained from the Arab population by the fact that a considerable part of the taxes—the Jewish taxes—was transferred to the Arab population.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): We could finish this debate, I think, but I should like to make one remark. In any country where tax regulations impose heavier taxes on the wealthier people, and these funds are used for the poorer people, the wealthy people do not say "I should like to give it to them myself but now it looks like a gift from the Government." I think we could leave it at that.

I should like to put one last question. On page 11 of Mr. Bernstein's address, I read the following sentence: "Meanwhile it should be stated that import licenses have been granted with special liberality for industrial consumer goods that were also produced in this country at a time when it was clear that the transition from war economy to peace economy would severely test the young Palestine industry." Could Mr. Bernstein perhaps explain this with some examples—just elaborate a bit more on what the actual rules were.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: I believe I can do it. The import policy of the Government was to grant import licenses, largely for what you call consumer goods, with severe restrictions for capital goods and raw materials, while we should have thought it to be contrary, and the effect is at this moment that the country is rather swamped with industrial produce of the kind we are making here, while there is a lack of raw materials and machinery. The import was especially heavy in one of the branches most developed in the war years—the textile branch—to such an extent that we tried continually to put some restrictions on the import of those goods by agreements between the merchants and the industrialists.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Has this policy had as a consequence a decrease in industrial production here?

Mr. BERNSTEIN: At present, at least in the textile branch, yes. There is, I hope, only a temporary reduction in production and work. I cannot tell you the exact percentage but I should say it is near forty per cent in the textile branch. In other branches it is not so much felt.

CHAIRMAN: Cannot the efficient import of heavy good and raw materials be due to shortage of such materials?

Mr. BERNSTEIN: It is due in part to shortages, but it is due more to monetary difficulties. In fact, it is a question of availability of dollars. I believe we could have had practically all we wanted if we could have used our dollar earnings for purchasing in the United States.

CHAIRMAN: You know of course there is a great shortage of certain raw materials—for example timber.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: To tell the truth, that is one of the legends. There is not such a shortage of timber and we could get as much as we like to buy, and even twice the amount, if we only provide the dollars.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): In connection with the immigration problem, has the Jewish Agency any plan in connection with the Jewish children from Europe? I refer, of course, to those who escaped the Nazi persecution and are now in the Cyprus Camp. I asked this question because I want to know who is now taking care of those children.

Mr. KAPLAN: If you ask me if sufficient care is being taken, I would say no. But if you say who is taking care of them, they are actually taken care of in three institutions. One is a Government institution. I do not know exactly what the relation is but the Government is providing a minimum for the care of children. Then there is the Joint Distribution Committee which is adding substantial sums. And then the Yishuv and the Jewish Agency have a special institution called, "Youth Immigration."

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): What are the health and cultural conditions?

Mr. KAPLAN: Very hard. The conditions are very difficult, and we beg for permission to take at least all the children to Palestine. Despite all efforts, the conditions are bad, and the cultural conditions especially.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I should like to know whether any estimate can be given, even in very broad terms, of the extent to which the development of the Jewish Community has necessarily relied on existing means of production, particularly foodstuffs, in the Arab community. To what extent has that been the case in the past, and to what extent can any calculations be given? Is it a necessary factor in the future?

Mr. HOROWITZ: Fifty per cent of the foodstuffs consumed by the Jewish Community in Palestine are produced by Jewish agriculture. Then, Jewish agriculture in Palestine produces foodstuffs for export, which provide an equivalent for a considerable proportion of the 50 per cent of foodstuffs which we do not produce. There is no difficulty in getting foodstuffs imported. A part is purchased from the Arab community. At present that part is estimated at something like 15 per cent of Jewish consumption of foodstuffs. 15 per cent is purchased from Arab agriculture; 50 per cent is produced by Jewish agriculture; the rest is supplied through imports. That means the imports represent something like 35 per cent of our consumption of foodstuffs, for which we create a certain equivalent in our export of citrus. So the foodstuff trade is almost balanced.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Does that mean a constant figure?

Mr. HOROWITZ: No, the figure for the last year.

Each year it changes. It depends on immigration and development of agriculture. In years when we have a large influx of immigration there is a certain lag in production; it takes time to catch up. In years in which there is an expansion of agriculture we catch up more quickly. It depends on the two factors; on the one hand expansion of agriculture through the establishment of new settlements and expansion of agricultural production in existing settlements; and on the other hand on the increase of the Jewish population. It changes. The figure I provided was for last year.

Mr. KAPLAN: Before the war we produced about a third of our own foodstuffs. During the war we raised the percentage up to 50 per cent.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I should like to go back to the discussion between Mr. Blom and the representative of the Jewish Agency about the claim put forward in the statement of Mr. Bernstein, that the Jewish community is entitled to get back in benefits for the Jewish community, their share in the taxes. I think the point which was raised by Mr. Blom is quite simple. It is uncontestable that the Jewish community is the wealthier part of the population of Palestine, and it is a common fact that the wealthier part of the population of any country pays the greater part of the taxes. It is common knowledge everywhere in our times, and I think it will be shared even by you because you are insisting—and rightly—on your progressive character. Bluntly speaking, the rich are paying the taxes not for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the poorer part of the community. So I think it is time to finish with this claim and with this putting forward that the Jews are paying more in taxes than the Arabs. It is incontestable, but quite natural, because the Jews are the richer people here, and if you still hold this view that what you are paying in taxes should be reverted in benefits for your community, in this respect you are reverting to the feudal system. I think that it is not your intention, and perhaps it is time to correct, once and for all, this impression.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: I am afraid there is a bit of misunderstanding on this point. If it were a question of distributing the tax income of some population among the rich and the poor, then it is a fully accepted principle by all of us that taxes must be paid according to ability to pay and must be used according to the need of the different parts of the population.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Of the whole community.

Mr. BERNSTEIN: If you will allow me, on this principle there is no discussion at all. What we at the time thought and demanded, but did not get, was as follows. We said, how in this quite exceptional case—not of an existing population but of a colonization where we have to create a community from the beginning—can we find the means of developing this community? There was a wide discussion on how to finance this colonization. Then the question had to arise,



how to use the gradually growing taxable capacity of this community for the further expansion and for the needs of this community? There were grave doubts in the beginning as to whether a new community would be able to pay its own way. And in this exceptional circumstance, not of an existing community but of a community being created through colonization, we thought to be entitled to use the taxable capacity of this newly created community for that community. It was not so, and in retrospect I tried to say what we thought at the time. It is now in actual fact a question of proportion, but we do not want to give the impression here that we were not fully alive to the necessity to employ the tax income according to the needs. But I would like you not to forget that this use of taxes in Palestine is not only a question of social equity, but also a political question because the distribution of taxes has an influence on political relations, and this in fact was the point I tried to stress in my remarks.

Mr. KAPLAN: May I call your attention to the additional statement made by me? I shall quote it: "The Government in its statement advocated the willingness of each to contribute according to his means and the need of the other." We accept this as a general principle, but a fair evaluation of needs and means is imperative to a just application of this principle. We questioned this relation implied by the Government statement. May I give two examples from my personal experience?

There is a tremendous need for education in Palestine, and I stress that there is tremendous need for education in Palestine also among the Jews. It is also one of the legends that all the Jews are rich. It is not so. We introduced quite a lot of taxes—voluntary taxes, but nevertheless Palestine taxes. The Government issued a law in the 1930's, I think, about twelve or fifteen years ago, giving the municipalities the right to introduce special taxes for educational purposes. Actually, the municipalities are, as you know, under Government authority. For years and years we asked to introduce—I give an example in this city of Jerusalem where we are now—an educational tax, and it is not true that the Arab community in Jerusalem is a poor one. It is sufficient to walk through the streets of Jerusalem and see the Arab houses to see there is a large number of very rich Arabs, as there is quite a large number of rich Jews. We begged to introduce such a tax. We could not achieve it up to a year and two years ago, and even now if you compare the taxes paid by the rich sections of the population—rich Arabs and Jews—and here I say by the rich sections for the sake of such essential needs—I dare say some Arab villages in proportion have paid more for their education than the rich Arabs of Palestine.

Now I will give you a second example. It was in the statement mentioned by our War Economic Advisory Council. I had the privilege of being among the War Economic Advisory Council and we discussed the question of taxa-

tion. There was a suggestion to introduce estate duties into Palestine. It is not a tax upon the poor and there is no racial discrimination. The Arabs opposed stubbornly the introduction of estate duties. They even quoted religious reasons, and then we asked if there was such a tax in Egypt and Iraq and said that we needed the money badly for a lot of social services in Palestine. But because of the opposition of the Arabs—probably not the very poor Arabs—this draft, which was already started, was not introduced. What we question is the evaluation of the means. If you will take the income tax paid in Nablus—I think you visited Nablus—and compare it with a small township—a Jewish township—you will see the income tax paid there and see quite a difference; not a difference of wealth, but a difference in the execution of the law. We question the evaluation of the means. We do not question the principle that you stated, and we can give quite a lot of figures to show it because we said, as Dr. Weizmann said, sometimes it is an appeasement, but an appeasement in the tax field.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I would like to ask Mr. Horowitz a question. He stated that about 15 per cent of the food requirements in the Jewish community was furnished by the Arab community. Can he give an estimate of the total economic exchange between the Jews and the Arabs in all fields? In other words, fifteen per cent of the food consumed by the Jewish community is furnished by the Arabs.

Mr. HOROWITZ: I said that fifty per cent of the foodstuffs consumed by the Jewish community is provided by Jewish agriculture and fifteen per cent by Arabs.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, that is what I said—fifteen per cent. Now, can you give me an estimate of the total economic exchange between the Jews and the Arabs in this country?

Mr. HOROWITZ: It would be quite impossible to give in actual figures. We only know that if you have a kind of trade balance between Jews and Arabs, that trade balance would be greatly adverse to the Jews.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Could you indicate the commodities?

Mr. HOROWITZ: Yes, I can. First of all, there is agricultural produce. We do not sell any agricultural produce to the Arabs although fifteen per cent of Arab produce are sold to the Jews, e.g. fifteen per cent of the Jewish consumption of foodstuffs. In absolute figures, this is a very high proportion of agricultural surplus produce, our Arab population being a population with a high consumption of foodstuffs; it is in absolute quantities of foodstuffs a very considerable item in the income of Arab agriculture. It is only fifteen per cent of our consumption, but a very considerable item in the income of Arab agriculture, as is shown by the raising curve of the production of these foodstuffs.

Mr. RAND (Canada): What do you mean by agriculture as distinguished from foodstuffs?

Mr. HOROWITZ: I mean food products. That is one thing. Secondly, we have fodder. We have intensive agriculture. We are related to Arab agriculture to a certain extent, like Denmark to countries from which it buys foodstuffs for animals. We concentrate on poultry raising, dairy products, and so on, and as we do not have enough land we do not produce enough feeding stuffs: here the proportion of our purchase of Arab agriculture is considerably higher. The third point—again we buy from the Arabs but they do not buy back from us, we buy a considerable proportion of building materials from Arabs, stone, groundstone, and a kind of coarse sand. This is a branch which employs many Arabs in the country. The produce is sold in a preponderant part to the Jews, as the Jewish building movement is doing the preponderant share of building in this country. Fourth, a large proportion of the Jewish population lives in houses built by Arabs, who let them out to Jews, as it is a very profitable occupation. Fifth, employment. For every Jew employed in Arab economy, if there are any, there are at least one hundred Arabs employed in Jewish economy, in Jewish services, in some Jewish industrial undertakings, Palestine Potash, etc. For every Jew employed in Arab economy there are at least one hundred Arabs, and I think the estimate is very conservative, employed in Jewish economy. That is the next channel of transition. Sixth, a further channel of transition is revenue. Whether someone approves it or not, revenue represents a transfer in the balance of payment between the Jewish and Arab community. Seventh, the sale of surplus land which goes into millions is also one-way traffic. All these seven channels form a kind of combination of connected vessels by which a considerable proportion of the import of Jewish capital is transferred to the Arab community. An additional factor is the relation in the foreign trade between Palestine and the neighbouring Arab countries which, in the course of a few years, created a deficit of LP 26,000,000 in the trade balance between Palestine and these countries. It is almost exclusively due to the development of the country by the Jews and the tremendous purchases by us from the neighbouring Arab countries, so that we not only provided capital for the development of the Arab sector of Palestine, but to a considerable extent we are the providers of capital and finances for development in neighbouring countries. And, the larger the Jewish immigration, the larger these trade deficits, particularly so now, when the Arab boycott decreased our exports to those countries. But we have not the power to use that deficit in trade balance as a means of a bargaining weapon—to say, if you continue with the boycott, we shall not buy from you. We cannot do it because we do not have the government authority. So, in that case, the very reward for the boycott is the increasing profit to the neighbouring countries from the Jews of Palestine.

Mr. RAND (Canada): These purchases that

you say you make from the neighbouring Arab countries, are they produce or transit goods?

Mr. HOROWITZ: They are not transit goods. They are the produce of the country, mainly raw materials, foodstuffs, etc.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Is there any perceptible interchange in Palestine in manufacturing goods between the Jews and the Arabs?

Mr. HOROWITZ: There is a sale of Jewish manufactured products to the Arabs. That is the only item which goes the other way around, but it is in no way comparable with all these seven items which I mentioned. It would be a very small, almost negligible fraction in the balance of payments. Even now there is an official boycott in the country which is not effective. That ineffectiveness proves that the boycott would be even less effective in Egypt and Iraq. It is effective in these countries by the prohibition of the Government of these countries in the issuance of import licenses for Palestine goods. When the Arab buyer, purchaser or consumer has to decide for himself, he finds ways and means, which I cannot mention here for obvious reasons, to resort to subterfuge in various ways to buy Jewish products, of course, in negligible proportion in the balance of payments, but it proved very conclusively that the boycott is very ineffective when the Arab consumer has to decide by himself.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Is there any degree of reciprocable purchase by the Jew of Arab manufactured products?

Mr. HOROWITZ: No, the Arab industry forms something less than 10 per cent of the industry of Palestine. It is not an industry. There are small workshops which do not have many products for sale. The only industry in the Arab community is the soap industry in Nablus. This soap industry is a special product which has a ready sale only among the Moslem population, because for religious reasons they prefer having the pure vegetable contents in the soap. It has a guaranteed religious value and it does not contain any animal fats. It has a very coarse external appearance and is bought mainly in Egypt and Palestine by pious Moslems, because that is the only kind of soap which has the guarantee that it does not use any animal fats. Therefore, it is a kind of special product.

Mr. RAND (Canada): You do not smoke the Arab tobacco?

Mr. HOROWITZ: We do, in very considerable proportions.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, I was told that the taxes in Palestine are twice as high as, for instance, Lebanon, four times as high as Syria, and ten times as high as Egypt. Can you tell us something about this comparison?

Mr. HOROWITZ: Per head or per population?

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): Per head.

Mr. HOROWITZ: I could not tell you exactly whether the figures are correct but to a certain extent it is true, as two-thirds of the taxes are levied on the Jews—the revenue is much higher

because the Jewish population has a much higher yield in taxation. But if you take only one-third and compare to the figures provided by you, you will find about the same taxation for the Arab population as in the neighbouring countries. But there is an additional yield of taxation from the Jewish population which, in its predominant part—I do not complain about it—goes to improve the service of the Arab population, so that this particular structure of the taxable capacity of the country is all to the benefit of the Arab population in Palestine.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): We had here a statement made by the Jewish Agency that the oil companies do not pay customs, and do not pay income taxes. I would like to know if only oil firms enjoy such privileges, or whether there are other firms in Palestine with such privileges.

Mr. HOROWITZ: There are no other items of that kind. That is a separate agreement between the Palestine Government and the companies which establishes the refineries. The pipeline was laid in 1929 or 1930. When the contract was concluded, these privileges were afforded to these companies exclusively.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Is this exemption of taxation temporary or for the whole duration?

Mr. HOROWITZ: For the whole duration.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

(No response).

CHAIRMAN: Then we consider the questioning of you gentlemen, as concluded. Of course, we reserve our right to return to questions on other matters, if we should like to, later on.

I now call Rabbi Fishman.

*(At that point, Rabbi Fishman took his place at the table, and his remarks which were made in Hebrew were interpreted by Mr. Kaplan.)*

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Rabbi Fishman, I do not know the Bible, I do not pretend to know it, but I should like to get information from you, your point of view, and I hope you will enlighten me as to what you have to say in regard to a few matters which I will put to you.

Rabbi Fishman, what was "the Promised Land"?

RABBI FISHMAN: The Promised Land was quite a large one, from the river of Egypt, up to the Euphrates.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): It included the whole of Syria?

RABBI FISHMAN: Yes, a part.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The whole of Transjordan and Iraq?

RABBI FISHMAN: No.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The whole of Syria, Lebanon, present Palestine and Transjordan?

RABBI FISHMAN: Yes, possibly part of Syria and Lebanon.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When was the promise made by God?

RABBI FISHMAN: The promise was given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, about 4000 years ago.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When was it confirmed by God?

RABBI FISHMAN: It was reaffirmed to Moses.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did God also promise that twelve tribes would arise out of Ishmael, son of Hagar and Abraham?

RABBI FISHMAN: It was definitely stated, the sons of Isaac would inherit the land.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That was not the question. Did God promise that twelve tribes would arise out of Ishmael or not?

RABBI FISHMAN: He said not. Twelve tribes would arise only out of Jacob the son of Isaac.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When did Cyrus, the Persian king, order the Jews to return to Jerusalem?

RABBI FISHMAN: It was approximately 2400 years ago.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was not the promise of God made to Abraham and Moses fulfilled by Cyrus' order of return to Jerusalem?

RABBI FISHMAN: Cyrus gave only a part of the land to the Jews.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And therefore, according to you, a part of the promise of God was redeemed.

RABBI FISHMAN: Maccabeans enlarged the area that Cyrus gave back to the Jews. Cyrus put in his proposal to Jews only a part of the country and the Maccabeans later expanded that part.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Did the Arab Prince Yohan object to the Jews return with Cyrus' order and try to stop them?

RABBI FISHMAN: After the exile, many of the neighbouring peoples occupying a part of Palestine resisted the return of the Jews. Among them was also the gentleman mentioned by the representative of India.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): According to the Jews, was their return to this country not to take place with the appearance of the Messiah?

RABBI FISHMAN: No, in accordance with the Jewish tradition the Jews should return to Palestine before the Messiah comes, and Jerusalem should be a part of Palestine. Only then, after the return of the Jews to Palestine in accordance with the tradition, the Messiah may arrive.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How long after the return of the Jews will the Messiah arrive, according to you?

RABBI FISHMAN: That is a thing nobody can tell.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How long has Rabbi Fishman been in Palestine?

RABBI FISHMAN: Forty-one years.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How many synagogues were there in Palestine up to 1917?

RABBI FISHMAN: I cannot give the exact figure for the moment, but in Jerusalem there were about fourteen synagogues.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And outside Jerusalem?

RABBI FISHMAN: There were a lot in other places such as Jaffa, Hebron, some not existing now, at Safad, Haifa, Tiberias and in all the Jewish villages.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are there any Christian Jews in the country?

RABBI FISHMAN: It is not for me to answer. There may be Jews who are converted, but I do not mix with them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): But are there any?

RABBI FISHMAN: I do not know, because I do not mix with them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am asking you if you recognize Christian Jews to be Jews. The Government does not treat them as Jews.

RABBI FISHMAN: I think that a Jew, even if he has been converted and has committed a sin, is nevertheless a Jew and cannot free himself from the bondages of Judaism.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): So according to you, a Christian Jew is a Jew?

RABBI FISHMAN: I wrote a long article about that. Jews who have committed a sin and have been converted cannot free themselves from the bondages of Judaism.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): So, according to you, all the Christians and all the Moslems are Jews?

CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

RABBI FISHMAN: That is your opinion, not mine.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am asking your opinion.

CHAIRMAN: We will content ourselves with this answer. Are there any more questions to be put to Rabbi Fishman? Then I thank you, and we will now conclude the hearing of the Jewish Agency.

I suspend the hearing for ten minutes. After the suspension, we will hear representatives of the Vaad Leumi.

*(The meeting was suspended for ten minutes.)*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

### Hearing of the Representatives of the "Vaad Leumi"

We will now hear representatives of the Vaad Leumi. I understand Mr. Ben-Zevie, the President of the Vaad Leumi, is going to give the opening address.

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE (Vaad Leumi): We are a delegation of four.

CHAIRMAN: You may come up as you are going to speak. It is not necessary for all to stay on the platform while one is speaking. You will be called up in your turn.

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: Permit me, first of all, to extend the greetings of the Yishuv to you, the representatives of the United Nations who came here from west and east to establish the truth

about this land and its particular problem, which is unique in the world. We appreciate the trouble you have taken and particularly the interest you have shown in the Jewish settlements, both agricultural and urban. You saw the Holy Places reminding you of millenia of the history of this country, of Jewish history past, and you saw the pioneering generation, paving the way of the future. Be greeted in your task of bringing before the forum of the United Nations the problem of the people of Israel and the Land of Israel.

The Vaad Leumi, the General Council of the Jewish Community of Palestine, represents the entire organized Yishuv of over 600,000 Jews. Every single one of the 340 settlements, rural and urban, are units of the Knesset Israel, as the organized Jewish Community is called. Every four years general elections are held for the Elected Assembly, the supreme parliamentary body of the Yishuv. The last national elections were held in August 1944, when the number of electors amounted to 300,000, of whom 67 per cent went to the polls. We are the only body elected on a democratic basis authorized to speak on behalf of Palestine Jewry.

We submitted to you a number of memoranda, dealing with history, local autonomy, social services and features of Emergency Legislation, and my colleagues here will supplement the memoranda and reply to questions arising therefrom: Dr. Eliash, our honorary legal adviser and member of the delegation, here on my right, will speak on the attitude of the Yishuv to the problems now confronting Palestine, Dr. Katznelson, member of the Vaad Leumi Executive in charge of Health and Social Welfare, will follow and Mr. David Remez, the Chairman of the Vaad Leumi, will sum up and conclude our evidence.

I for myself wish to supplement here the historical memoranda.

Our right to Palestine is based upon our national history. Like any other nation we claim the elementary right to independence and we identify ourselves with the Jewish Agency demanding the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. Although in the course of our history we lost independence, we never gave up our entity as a nation, we never ceased hoping for our return to the Land and the restoration of our State. Only once in its history has this land had its independent statehood, and that was the Kingdom of Israel. The inhabitants who lived in the Land before the children of Israel came here never succeeded in laying the foundation to one political and cultural unit in Palestine. The Holy Scriptures and the living historical tradition of our nation tell us of the Jewish State established not only on the basis of common origin and background, but also of religion, culture, language and ideals. The Jewish State of Palestine existed for almost eleven centuries with small interruptions, from the days of Saul and David up to the darkest days of the destruction of the Temple by the Romans in the year 70 C. E. In spite of the fall of the independent

State, the bulk of the Jewish population in Palestine survived for almost another six centuries and shattered remainders clinged to their land and persisted in carrying on the tradition of their people. None of the conquerors in the history of the country, be they Romans, Arabs, Mongols, Mamelukes, or Turks, cared or succeeded in establishing a State, with the exception of the Latin Kingdom which only for ninety years formed a unity of the Land.

We firmly believe that the restoration of independence of the Land of Israel is the historical destiny of the entire Jewish people. In our paper called "Three Historical Memoranda" we prove that the Jewish nation never interrupted its connection with Palestine. In a special chapter, dealing with the continuity of Jewish settlement in Palestine, we prove that there was a Jewish population in existence in Palestine throughout the generations who never departed from the Holy Land and its soil. Moreover, waves of immigration kept coming from the Western as well as the Eastern and Oriental Diaspora. It is an historical fact that for centuries during the Arab rule, the Crusaders' and the Turkish period, the country remained a waste and disease-stricken Land and a population amounting perviously to 3,200,000 in the beginning of the seventh century dwindled down to 673,000 on the eve of the British occupation. Since then the population increased threefold, the whole population increased threhold; the Yishuv, that is the Jewish population, rose from some 60,000 to 640,000. A similar figure of increase was reached by the Arab sector, due both to natural increase and to immigration from neighbouring Arab countries. This was increased by nearly 600,000 during this time. It is remarkable that no similar increase and development took place in the neighbouring Transjordan, originally under the same British Mandate, where general conditions are not very much different from western Palestine and where natural resources are even more plentiful than here.

What is Palestine for us and what is it for the Arabs? For us, it is the sole refuge, the harbour of salvation and the sole hope for our dispersed nation, whilst for the Arabs it is a negligible part of the vast Arab territories. Compared with the Arab territories in Asia alone it represents 0.8 per cent, if we include Arab countries in Africa, Palestine is only 0.4 per cent. Even Arab countries with such natural resources as Iraq have a density of 8 per square kilometre, Syria, 15 per square kilometre. The vast Arab territories and their natural resources leave space for an enormous increase of the Arab population, and for their development they do not rely on this small country of 27,000 square kilometres, while the Asiatic Arab countries alone consist of 3,226,000 square kilometres with a total population of only about 14,000,000.

During the period of the Mandate the Jews made their supreme efforts to build up the country, believing that the process of reconstruction would be favoured and encouraged by the Mandatory according to the letter and

the spirit of the Mandate. Instead, the policy of the White Paper, of 1939 aimed at stopping further development, immigration and colonization of the country. We are convinced that if we had had the liberty of taking charge of our own affairs, hundreds of thousands might have been brought to Palestine and been saved. Now we face the fact that over one million of those who survived the Nazi inferno are condemned to utter despair if they are not granted immediate facilities of immigration. The strong links between them and us, among them there are many of their own families, and the wish to be reunited increase their anguish. The homes of the Yishuv are kept open, in every settlement, in every village, in every town dwelling to receive saved brethren.

At the same time the position of Jewish minorities in the neighbouring countries is rapidly deteriorating politically, culturally and economically. The development during the past twenty-five years of the newly established Arab States does not provide any chance for non-Arab minorities, be they Assyrians, Kurds or Jews. The sole hope of the Jewish minorities is the exodus.

Our appeal to you is: Open the gates of our country.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to conclude with a citation of a prophet who prophesied three thousand years ago, Isaiah: (62.10 ff.) "Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people. Behold the LORD hath proclaimed unto the end of the world, 'Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, the salvation cometh.'"

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mr. Ben Zevie.

I recognize Dr. Eliash.

MR. ELIASH: It was about sixteen months ago, in March 1946, that this delegation sat before this very table and pleaded the same cause which it has come to do today. It then endeavoured to explain the attitude of the Yishuv in matters of general policy, and it is today again to explain its attitude to the problems confronting Palestine today.

I am sure that after all you have heard from the various witnesses who presented the Jewish case, you will be convinced that had anyone predicted sixteen months ago that the people who are pining away in the concentration camps, now called centres of assembly, would pass another winter and would be faced now with a third winter, we would have called them in this country "false prophets," or perhaps, in these modern times, I should say "false experts." But we are again before you to explain the attitude of the Yishuv in these matters.

Now the Yishuv, as the Jewish population of Palestine is generally called, is on the one hand a link, the present day link in that long chain of Jewish generations in Palestine which goes back to its national life, to that very national home which is to be reconstituted in Palestine.

On the other hand, it represents the embodiment of the modern national home called into being by the Balfour Declaration and as a result of that process of rebuilding the Jewish nation to which our sons and our daughters have responded from east and west, from north to south, they have contributed to creating the present-day Yishuv.

You may well ask yourselves why we, the handful of Jews in Palestine, assume to come before you to state a case after it has been so eloquently stated by the representatives—the fully-accredited representatives—of the Jewish people as a whole. I may say, it is because we in Palestine consider ourselves trustees over certain values, certain created and recreated values for the Jewish people outside.

I see that in the Report of the Anglo-American Committee it is stated that one Jewish witness stated to the Commission that the people in Palestine consider themselves a "vanguard of an army which is to follow." I am afraid this statement does not rightly represent what the Yishuv feels about itself. We are here as the beginners of a task, as those to whom the privilege has fallen to start and make it easier for those to come. And that is why we think that the discussion as to whether the national home is already established is both idle and irrelevant, in the same way as it would be idle and irrelevant to discuss whether a child has already reached manhood; so that it should now be put into a concrete casing. For that is how we see the departure from the policy of the Mandate, that the national home is to be considered crystallized so that it may be petrified; it is to be considered sufficiently grown so it may be stultified; it is to be considered sufficiently developed so it may now be maimed and crippled.

We, in Palestine, the Yishuv, have come to see that immigration to Palestine is regarded by us as our very life blood, as the very essence of our continued existence and development. It may, perhaps, be strange that an economic entity should not consider itself in a position in which it should advocate the elimination of competition, in which professions, trade unions, merchants, artisans should not come and say, we do not want anyone to come in and compete with us. And perhaps it is also another unique feature among the unique features of the Palestine case that you find that the Yishuv not only suffers through the White Paper in that its next of kin cannot be rejoined, its families and those people have been waiting now for years to see remnants, sole remnants of families who survived the holocaust of Europe, but that it also feels itself stunted in its growth, that it feels itself deprived in the influx of fresh blood, fresh energy, forces which help it to exist and to continue in its growth.

The position is at present such in Palestine that if a man welcomes in his home his own wife, who may have come into Palestine from a concentration camp, but has not obtained the necessary permit, he would be liable for helping an illegal immigrant and would be

facing a penalty of eight years imprisonment and a fine of one thousand pounds. This is laid down in our Emergency Defence Regulations, and the anomalous position has been created that if you harbour a murderer in your home you are only liable to three years imprisonment. What is more, if that murderer happens to be a close relative, you would not be prosecuted at all, but for harbouring an illegal immigrant, whoever he may be, the penalty which faces the wicked person so doing is eight years imprisonment and a fine of one thousand pounds.

It is in these conditions that the Yishuv has been living for the last eight or nine years, and it is this that we have come forward to tell you. The same White Paper has left about two and a half per cent of Palestine where land could be acquired by Jews. You may wonder why the figure is two and a half and not five per cent as was mentioned by other witnesses who have addressed you; it is because half of that area already belongs to Jews, half of the free area, as it is called. But the remarkable provision is also this: it is not as if the legislator, in his wisdom, decided that a certain part of Palestine should be reserved for Jewish development and another part for Arab development. This legislator excluded entirely Jews from the 95 per cent, but left the 5 per cent—or the two and a half per cent, as I called it—to free competition, not only to free competition in Palestine, but to any Syrian or Egyptian investor who desires to invest his money in land which is bound to rise in price, because the Jews must buy it one way or another. It has so arranged matters that the entire Arab energy, both financially and politically by the way of propaganda can be directed to prevent the sale to Jews of these two and a half per cent. That anyone placing his land on the market can be either persuaded or intimidated not to sell it to the Jews who are free to buy it if they can.

And in addition to that, the Yishuv is at present regarding, as has been stated already to you, with the gravest apprehension new proposed legislation as to the water resources in Palestine. Not the surface water resources, which are vested in the High Commissioner, and as regards which no legislation has yet been proposed, but the underground water resources, which are created by special effort; and as regards these, too, the widest possible powers will be exercised by officials whose word will be final and the Yishuv gravely fears lest this be another means of curbing its activities and of restricting its expansion. This White Paper has been introduced to the Yishuv as an introduction to a minority status in Palestine, and I think the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry have used the word "terror," by saying "community lives in the terror of remaining a minority, and perhaps a steadily diminishing minority in this country." The minority was offered safeguards, and perhaps it may not be amiss if I mention one case of safeguards which has turned out to be of very little protection.

The Mandate of Palestine, which was ap-



proved by fifty nations, contained a safeguard in its Article 15, that no legislation shall be passed in Palestine which tends to discriminate between the inhabitants of Palestine on the grounds of race or religion. The Palestine Order-in-Council provided a further safeguard by providing in one of its sections—in fact, in three of the sections—in one of its sections that the Legislative Council of Palestine should not be able to legislate in a manner which discriminated between the inhabitants. In another place, that the High Commissioner should not be able to legislate in that manner, and finally, in Section 89, that His Majesty reserves himself the right to legislate in Palestine only in accordance with the Mandate.

And yet the very same Order-in-Council was amended by the insertion of this Article 16 (d) which discriminates between the people of Palestine on the ground of race and religion and limits the rights of the Jews to buy land, even from fellow Jews if the land happens to be in Zone A.

We are living now in a period where history is rapidly giving new forms to peoples and to governments, and we see before our own eyes how two sections of a great people who joined to struggle together for their freedom, one of them containing a very large and powerful minority, decided not to rely on safeguards for its future. It may be a very indicative pointer to the Jewish people as to whether safeguards could help a minority living among a majority. Moreover, this Yishuv has real state functions imposed upon it. It has to provide its own social services, and in that connexion may I say a word about this question of taxation, which served as a subject of interrogations this morning.

The position in Palestine is not such that the Jewish community is taxed and then the services are equally divided, as a result of which the Arab community benefits by sheer weight of its numbers. If one applied the principle that the rich have to be taxed so that the poor may have their services, one would still wonder whether in any country the rich are taxed and then they are told, "Oh, water? We are not going to give you. Schools we are not going to give you, because you are rich. Hospitals we are not going to give you, because you can provide them for yourselves." It seems to me that if the principle of taxing the rich is common, so also is the principle of giving the essential services to the rich and poor alike. And even if this myth of the Jewish community being the rich and the Arab community being the poor were fully and scientifically established, the iniquity of taxing the Jewish community and then telling it to provide for its own education, its own health and its own necessities, does, in my submission, call for some comment.

But in addition to these functions of maintaining the community as such, it is obvious that the Jews of Palestine will have to do their share—and the lion's share it will be—in re-establishing the shattered remnants of Jewry

now in Europe. They will have to do it as a people and not as a community. They will have to find their place among other nations who are being helped by the richer, the happier of nations to rehabilitate their own people, and as we stand now, a community only without a standing in the world as a people, we shall certainly not be able to perform that duty.

We also stand entirely defenceless in matters of political action and reaction by others of our neighbours. You have heard about the boycott of our goods; you have heard about the difficulty one has to get across a neighbouring country, the impossibility of procuring a visa for a child if it has to get across a country which does not like any more Jews coming to Palestine. We stand entirely defenceless in that regard. We cannot either suggest reciprocation or appeal to our own practice as Jews for the abolition of those practices against us, and it is only when we shall be one day able to act as a people that we shall be able to defend ourselves against these discriminations.

There is another result of this policy—perhaps the most tragic one for us, the people of Palestine—and that is the cancer which is growing in our flesh, the terror of which one hears the Jews as a whole so often accused, with the result that our own children have turned away from the precepts of their fathers. Generations of Jews have taught them the great Command: "Thou shalt not kill;" and the Yishuv is rent and torn between the desire to eradicate the cancer and the impossibility of co-operating with a Government which has proclaimed as its declared policy to condemn us to the status of a minority in this country. As a result, we have lived now for years in a regime of defence regulations. You will find that these regulations have become quite a substantial part of the Statute Book of Palestine. They have been given the dignity of a special edition by the Government, in which they are all collected until 2 March 1947. Since then they have again been increased, improved and amended. You will find in them that laws can be promulgated even orally without any publication; that they can be contrary to any other law of the country and yet would prevail. That other law may even be the Order-in-Council itself—that great source of safeguard. You will find that property and liberty are not properly protected. As a result hundreds of people are in detention camps. That many of them are innocent is obvious from the fact that some of them get gradually released as investigations proceed.

Is this the regime which is to be perpetuated? Is this the regime to which no solution is to be found? We have come here to pray that the solution may be a radical one and an early one. The organized conscience of mankind has found it possible to do justice to the Jew individually in almost every nation. The great ideals of the French Revolution have taught the world liberty, equality, fraternity as regards individual Jews in each of these countries. Perhaps the great ideals now animate the United Nations

will teach the organized conscience of mankind to do justice to the Jews as a people. And then we in Palestine shall be given the status not of a religious community merely, as we are now, but of the people of Israel in the Land of Israel.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Eliash.

I recognize Dr. Katznelson.

*(Dr. Katznelson took a seat at the table.)*

DR. KATZNELSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: In our memorandum "The Jewish Community of Palestine and its Social Services," which we have submitted to you, we described the structure of the Jewish Community of Palestine, its authority and functions, as well as the development of its social services: Education, Health, and Social Welfare. In the memorandum it was explained that the burden of these services, which have reached the accepted standards of a civilized community, is borne almost entirely by the Yishuv, without appropriate aid from the Government Treasury, and without even the necessary authority to raise funds by means of progressive taxation, such as the imposition of a special income tax upon the members of the community.

The object of my evidence is to illustrate this peculiar state of affairs by further factual descriptions of the situation.

The Social Services have always been the deep concern of the Jewish community and its local and national authorities. Care for the education of the younger generation, for the health of the inhabitants, and for the relief of the needy, has long ceased to be regarded by the Yishuv as the concern of private organizations and philanthropic societies. The Yishuv regards this as a public duty incumbent upon the central and local authorities, and claims a just distribution of the financial burden involved between these two factors. But in vain. The Government of Palestine looks upon the Yishuv mainly as a source of Government revenue, and upon its readiness to fend for itself as sufficient reason for depriving it of the aid due to it from such revenue.

Here are a few figures.

Over 6 million pounds were spent in 1945-46 by the Jewish social services; that is, some ten pounds per capita—a sum normal in a progressive community, and certainly not high considering the conditions under which the Jewish community is living and developing in Palestine. How do Government and the Yishuv share in providing this sum? Not on the fifty-fifty basis normal, for example, in England and other countries, but in a proportion of 5 to 95. And this 95 per cent is not, as many seem to believe, largely derived from outside sources; only 13 per cent of the total sum comes from abroad, the remainder being provided by the Yishuv itself.

Here is a diagram illustrating this proportion, or rather, disproportion, of revenue from various sources. Here is the expenditure on Jewish social services 1945-46.

It is divided according to sources of income.

The Jewish community of Palestine provides 82 per cent; Jewish sources abroad—mainly American sources, including Hadassah—13 per cent; Government of Palestine 5 per cent.

This disproportion is even more marked in the Yishuv's health budget, if taken separately. Out of the 3 million pounds spent on this service, only 1.6 per cent is provided by Government. In this budget, too, the income from outside sources is small. You have seen Hadassah's University Hospital on Mount Scopus, and have learned something of its splendid work, but the contribution of Hadassah in America towards the health budget of the Yishuv is less than 10 per cent of the total. Nor does this contribution come from rich people in America, but is the result of the voluntary effort of Hadassah's 200,000 members. The main sources from which our health services derive their income are the health insurance fees paid by Jewish workers.

Here you see the health budget of the Yishuv (see diagram page 16 of "Palestine's Health in Figures") that is included in the previous sum of 6 million pounds. The health budget amounts to some 3 million pounds a year and is derived 90.2 per cent from the Yishuv, 8.2 per cent from Jewish sources abroad—almost entirely American Hadassah—and 1.6 per cent from the Government of Palestine.

As I said, the main sources from which our health services derive their income are the health insurance fees paid by Jewish workers—members of the Workers' Sick Fund, named in Hebrew Kupat Holim—from patients' fees and, to a lesser extent, municipal rates. In 1946 the expenditure of Kupat Holim which covers practically the entire Jewish working population—nearly 50 per cent of the community—amounted to LP 1,900,000. The health of the worker is a national asset—a definition accepted in international labour conventions, and it would have been natural to divide this expenditure equally among the three factors concerned: the Worker, the Employer, and the Government. Instead, the proportion is 82:15:1, and even this one per cent has been obtained only recently in the form of a small grant to the Kupat Holim Hospitals.

Here is the diagram illustrating the position of this chief medical institution in this country, spending, as I said, last year, 1946, LP 1,900,000. 82 per cent is paid by the workers themselves; 16 per cent by employers—voluntarily, because there is no legislation at all in this respect—1 per cent by the Government; 1 per cent from other sources.

In our memorandum to you it was pointed out that for years Government has been requested in vain by the Vaad Leumi to come to the aid of Kupat Holim, both by means of appropriate social legislation and by contributing towards the cost of maintenance of their services. The following extracts of letters addressed by the Government Department of Health to the Vaad Leumi, in reply to the latter's representations in this matter, are characteristic of Government's attitude:

"... It is the opinion of this department—that is the Department of Health—that legislation that involves compulsory contributions towards health insurance, however desirable it may be for the Jewish workers, would not be accepted favourably by the majority of the labourers of this country" . . . and

"... In the opinion of Government, the stage of development so far reached in Palestine is not such as to admit of the establishment of a general health or social insurance scheme, and in the absence of such a scheme it will be appreciated that Government cannot properly make contribution to a fund maintained for the benefit of only one section of the population."

This attitude, in effect, means that Government shirks its elementary duties towards the health of a large working community and has placed on the shoulders of this community the entire burden of providing its medical requirements. The readiness of the worker to pay excessive dues, in relation to his limited earnings, in order to ensure medical facilities when he falls ill, is a strange reason for withholding from him his share of assistance from public funds.

As to the extent which the Yishuv benefits from Government's social services—Government's education system, as you know, is purely Arab, and Government's health services meet the Yishuv's requirements only to a small extent. Less than six per cent of all Jewish patients admitted to hospitals, and only three per cent of all Jewish out-patients attending clinics receive treatment in Government institutions.

Here is the diagram illustrating the position of the hospitalization of Jewish patients in Palestine (page 12, "Palestine Health in Figures"). Some 52,000 Jewish patients are treated in hospitals yearly. Out of this 52,000, 48,000—92.1 per cent—are treated in Jewish hospitals; less than 3,000—or 5.5 per cent—in Government hospitals, and 2.4 per cent in non-Jewish hospitals—that is, missionary hospitals. That is the position with regard to hospitalization of Jewish patients.

The next diagram (page 13 of "Palestine Health in Figures") illustrates the great shortage of beds in our hospitals. In the Jewish hospitals the daily bed occupancy is over a hundred per cent, and that is the average. That means there are days when many additional beds are put in the corridors; in Government hospitals, the bed occupancy is seventy-five per cent, and in the missionary hospitals only about fifty per cent. This shortage of beds is a constant source of suffering for hundreds of patients, including many serious cases which must be refused admission to hospitals. The distribution of Jewish out-patients treated in the dispensaries of various institutions can be seen from the diagram on page 14 of "Palestine Health in Figures": 95.4 per cent are treated in Jewish clinics, 3.1 per cent in Government clinics, and 1.5 per cent in missionary clinics—non-Jewish clinics.

I wish to mention here that all these figures given here are Government figures. In our book-

let distributed among the members of the Committee, these figures are included and the sources are indicated there; they are all official sources.

Most characteristic of Government's health policy is its attitude to the Jewish medical profession. Jewish doctors constitute some 90 per cent of Palestine's medical profession, but what is their share in Government's medical services? Out of a total of 13 senior medical officer, there is not one Jew—all being Britishers and Arabs; and of the twenty-five medical officers, Grade I, twenty are Arabs and only five are Jews, the latter having been appointed only a few months ago, possibly a result of some pressure on behalf of the Vaad Leumi.

Here is a diagram illustrating the position (page 15, "Palestine's Health in Figures"). You see that among 2,700 doctors in Palestine, some 2,400—nearly 90 per cent—are Jews, and some 10 per cent non-Jews.

However, among thirteen Government Senior Medical Officers, there are no Jews, at all, and among twenty-five Medical Officers Grade I, there are only five Jews.

This is at a time when Jewish doctors have earned great popularity among Arabs in Palestine as well as in the neighbouring countries. According to the official figures available, some 2,500 non-Jewish patients are treated yearly in Jewish hospitals and many thousands of non-Jewish out-patients in Jewish dispensaries. In this connexion it is of interest to note that even after the official boycott on Jewish doctors, proclaimed some time ago by the Arab Medical Association, Arab patients continue to attend the Jewish medical institutions as before. I would add to that in Jerusalem there are more Arabs in the Hadassah Hospital than there are Jews in the Government hospital.

Government's health policy places the Yishuv in a most serious dilemma: either to cut down its essential services, educational, medical and social welfare, or to increase more and more the rates and fees already over-burdening the members of the Jewish Community. The Yishuv endeavours to follow the latter path, raising health insurance dues and municipal rates, as well as payments for services, such as patients' fees, tuition fees in schools, and maintenance fees in social welfare institutions, etc. The latter recourse is contrary to the social character of these services, and greatly affects the poorer sections of the community. This is particularly felt in the mixed towns where practically no aid is forthcoming from the municipal authorities towards the social needs of the population.

Whereas it is the Government's policy as regards the Jewish community not to help those who help themselves; its policy as regards the Arab community is the reverse—to help those who do not help themselves. All the Arab social services are maintained, with a few exceptions, by Government. The contribution towards these services from local taxation and fees is insignificant. Instead of educating the Arab community towards financial and administrative responsi-

bility through participation of their local authorities in the maintenance and administration of their social services, Government absolves them from this responsibility. Instead of encouraging Arab initiative, Government discourages Jewish initiative. In this way Government cannot, naturally, meet the health needs of the population with the small funds at its disposal for health purposes, even after disregarding its duty towards the Jewish community. Outstanding is Government's failure in two fields of public health which should have been its main concern: The fight against tuberculosis, and the care for mental diseases.

In 1935 a Government expert who made an inquiry into the state of tuberculosis in this country reported as follows:

"The problem of tuberculosis among all communities in Palestine is of sufficient gravity to warrant systematic attention on modern lines, the valuable time lost by the inability of Government to take active measures in the past making the position all the more urgent."

Since that report nothing has been done to carry out its recommendations. Moreover, when the Vaad Leumi last year submitted to Government a plan for the erection of two tuberculosis hospitals—a total of 400 beds—which are badly needed to meet the most pressing demands of the Jewish community, and asked for a capital grant of twenty-five per cent of the total cost involved—that means taking upon itself seventy-five per cent—their request was rejected by Government.

The shortage of beds for mental patients sometimes takes on an aspect of a public scandal. The decision taken by Government some twenty years ago to establish a large mental hospital in Jerusalem has not yet materialized. Government's failure to respond to these vital requirements of the community is even more striking in view of the fact that Government's estimates of revenue and expenditure for the year 1947–1948 show, on 31 March 1947, a surplus of six million pounds.

It is regrettable that Government's health budget is relatively small, constituting only five per cent of its total expenditure. Government, as is known, argues that it is unable to set aside larger sums for social services owing to the large expenditure on security; but it is also a fact that in peaceful years, for example, 1931–1935, the percentage of expenditure on health services was not higher than at present. However, even granting Government's argument, one asks oneself whether it is indeed for the Jewish taxpayer to bear the heavy burden of taxes in order to enable Government to maintain a regime in Palestine devoid of any moral or constitutional basis.

These are the political and administrative conditions under which the Yishuv has to meet its ever-growing needs; to provide educational facilities for every Jewish child in a land where education is not compulsory; to care for the health of the worker in a country where health

insurance, is, again, not compulsory; to maintain welfare services in a country where there are no legislative provisions for social security. The voluntary funds established for these purposes by the General Federation of Jewish Labour, such as the Unemployment Fund, the Invalidity Fund, Pensions Fund, etc., receive no assistance whatsoever either from Government or from employers.

Under such conditions the Yishuv has not only to care for the maintenance of its normal services, but had, from the very beginning, to overcome the obstacles which beset the path of the early settler, and first and foremost, to eliminate the dangers which threatened his health and very life through the diseases prevalent in the country. The few maps and diagrams which I am going to present to you illustrate some of the achievements in this field.

Taking first the great problem of malaria: you see here an official map taken from a Government survey published before the war (last map in "Palestine's Health in Figures"). It is Palestine in 1920. The blue areas are the highly infected malaria areas. In the blue area the rate of infection was, in 1920, 50–100 per cent. The rest of the country was also malarial, but the percentage was from ten to fifty per cent. That is the malaria rate of Palestine in 1920 as presented by an official map of the Government of Palestine.

Now comes another map—the map of Jewish settlements in Palestine since 1920. From the brown spots you can see that the Jewish settler almost closely followed the highly infected areas of malaria. What it meant to the Jewish settler and the Jewish health service during the twenty-five years is quite obvious.

The next diagram illustrates the results of Jewish anti-malaria work during the twenty-five years (page 9, "Palestine's Health in Figures"). This work started in 1922 with the establishment of a special institution for malaria research. Here you can see some of the areas—settled by the Jews; the Huleh, the Beisan and the Emek Hefer, and you can see how malaria incidence in these areas dropped during the years to an almost negligible percentage. Even in the Huleh area, which is far from being reclaimed.

Here we come to another disease, trachoma (diagram, page 10, "Palestine's Health in Figures"), which was severely endemic in Palestine after the First World War and now has dropped to almost a negligible rate among the Jewish population. It is also decreasing constantly among the Arabs. Here are two lines: one, the Jewish community as a whole, and the other, the Oriental Jews, such as the Tiberias community, which had a percentage of 80 of trachoma among the school children, and is now nearing almost the average rate of the Jewish community in Palestine.

Here is the Arab line showing the decrease in trachoma incidence, from which it appears that the work of the Government in the Arab

schools was less successful, at any rate, than the Jewish, and trachoma came again among the Oriental Jews where the same rate of trachoma among the school children was as among the Arabs.

I now refer to a diagram entitled "Mortality from Typhoid in Various Countries" (Page 11). This chart shows that the results of the anti-typhoid measures are disappointing. The reason why they are disappointing is because we had no control of the Arab sector, and over the sources of the disease. You will see here that while in the Western countries typhoid is at a low ebb and does not exist as a serious disease—the Palestine Jewish community here belongs to the backward countries, and the Arab community has the highest percentage of typhoid mortality—nearly two per thousand of population. The Jewish community has about one case per thousand a year. But, that includes also a lot of cases of typhoid which could be prevented by an effective campaign against it, by measures of sanitation, etc. Now, we are compelled, almost every year to provide mass inoculation against typhoid, similar to the method used in the army during the war, in order to prevent the disease. For example, we tried to prevent this disease by inoculating all our school children, but it certainly is not a means to eradicate it—it is only a means to prevent outbreaks.

I now refer to a diagram entitled "Death Rates" (Page 3). Here you see death rates per one thousand population. The lowest line indicates Palestine Jews. The next line just above indicates Palestine Moslems. The top line indicates Egypt. You can see here that the Jewish mortality rate dropped from some 16 to some  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per thousand of the population. The Moslem mortality rate again dropped very rapidly and is now nearing the European mortality rate. There was a time when the Moslem mortality rate, twenty years ago, was higher than the Egyptian mortality rate. At the same time the Egyptian mortality rate is almost on the same level as it was twenty years ago. All these diagrams, as I mentioned, are based on official figures. With regard to Egypt, the official figures are those of the Egyptian Government. I now refer to a diagram entitled "Death Rates in Thirty Countries" (Page 4). This diagram, and I am referring to the one indicating the situation after the First World War, shows the position of Palestine among thirty countries. Below you see Palestine's position immediately before or after World War II. After the First World War, some twenty-five years ago, you see the Palestine Jews in the Middle of these thirty countries. Now it has advanced to first place. As I have mentioned, the Jewish mortality rate in Palestine is one of the lowest in the world—6.5. Also, the Moslem mortality rate advanced from second place to much nearer to the European countries, leaving behind almost all the oriental countries.

I now refer to a diagram entitled "Infant Mortality in Palestine and Egypt." (Page 6). Here

again you see the decrease, almost parallel, in the Jewish infant mortality with the Moslem infant mortality for the past twenty years. The Egyptian mortality rate again remained as it was some twenty years ago.

I now refer to a diagram entitled "Infant Mortality among Oriental and European Jews in Palestine" (Page 7). Here is an important picture, illustrated by this diagram, showing what can be achieved by modern health work, and particularly by modern infant health work. As you know, there is in Palestine a considerable proportion of Oriental Jews. These Oriental Jews had a very high infant mortality rate. It was almost as high as it was in the Arab sector of the community. Now, due to the constant efforts by the Infant Welfare Services, by the Hadassah Medical Organization, and by other bodies, it dropped almost to the rate of the European part of the Jewish community. Here are Jewish children of European origin, and here are Jewish children of Oriental origin—you can readily see the difference. Once again it must be stressed at this point that among the Oriental Jews the percentage of the very poor is very high, I may say even higher than the average. But the diagram shows that the difference in mortality rates in the richer classes and in the poorer classes can be abolished by systematic and extensive medical work.

I now refer to a diagram entitled "Child Mortality in Palestine" (Page 8, "Palestine Health in Figures"). This is a diagram showing child mortality up to the age of five years. Here are Moslems and here are Jews. Among the Moslems, out of one thousand new born children about five hundred died before the age of five. That was the position fifteen years ago. Now you can see that it has dropped to nearly half, only two hundred and fifty. This refers to all towns of Palestine.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Did you say two hundred?

Mr. KATZNELSON: No, two hundred and fifty—nearly half the previous rate. Now here we have again the Moslem mortality among children in purely Arab districts. You see it as it was fifteen years ago and as it is now. But, if you compare that with mixed districts, Jaffa rural sub-district and Haifa rural sub-district, you can see the beneficial effect of Jewish settlement on Arab child mortality. In the purely Arab districts the rate is much higher than in the mixed-districts of Jaffa and Haifa. Jewish mortality among children is certainly lower, but still one hundred are dying before the age of five. It is quite clear that the mortality rate among the Moslem people can be dropped even more if Jewish settlement is allowed to continue.

Now to conclude my evidence. What conclusions are to be drawn from the above facts?

A. The Jewish community of Palestine has proved by a quarter of a century of constructive work its ability to establish and maintain, under the most unfavorable conditions, public services on a national scale for the benefit of the Jewish

population and the country as a whole. B. The political conditions in this country are in complete contradiction to the progressive character of the Jewish Community, and shackle its constructive ability to develop this country for the absorption of immigration on a scale appropriate to the needs of the Jewish people. C. The present state of affairs involves the Yishuv in a tragic and constant conflict between its social requirements, which are those of a civilized state, and its potentialities which are those of a voluntary organization. There is only one remedy for the present intolerable situation, and that is to grant the Jewish community of Palestine a status which will enable it to fulfill its historic mission by establishing a Jewish State in Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Katznelson, and I recognize Mr. David Remez.

*(At that point, Mr. David Remez took a seat at the table).*

MR. REMEZ (Chairman of the Vaad Leumi): On coming here to sum up the testimony which has been submitted in the name of the Yishuv, I should like to mention first of all that the news of the visit here of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine was received by the Yishuv with hope and faith even though we are weary of enquiries. More than two years have passed since the end of the World War against Hitler, and we have seen only broken pledges and unfulfilled promises as far as the Jewish people is concerned. We said, "At last the question has reached the judgment seat of the United Nations, and the day for pronouncing an international verdict has come." You took the trouble to travel North and South; you did not mind undertaking tiring journeys on our hot summer days, and we are grateful for it. We believe that what you see with your own eyes is the best testimony to our enterprise. You have seen for yourselves by what a powerful urge to live and by what a strong creative impulse are moved those who bear the main burden of the work of our revival. These are not destructive, but creative forces which have never been frightened of sand or swamp, of rocks or desert. Through much pioneering labour all this has been turned into agricultural land which can support a thriving population. We have actually only one prayer: that you, the delegates of the United Nations, will understand this great constructive endeavour which derives from the hopes of generations now at last being fulfilled. The responsibility which falls on you and those who sent you is all the greater precisely because, internationally approached, the problem is not difficult of solution.

2. The historical connexions of the Jewish people with its land are not mummified memories of the past; they are those of a living people which has ever kept its faith in its deliverance and restoration. The associations of the past and the hopes of the future are inseparably bound together. On these two shores, the past and the future, beat the waves of Jewish immi-

gration from all parts of their exile and at all times, defying the perils of the journey and the various oppressive regimes in this country. The world acknowledged this unique connexion and the League of Nations gave it its express approval in the Palestine Mandate.

3. The Yishuv is a hardy community, educated to independence and self-defence from its very inception. From the days of Ottoman rule in Palestine it has undergone severe trials. Those responsible for the government of the country were not always able or willing firmly to defend the Jews. Nevertheless, the Yishuv struck root; it created a new agriculture and industry, revived its language, set up scientific institutes until, today, it represents a self-contained economic and cultural entity, capable of carrying out its historic mission, sanctioned by the Nations of the World—that of gathering together the dispersed of Israel in their home. If a man does not take his homeless and afflicted brother into his home, then he is no real brother or his home is not a home. Our home, our National Home, is closed to us from the outside, and for two years we have been battering our heads against the doors guarded by fleets and aeroplanes. It would be your privilege, delegates of the nations, to open these gates at once. Do not let the poison sink further into the souls of these outcasts and into our own souls. And these outcasts in Europe are not the only ones.

4. We know that the anvil of our work is the waste-lands. It is within our power to fertilize them and drive out desolation from all corners of the country. We are thankful to Providence that our work does not despoil others but adds something to what they have. It raises us and our neighbours; and our neighbours, the Arabs, cannot rightly obstruct our return. You, delegates of the nations, know that five Arab States are already represented in the United Nations, the sixth stands outside of his own free will, and the seventh, whose territory was originally included within the boundaries of the Mandate, is seeking admission. The area of land which is in the possession of these States is enormous, but all sparsely populated. Is there really any international law that even the poor man's ewe lamb, his only one, should be given to the rich?

5. The Yishuv and the Zionist Movement have declared in explicit terms that an independent Jewish State will be based, from the beginning, on the assurance of full civic, cultural and religious rights for the Arabs, whether as individuals or as a community. A threefold safeguard will here be operative; the presence of the Arab peoples around us and our sincere wish to live in peace with them, the existence of scattered Jewish communities throughout the world, and the adherence of the Jewish State to the principles of the United Nations. But you cannot reverse this claim and suggest to the Jews that instead of political independence in their own country—the only one they have in the world—they should accept minority rights while



the Arabs should receive yet another State in addition to the seven they already have.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to indicate the following three essential points:

- a. *No more delay.* No more letting the bitterness of disappointment seep into the hearts of Jews. The most cruel feature of this situation is delay.
- b. *No solution that is not a real solution.* What use will any constitutional arrangement be to us if it makes us dependent on those who deny the essential principle—our right to return to our country and develop it as our homeland?
- c. *No further patronage.* We have reached the point where the consummation of our enterprise as well as the creation of friendly relations between ourselves and the Arabs are contingent on our independence. Once a Jewish State has come into being, reciprocal relations between it and its neighbours will follow. Give the constructive genius of the Jewish people a proper chance and one of the sorest international problems will have found a just and happy solution.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mr. Remez. Now, I would like to put to you some questions. You have indicated certain general principles, but if you should try to put these general principles into a more concrete form what solution would you propose?

MR. REMEZ: Our President, Mr. Ben-Zevie, has declared in his opening address that we identify ourselves entirely with the political demands of the Jewish Agency which has largely been explained, I believe.

CHAIRMAN: So you want to promote the same solution as the Jewish Agency?

MR. REMEZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What about the partition scheme which has been discussed here so many times?

MR. REMEZ: We identify ourselves also in this respect with the declaration made by the Chairman of the Jewish Agency, Mr. Ben Gurion. We are ready to negotiate a proposal for establishment of a Jewish State, without prejudice to our main claim.

CHAIRMAN: Does any Member of the Committee want to ask any question?

MR. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask if the problem of Palestine and the solution the Jewish Agency is presenting has been discussed in the representative bodies of the Yishuv in Palestine and, if so, whether we could then get some information on the results. Have you taken votes on any decisions which have been reached?

MR. REMEZ: Yes, sir. There were many discussions, naturally, in the elected bodies of the Jewish community. But, as a part of the Jewish people, we are included in a World Organization, and we accept the decisions made by the Zionist Congress as binding for us as well.

MR. BLOM (Netherlands): You said there have been discussions in the representative body of the Vaad Leumi. Was it then decided that whatever the Zionist Congress and, on their behalf, the Jewish Agency would present as the opinion of the Jews all over the world would be accepted by the Yishuv also, or with specific proposals and specific solutions by your representative body before the discussions came up?

MR. REMEZ: One of the fundamentals of the Yishuv and of the elected assembly of the Yishuv is that they are included and consider themselves as a part of the World Jewish Organization. I would say it is a constitutional basis accepted forever. But, we have also identified ourselves with the request for a Jewish State. That is a resolution accepted by the elected assembly of the Yishuv identifying the Yishuv with the establishment of a Jewish State. If you like we could provide you with the resolution.

MR. BLOM (Netherlands): It is not quite clear to me yet. If it is constitutional that the Vaad Leumi should not present its own separate view, why then discuss it in the representative body of the Vaad Leumi. My first question was if the problem had been discussed and the answer was, yes.

DR. ELIASH: If you will be good enough to glance at the very last page of the Supplement presented to the United Nations by the Government you will find there that the Yishuv has sent 79 delegates to the last Zionist Congress, and that these delegates belong to various political parties. The same political parties, most of them, are also represented in the elected assembly of the Jewish community. There can be no doubt that the question which so vitally affects the future of a community would merit the liveliest discussion in its representative assembly. But at the same time, it cannot constitutionally pass a resolution which would be binding on the Jewish people. On the contrary, a resolution to the contrary would be binding on the Jewish population of Palestine which considers itself politically affiliated with it. Therefore, while there is a discussion of the current thought in the country and the opinion of the Jewish community is considered and given due weight by the Zionist World Organization, the actual resolution which is presented on behalf of the Jewish people is on behalf of the Jewish Agency and not of the Vaad Leumi.

CHAIRMAN: I want to put a question in connexion with the one put by Mr. Blom. I read here in the opening address of Mr. Ben-Zevie the following: "The Vaad Leumi, the General Council of the Jewish community of Palestine, represents the entire organized Yishuv of over 600,000 Jews. Every single one of the three hundred and forty settlements, rural and urban, is a unit of the Knesset Israel, as the organized Jewish community is called. Every four years general elections are held for the Elected Assembly, the supreme parliamentary body of the Yishuv. The last national elections were held in August 1944, when the number of electors

amounted to 300,000, of whom 67 per cent went to the polls. We are the only body, elected on a democratic basis, authorized to speak on behalf of Palestine Jewry." How many members does this elected parliamentary body consist of?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: One hundred seventy-one members.

CHAIRMAN: And does this body elect representatives to the Zionist Congress?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: Not exactly. This body elects only the Vaad Leumi, the Executive Council which is called General Council or National Council, consisting of forty-two members. This Council, which meets every month or so, elects a permanent executive of 11 to 13 members who work daily, most of them, in the office. Now, about the delegates in the Zionist Congress—they are elected separately, not through this Assembly, but by popular elections.

CHAIRMAN: Do you, in the Yishuv, discuss these political issues?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: Yes, certainly we discuss them in our Assembly, and after discussing we came to the same conclusions supporting the views of demands of the Jewish Agency towards the big issue, the Jewish State in Palestine. That is the only solution we accepted in our Assembly, and we are entitled, on behalf of the Vaad Leumi, on behalf of the communities, to express the views here which were presented by the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Was that a unanimous vote on the question to which you refer?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: Of course that happens very seldom in any parliament; it was not unanimous, but there was a very large majority. The minority remained a minority but accepted the views of the majority. The decision of the majority prevails. It may be that minorities still have their opinion, but they accepted the majority and the majority prevails, as in every other government. The majority of the government or the parliament prevails, although minorities may remain with other views.

CHAIRMAN: Did you take this vote before or after the Zionist Congress?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: It was before the Zionist Congress.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I have one more question. I would remark that Mr. Ben-Zevie just said that as in every other government, the majority prevails.

My last point is this: I would like to know which labour conventions are in force here in Palestine. Is the policy of the Government with regard to the application of labour conventions the same as either in the United Kingdom or the Colonial territories, or is it different from both? Can you tell me that? I mean, what is the trend of it?

Mr. ELIASH: As regards real social legislation in Palestine, Palestine is still in its infancy. We have a Workmen's Compensation Ordinance which has recently been redrafted. This is about

the only thing on the Statute Book of Palestine in the nature of labour legislation.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): You told us that Vaad Leumi has the same point of view as the Jewish Agency in regard to partition or establishment of an independent state in Palestine. Does that mean that all groups within the Jewish Agency have the same point of view, or are there some groups which do not have the same point of view in regard to partition? Is there only a numerical majority or minority against or for partition?

Mr. ELIASH: Well, there is no doubt about it, that not all parties regard the solution with the same eyes. There are parties who would exclude partition as a possible solution because they ask for the whole of Palestine as a Jewish State. Others exclude it because they prefer parity and a bi-national state. The matter has certainly been very thoroughly discussed for years. But in all such matters, Jews, as a coalition government, eventually arrive at a policy. A coalition government eventually arrives at a platform which it presents on behalf of its entity and not on behalf of the group which advocates it.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): May I ask which groups between the Jewish Agency and the Jewish Community are in favor of establishment of independence of Palestine as a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine? Which groups are in favor of establishment of a State in an adequate territory? Which groups are for a bi-national State? We would like to have the situation clear.

Mr. ELIASH: If I may say so, some part of this information is contained in the statement which has been prepared by the Government, which more or less accurately represents the position. You will find there stated that the Hashomer Hatzair are the protagonists of the bi-national independent State in Palestine based on the principles of Zionism and socialism, as it is stated here. You will also find here that some of the parties share part of these views. The matter really cannot be stated with great brevity. It has taken the Government about half a dozen pages to state it.

If the Committee desires, the Vaad Leumi will present a statement which accurately sets out the views of the various parties. We will also give their numerical proportion.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): I should like to put a few questions to Dr. Eliash.

The Vaad Leumi has submitted a memorandum on the Emergency Defense Regulations of Palestine. Furthermore you, yourself, Mr. Eliash, mentioned in your exposition some features of the Emergency Regulations. The first question I have is: Do you know of a similar legislation in any part of the world or in any time or in any epoch of humanity? Do you, as an excellent attorney, an expert in Palestine law, know of a similar law anywhere else?

Mr. ELIASH: Well, I would not claim such a wide knowledge of legislation all around the globe, particularly when I sit before an assembly

in which so many nations are represented. But I think one can add it to the unique features of Palestine. You have heard so much about the Palestine case being unique. To the best of my knowledge, the entire combination of all these provisions is certainly unique.

CHAIRMAN: We might perhaps clear up that question in the Committee when we come to the stage of writing our report.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): I am interrogating a witness who is an expert on Palestine law. I am entitled, I think, to know everything he can say about it.

Now, Mr. Eliash, on what legal grounds was that law enacted?

Mr. ELIASH: In 1937, there was a special Order-in-Council which has given extremely wide powers to the High Commissioner to enact these regulations. As a matter of fact, I have it with me, and I can refer to it if you wish me to.

The Palestine Order-in-Council, 1937, which was gazetted in Palestine on the 20th of March 1937, gave power to the High Commissioner to make such regulations as appear to him, in his unfettered discretion, to be necessary or expedient for securing the public safety, the defense of Palestine, the maintenance of public order, and the suppression of mutiny, rebellion and riot, and for securing the essentials of life to the community. It was under this Order-in-Council that the present Regulations have been published in 1945.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Can you explain to me, Dr. Eliash, how can an Order-in-Council be applied to Palestine? I mean, on what legal grounds are the Orders-in-Council based? Is that on the Parliament Act of 1890?

Mr. ELIASH: His Majesty enacted it in Palestine, mainly under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act of 1890, and it has been recently held by our courts in Palestine that the Municipal Courts in Palestine cannot question whether these enactments are or are not contrary to the Mandate; the courts having held that the Mandate, being in the nature of a treaty or a covenant between the Allied Powers and His Majesty, it is only the Allied Powers or their successors that can raise an objection to the legislation being contrary to the Mandate, but not the people of Palestine before the Municipal Courts.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Do you have there the text of the Mandate?

Mr. ELIASH: I have.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Have you noticed that in several articles of the Mandate they make a distinction between the Mandatory and the Administration of Palestine?

Mr. ELIASH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Could you read Article I of the Mandate?

Mr. ELIASH: Yes, it is before me. "The Mandatory shall have full powers of legislation and of administration, save as they may be limited by the terms of this Mandate."

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Will you please read Article 7 now?

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Granados, what are you aiming at now?

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): I am going to ask Mr. Eliash's legal opinion.

CHAIRMAN: On the formal validity of these Orders-in-Council?

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But there has been no contention on any side that they are or are not valid.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): It is not a question of contention; it is a question of wanting to hear the opinion of an attorney who is an expert on the legislation of Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: This is not a question of the legislation of Palestine. It is a question of the Legislation of the Mandatory Power.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Well, it is the application of the Mandate.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): It is a question for the Committee.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): The Mandate is the basis of everything that has been done in Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: I could understand the question if it had been suggested from any side that it was formally not valid.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): I am sorry, Sir. I have noticed that in that case of the legislation of Palestine there is some kind of reserve, and, as I exposed it in one of the private meetings of the Committee, I had the intention to prove, or at least to show that most of the legislation of Palestine, in my opinion, is invalid. I feel that I am entitled to ask the opinion of one of the outstanding lawyers of Palestine. I just want to ask him two more questions.

First, will you please read the first part of Article 7 of the Mandate?

Mr. ELIASH: "The Administration of Palestine shall be responsible for enacting a nationality law."

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Do you not think that it is only in that case that the Administration of Palestine can enact laws if, according to the first Article, the limitation of the terms of the Mandate are for the Administration of Palestine?

Mr. ELIASH: With all respect, it has always been regarded that Article 7 makes it a specific duty incumbent on the Administration of Palestine to enact a nationality law. It was never understood to mean that the Administration of Palestine shall be limited in its powers of Legislation only to nationality law. It is understood, and always has been understood, that the Mandatory legislates in Palestine, through the machinery of the local administration, but that such legislation is limited to the provisions of the Mandate and can in no case be contradictory or be in antimony with the provisions of the Mandate.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Is that Act of Parliament of 1890 something that is to be applied to the colonies?

Mr. ELIASH: The Foreign Jurisdiction Act gives power to His Majesty to legislate in any part of the world for which His Majesty is in any way responsible, either as a sovereign or, in the present case, as a Mandatory.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Can you tell me what was the extent of the immigration from the Arab neighbouring countries?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: I could not state in that regard any sure figures. I know it is spoken about as 30,000.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When was that?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: For the last year, 1945-1946, I am not responsible for the figures. This includes, of course, a very small proportion of legal immigration. As to the remainder, I would say that we are admitting in the towns, in the villages, people who are coming from Syria, and they are employed in different capacities. We have admitted them—I cannot state how many exactly—but that is the figure that is mentioned by different people.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do they come here for a temporary period, or do they come here permanently?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: There are certain cases where they come for seasonal work, but there are many cases of men who come for seasonal work and remain permanently. For instance, around Haifa, you will see large numbers of tents and barracks built by Haurani people who remained for years and years. They built up temporary quarters but they remained for years and years.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I suppose it is not possible for you to give a definite idea about the numbers.

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: No. I would not do that, but the general numbers are known. There has been an increase of about 600,000 Arabs, in comparison with what it was 25 years ago. That does not represent natural increase alone; it represents a large number of immigrants. Otherwise, such a large increase could not be explained as a natural increase. There was only a population of nearly 680,000 in Palestine, including 80,000 Jews. This figure includes Bedouins and Christian Arabs. Now you have another nearly 600,000 Arabs. That increase could never be explained by natural increase. It includes a large number of immigrants.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Now is it correct that the Government give you 27 per cent of its financial budget towards education and that you provide the rest?

Mr. KATZNELSON: No.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): How much.

Mr. KATZNELSON: The Government contribution for the financial year 1945-1946 to the Vaad Leumi was nearly a quarter of a million pounds. The public expenditure on the Jewish educational system was a million and three quarters.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): 27 per cent of the whole of the educational budget.

Mr. KATZNELSON: Of the Government?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Of the Government.

Mr. KATZNELSON: There is a specific formula governing the allocation from Government funds for Jewish education. The formula is based on the proportion between the Arab children of school age and Jewish children of school age, from the ages of five to fifteen.

Now, the present percentage is about 30 per cent. The Jewish community is receiving some 30 per cent of the Arab educational expenditure. That means some 25 per cent of the total Government expenditure on education.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): What is the Arab education expenditure that is being incurred by the Government in employing government employees, inspectors, and so on.

Mr. KATZNELSON: The expenditure on Government education includes the entire staff. The teachers are almost all Arabs. That is among the inspectorial staff.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is it Arab staff?

Mr. KATZNELSON: The directorate of the department has some British staff but in general the Arab educational system is staffed by Arab teachers and Arab inspectors. A few among them, as far as I know, are Britishers.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I heard that the sum of 226,000 pounds was given to the Jews in regard to Huleh lands, for clearing the malarial disease; is that correct?

Mr. KATZNELSON: By whom?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): By the Government.

Mr. KATZNELSON: Not as far as I know. The terms of the commission on the Huleh land were, first of all, that the Jewish authorities had to allocate one-third of the older lands of the Huleh for the Arab inhabitants. That is the first thing. The second, we had to reclaim all the swamps in the Huleh area, including the Arab part—one-third allocated by the Arabs. I do not know about any other application of Government funds for Jewish resettlement.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You do not understand my question. Was the sum of 226,000 pounds given to the Jews for malarial campaign in the Huleh lands?

Mr. KATZNELSON: No, not a penny was given to the Jews. On the contrary, the Jews had to spend funds on Arab lands.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): May I ask my questions tomorrow?

CHAIRMAN: Is it not better to try to concentrate the questioning at the same time?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): But I would like to formulate my questions tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN: But the representatives will have to come back tomorrow and we hold up our work.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I shall have to write my questions for tomorrow.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I suppose the Vaad Leumi organization is broken up in several departments, the Executive, the Health, the Educational, and so on. Are these departments still in regular contact with the corresponding Government departments?

Mr. KATZNELSON: First of all, the technical departments of the Vaad Leumi, Education, Health, Social Welfare, are in close contact with the corresponding departments of the Government.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Is that still the situation today?

Mr. KATZNELSON: Yes. There is a contact with the Government regarding the common affairs of the community in all branches of social services.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Is the co-operation going along on smooth lines?

Mr. KATZNELSON: You can see from our memorandum and from the diagrams presented here that the co-operation was merely one-sided. On our part, we provided a very considerable proportion of the Government revenues, but we had to continue almost a constant, permanent fight for every penny allocated to the Jewish community. I was personally connected with this work for some twenty or twenty-five years, and I must say that nothing is more difficult and more disappointing than arguing with the Government about the provision of adequate facilities, both in services and in money for the requirements of the Jewish community. If that is called co-operation, it may be, but I cannot accept it.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I have one additional question. I am afraid I did not make myself clear enough when I first asked the question about the labour conventions. I was referring to International Labour Conventions, conventions of the International Labour Organization. Did you understand that at the time?

Mr. ELIASH: I understood your question to be whether there is any similar provision in law in Palestine for treating, let us say, labour unions or relations between employers and employees similar to that in England, or whether it follows the English pattern. To which my reply was: the only thing which has taken shape and form of an ordinance in Palestine is the Workmen's Ordinance in Palestine.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Are there any labour inspectors here?

Mr. ELIASH: Only under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance. There is inspection of machinery in connexion with that. But social legislation in Palestine is certainly still in its infancy.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): How does it compare with the British Colonial territories?

Mr. ELIASH: There may be places which are even less advanced than Palestine; we certainly do not head the list.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I do not intend

to put any questions about the political issue because, in this respect, the position of the Vaad Leumi is quite clear and can be expressed in one sentence. They endorse all that was or will be said by the Jewish Agency; so it is quite unnecessary to discuss that aspect.

I have only one question. On page 1 of the opening statement of Mr. Ben-Zevie, I see that the last elections for Vaad Leumi were held in August, 1944, and that only 67 per cent of the voters went to the polls. This means that a full one-third of the voters abstained from voting. That is rather surprising to me in view of the highly developed political sense of the Jewish community in this country. May I obtain the explanation of this fact, which I think is rather surprising?

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: I think that in general 67 per cent is a fair per cent of attendancy. However, I would like to take this opportunity to mention that we have an organized Jewry of over 600,000, while the actual figures may be over 630,000, or something like that. However, we have a number of Jews who have left the community for two reasons; some of them have left for reasons of principle, and some have left for financial reasons, because they did not want to pay the rates. Anyway, all of those groups together may comprise something like 5 per cent. I would say we have about 600,000 organized Jews, including children and infants. We do consider the number of voters to be something like 300,000. There were some abstainers for political reasons, and some naturally abstained because they were not willing to vote or they were too busy and they could not get the time off. I think we may consider 67 per cent a fair proportion of voters. If you take other countries and other places, you may find an even greater proportion of absentees.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): Yes, it is true in other countries where the situation is more normal, but given the special character of this country on which so much is insisted by every speaker, I must stress myself this great personal issue of absenteeism, because it is, as you say, the only democratic way of expressing an opinion.

Mr. BEN-ZEVIE: May I also remind you that after these elections, after the first elected Assembly, we received a letter from the High Commissioner in which he said he was satisfied it was a sufficient and fair amount of attendancy.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I am not speaking for the High Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

Mr. Fabregat wants to put some questions tomorrow to Dr. Eliash and Dr. Katznelson. Will you please be here and answer those questions.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Excuse me for being unable to question you today.

CHAIRMAN: We have gone through the agenda for today, and the meeting is adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

The Committee will meet in private session in the Conference Room.

*(The meeting adjourned at 1.30.)*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem,  
Palestine, Thursday, 10 July 1947 at 9 a.m.*

### *Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
SIR ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. BRILEJ, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
MR. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The agenda for today's meeting contains, first, public hearing of representatives of the Vaad Leumi; second, public hearing of representatives of the Chief Rabbinate; third, public hearing of representatives of Agudath Israel. The Jewish Women's Organizations of Palestine are not ready to appear today.

### Continuation of Hearing of Representatives

CHAIRMAN: Have you any questions, Mr. Fabregat?

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Dr. Eliash and Dr. Katznelson, will you please come up to the platform?

*(Dr. Eliash and Dr. Katznelson took seats at the table.)*

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): In point (7) of your statement did you say that the educational system—or the benefits of the educational system—of the Government is purely Arab? I should like to know what you mean when you say a "purely Arab" educational system.

DR. KATZNELSON: The educational system in Palestine is composed of two official public school systems called (1) the Public Arab school system and (2) the Public Hebrew School system. The Public Arab school system is administered and maintained by the Government; the Public Hebrew school system is administered and maintained by the Vaad Leumi. That is the official name and the official status. As a matter of fact, the Arab school system is not only Arab in name; it is Arabic in the language of instruction and in the composition of its school population. It is also one hundred per cent Arabic in the composition of the teaching staff. That means these schools are in practice available only to Arab pupils. The Hebrew school system is recognized by the Government as the official Public Hebrew school system.

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Who approved the educational system in the Jewish school, and

who controls the educational system? Not the Government?

DR. KATZNELSON: No. It is controlled by the Vaad Leumi Department of Education and supervised by the Government Department of Education.

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): And on the Arab side who controls?

DR. KATZNELSON: The Government Department of Education.

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I have seen some interesting schools for your Jewish children in several places; e.g. Tel Aviv. If those schools are not supported by the Government budget, are they maintained by additional city taxes which increase the taxation of that place?

DR. KATZNELSON: The system of financing the Hebrew school system—that is, the Vaad Leumi school system—is the following. Schools are maintained by the Vaad Leumi and the Jewish local authorities. The sources of budget are as follows. All Jewish local authorities impose special rates for education. That is the first source of income.

The second source of income I regret to say, is tuition fees, even in elementary schools with the exception of Tel Aviv. In all the other towns and colonies there is still in existence a system of tuition fees which, in our opinion, is not a good one. Tuition fees mean school fees paid by the pupils for education, and we are not in a position to abolish it as it is abolished, for example, in Government Arab schools. They are free of charge. We cannot do it because our funds are too short to satisfy the requirements of the Jewish community. That is the second source.

The third source is a grant by the Jewish Agency to the Vaad Leumi, from Zionist funds, which, during the current year amounted to LP 200,000.

The last source is a grant contributed by the Government, as explained yesterday. It amounts to some 25 per cent of the total Government educational budget. As you see from the statistical tables in our memorandum, the number of pupils in the Vaad Leumi schools and the Government Arab schools is approximately the same—about 90,000. But the sum spent by the Government on the Arab schools is three times as much as on the Vaad Leumi schools, and that is the reason for our contention. In our opinion, the Government's contribution to education should be either in proportion to the number of children attending the schools or to local contribution. That means a system of pound per pound in proportion to the local authorities' contribution in order to stimulate more and more local effort for the expansion of the educational system. But the Government approved quite a different formula which is, in our opinion, discriminatory, because an Arabic pupil in a Government school costs the Government three times as much as a Jewish pupil in a Vaad Leumi school.

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): You mentioned also the tuberculosis problem in Palestine. How



formidable is the problem, and what are the provisions taken by the Government to prevent it? I want to know also which groups of the population, as far as age or race are concerned, are more affected by the tuberculosis problem.

Dr. KATZNELSON: For many years we have been pressing Government health authorities to embark on a systematic campaign against tuberculosis. In our opinion it was an urgent duty on the part of the Government because tuberculosis is an infectious disease and a danger to the community as a whole—Jews and Arabs alike. In 1935 the Government made a survey, in spite of the fact that long before then there was no doubt that there was such a problem in Palestine. The Government expert submitted a report, and in my statement I gave a quotation from this report indicating that the problem of tuberculosis among all communities in Palestine is of sufficient gravity to warrant systematic attention on modern lines and the development of research. The time lost and the failure of the Government to take active measures has made the position more serious.

The report included a series of recommendations for the establishment of dispensaries and hospitals, but unfortunately, since then very little has been done. There are a few Government dispensaries in certain towns, but no Government hospitals for tuberculosis.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): The dispensaries are only in the cities?

Dr. KATZNELSON: Only in the cities. For that reason we had no alternative but to go on with our own programme and to extend our institutions. For example, we have a hospital at Safad. It was a very small beginning, with some 35 beds. It has now 100 beds. In Jerusalem, Hadasah is now planning to erect a tuberculosis hospital with 200 beds. We asked the Government to contribute 25 per cent to the capital cost, taking upon ourselves 75 per cent. It was only a few months ago. The Government refused for lack of funds. We have again to try to find from Jewish sources certain funds in order to go on, because we must do it. That is the position with regard to tuberculosis.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): You spoke about the Jewish doctors. What significance has the discrimination against them in the development of hospital assistance in Palestine? This is point (7).

Dr. KATZNELSON: The boycott on Jewish doctors was a purely political one proclaimed by the Arab Medical Society nearly a year ago, at the beginning of 1946. But according to our information it had no effect on the Arab public. Arabs continued to use our medical services, particularly in Jerusalem and not only Palestine Arabs, but also patients from neighbouring Arab countries are attending our institutions, and, I hope, to their complete satisfaction. At any rate, we have a lot of evidence from very prominent Arab visitors from neighbouring countries illustrating the most cordial hospitality afforded to them in our medical institutions.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): According to certain information acquired by members of the Committee, the Administration of Palestine in 1934 spent 6.24 per cent of the budget for education and 5.1 per cent for health; in 1944–1945 only 2.9 per cent went to education and 2.7 per cent to health. Are those figures in accordance with your knowledge of the subject, and are they reasonable as compared with those of some other countries?

Dr. KATZNELSON: Yes, it was one of our constant complaints that the allocation for social services, education and health in the Government budget is relatively very small. It never exceeded 5 per cent for health and about the same for education. There was no allocation before the war for social welfare activities at all; for example, for child welfare and other welfare institutions. Recently a very slight improvement occurred and in the current financial year Government estimates show an increased allocation for social services, education, health and social welfare, totalling nearly 12 per cent: 5 per cent for health, 5 per cent for education, and some 2 per cent for social welfare. But it is certainly—in the light of the present high cost of living in Palestine—an increase which is not effective because it is caused by an increase in salaries and in administrative costs. It provided so few additional medical facilities as to be absolutely inadequate to satisfy the requirements of both communities, Jews and Arabs alike. And, as I explained in my statement, the reasons given by the Government are reasons of security. Those reasons, in our opinion, are not convincing, because, as a matter of fact, on March 31, 1947, the end of the last financial year, the Government had a surplus of nearly LP 6 million, and a part of the surplus should be allocated at least for capital expenditure, for the extension of hospitals, and school buildings. Perhaps you have seen that in most of our schools in Tel-Aviv the pupils attend school in two shifts. Certainly it is very bad, but nothing can be done because the Government intends to use its surplus revenue for some specific purposes, such as the maintenance of the internees in Cyprus, and for other purposes which are certainly very far from being productive.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask a question in this connexion. Did the fall in percentage of the expenditure allocated to schools and health also mean a fall in the absolute figures of money allocated to those aims?

Dr. KATZNELSON: No, the Government allocation as a whole increased—that is an increase, certainly in the absolute figures. But, as I explained, in terms of services it provides very little more because it is absorbed by the high cost of living, and the increases in salaries, and so on. For that reason there is not much progress due to this increase. But, in relation to a project of some LP 25 million we consider an allocation of only one million for health, for all medical services, absolutely inadequate. I cannot give accurate information with regard to the position

in other countries, but I do know about the Western countries. I can state that England's expenditure on social services amounts to nearly ten pounds per person, while the Palestine Government's expenditure on all social services is merely one pound per person. Here we have some two and a half million pounds for all social services, with a population of some two million. That is a little more than one pound per person. That is one-tenth of the expenditure now existing in a country like England.

CHAIRMAN: The fall in percentage was thus due to the increase of the total expenditure and, therefore, the percentage became less?

Dr. KATZNELSON: No, the percentage remained as it was, more or less, about five per cent for health, and about the same for education. But the absolute figure is higher, because I explained the reason for the difference in the absolute figure which is mainly due to the change of conditions in the country.

CHAIRMAN: To which fields of Government activities did the increased expenditure go?

Dr. KATZNELSON: There is an increase from year to year in the Government budget on the so-called "security items." It is LP 7 million as against one million for health, one million and a quarter for education in the Palestine Estimates for 1947-1948 now published, and there is also an increase in the administration costs, a very considerable increase in the overhead expenditure, but unfortunately the amount for social services is out of proportion to the requirements and the needs of the community.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Do you think that the present laws of Palestine coincide with the scope of the Mandate as granted to the Mandatory Power? I am now speaking about the discriminatory sense of the Land Law and the Irrigation Bill.

CHAIRMAN: That has already been stressed by the organizations who have testified here. They consider it a discrimination.

Dr. ELIASH: As regards the Land Law, or the Land Transfers Regulations<sup>1</sup> as they are called, of 1940, the purpose of the discrimination appears both in the Order-in-Council, which made it possible to promulgate that law, and in the law itself. The special amendment to the Order-in-Council, which is known as Article 16 D,<sup>2</sup> gave special power to the High Commissioner to make the regulations which may be made applicable only to transfers of land from Arabs to Jews, or to other persons not being Arabs; or from Jews to Arabs, or to other persons not being Jews; or from Arabs or Jews to any bodies of persons corporate or unincorporate. So that the very power which was given to the High Commissioner under Article 16 D of the Order-in-Council foresees and envisages discriminatory

legislation. And the regulations themselves, which were published in 1940, make it perfectly clear that in certain zones the transfer of land should only be allowed to Palestinian Arabs. No question can arise that these regulations are discriminatory by their very nature.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): How was the Land Law enacted?

Dr. ELIASH: Well, it was enacted first of all by means of a special amendment of the Order-in-Council. Without that amendment it would have been quite impossible, because the Order-in-Council prohibited enacting laws which are discriminatory in nature. The Order-in-Council provided originally in Article 17.1 (c)<sup>3</sup> "That no Ordinance shall be promulgated which shall be in any way repugnant to or inconsistent with the provisions of the Mandate." Also that "No Ordinance shall be promulgated which shall tend to discriminate in any way between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion, or language." And, as a matter of fact, the power of His Majesty, which was reserved to Him under Article 89,<sup>4</sup> of the original Order-in-Council, also contains a provision at the end: "There shall be reserved to His Majesty, His heirs and Successors, the right of advice of His or their Privy Council from time to time to make all such laws or ordinances in Palestine in accordance with the Mandate conferred on Him." So, it was found necessary to make a special amendment of the Order-in-Council giving power to the High Commissioner to make regulations in regard to sales of land which would be discriminatory by their very nature. And, it is in using that power that these regulations were published in 1940. As I stated yesterday, they were challenged in the Palestine Court recently, and the Courts held that it was the duty of His Majesty not to discriminate as laid down in the Mandate. And, as the Mandate is in the nature of a covenant between the Principal Allied Powers and His Majesty, it is for the Principal Allied Powers or their successors to lodge any complaint in that regard. The Municipal Courts of Palestine are bound by that legislation and can entertain no action or complaint by anyone representing the population of Palestine.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): This Committee has received several communications indicating inadequate accommodation and health conditions for prisoners at the assembly camps. Have you information as to who is in charge of medical services and the conditions of these people?

Dr. ELIASH: I do not quite get the sense of the question. Is it about prisons in general?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Yes, about the living conditions, conditions of health in the camps of detention. Of course, as I understand it, the camps of detention have the name here of assembly camps.

CHAIRMAN: Which camps do you mean?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Cyprus, and the camps of detention in Palestine.

Dr. ELIASH: With regard to Cyprus, my friend Dr. Katznelson mentioned yesterday that steps

<sup>1</sup> Palestine Gazette No. 988, 1940, Supplement 2, page 327.

<sup>2</sup> Palestine Gazette No. 898, 1939: Supplement No. 2, page 461.

<sup>3</sup> Drayton: Laws of Palestine, Vol. III, page 2591.

<sup>4</sup> Drayton: Laws of Palestine, Vol. III, page 2589.

were being taken by outside groups to supplement the scanty provisions for the comfort and upkeep of inmates which are made by the Government and its agents in Cyprus. As regards the detention camps in Palestine, they are a part of the general prison system in Palestine and, therefore, medical attention there is taken over by the Government and the Department of Health, which is also in charge of the medical services of the prisoners in general. In addition we have the camps outside of Palestine in which political detainees are kept. I have no information as to what arrangements are made in these camps and by whom they are provided.

Dr. KATZNELSON: With regard to Cyprus, Jewish authorities here in Palestine, in co-operation with the Joint Distribution Committee—that is the American Jewish Relief Organization—are doing their utmost to improve medical conditions in the Cyprus camps. We have sent a medical mission to Cyprus and a nursing staff, and now a special mission is going to enquire into the state of mental health. But, all our efforts are certainly not very effective in view of the very hard, I may say inhuman, sanitary conditions in the camps. For instance, if there is an absolute shortage of water, and water must be distributed in very modest rations, or if there is such overcrowding in the tents and huts that families are living together, certainly medical facilities are not sufficient in order to improve the conditions of health in these camps. We are doing our best, and I must say of the military medical authorities that they are very helpful. There is a military hospital at Nicosia where some 300 beds are kept for internees, but these measures are merely palliatives in view of existing conditions. With 16,000 people living in insanitary conditions without sufficient quantities of water, without light, and without the minimum requirements with regard to housing, all these efforts are, to a great extent, made in vain.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): And the 2,000 children are in the same condition in the Cyprus camp?

Dr. KATZNELSON: Yes. There is a separate cantonment for 2,000 children within the camp.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose the Cyprus camps are not under the jurisdiction of the Palestine Administration?

Dr. KATZNELSON: No, Sir.

CHAIRMAN: They are under the administration of the Cyprus authorities?

Dr. KATZNELSON: Yes, Sir.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Excuse me for my questioning this morning. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else wish to ask any questions?

Dr. ELIASH: May I be permitted to amend a statement which I made in reply to the repre-

sentative of the Netherlands, with regard to the amount of labour legislation in Palestine. I have since checked it up and it is quite correct, as I have said, that no international labour conventions have been made applicable in Palestine, but some additional legislation has been passed which more or less follows the line of some of these conventions. In addition to the Workman's Compensation Ordinance which I mentioned yesterday and which has recently been redrafted, there is this new draft of 19 June 1947; there is also a Trade Unions Bill, another draft of which has also been published for information in the same Gazette; and I should have mentioned two Employment Ordinances which exist. One is the Employment of Children and Young Persons Ordinance (1945), and the other is the Employment of Women Ordinance, which also endeavour to embody some of these provisions of the Convention. There is, further, an Accidents and Occupational Diseases (Notification) Ordinance, and there is, of course, a Department of Labour Ordinance which provides the machinery for dealing with these labour matters. There is also a Trade Boards Ordinance and a Factories Ordinance which deals with the inspection of factories; I have ascertained that some inspectors do arrange for inspection of factories and places of employment.

There is also a booklet<sup>1</sup> which I wanted to pass to you, in which the representative of the Netherlands would be interested, on social welfare and social insurance in Palestine, and I was quite correct in saying yesterday that for social insurance legislation, nothing so far has been done. There is no compulsory health insurance, no infirmity or old age or death insurance, no unemployment or maternity insurance. I think this booklet would give information up to 1947.

Then there are one or two further points which I wanted to amend in connection with yesterday, and which have not been fully answered.

The question was put yesterday with regard to the resolutions of the Elected Assembly on the political problems of Palestine. Resolutions on this matter were passed at two sessions of the present Assembly, which was elected in August, 1944.

The first resolution was passed in December, 1944, and I have here a copy of this resolution. Do you desire me to give it out, Mr. Chairman, or shall I read out the resolution as it was passed?

CHAIRMAN: Please read it out.

Dr. ELIASH: It was passed in December, 1944, and consists of five paragraphs:

"1. The Elected Assembly appeals to Great Britain, the United States, the U.S.S.R., and the Allied Powers, who are to decide the fundamentals of the new world order, to seek a solution also to the problem of the Jewish nation's exile from its homeland, and to grant the demands of the World Zionist Organization:

"(a) To open the gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration;

<sup>1</sup> "Social Policy and Social Insurance in Palestine" by I. Kanievsky.

"(b) To vest in the Jewish Agency authority over immigration into Palestine and to grant it the necessary power to develop and build up the country, as well as to cultivate its uninhabited wastelands;

"(c) To establish a Jewish State in Palestine which will fit into the new world structure . . .

"2. The Elected Assembly demands of the Allied Powers international pledges and guarantees of concrete aid towards the implementation of the Zionist project: free mass immigration and wide-scale colonization for the purpose of concentrating the Jewish nation in its homeland and securing its political independence.

"3. The Elected Assembly asserts that any plan for the partition of Palestine is contrary to the historic, religious, and national ties of the People of Israel with the Land of Israel and is in contradiction to the recognized rights of the Jewish People, its needs and claims and to the development capacity of the country, and declares that the entire Yishuv will vigorously oppose any such plan.

"4. The Elected Assembly declares that the aim of the Yishuv and the Zionist Movement is to co-operate with the Arabs of Palestine in a spirit of mutual aid, on the basis of equal political, religious, economic and cultural rights for every inhabitant of this country, without domination or hegemony.

"5. The Elected Assembly demands that Great Britain abolish forthwith the White Paper with all its decrees, which render null and void the pledges contained in the Palestine Mandate and the Balfour Declaration."

That was in the 1944 resolution. This was followed by a resolution passed in May, 1947, after the United Nations Special Assembly on Palestine, and representatives will find a considerable modification of the first, particularly with reference to the third paragraph, which is not contained in this one. This consists of the following:

"The Elected Assembly of the Jewish Community of Palestine, at its Session on 20-22 May 1947, passed a vote of sincere appreciation and thanks to the representatives of the Jewish Agency for their appearance before the United Nations Special Assembly on Palestine.

"The Elected Assembly identifies itself with their repudiation of the policy of the Mandatory and with their presentation of the claims of the Jewish People to the restoration of its independence in its historic homeland, namely, to a Jewish State.

"The Elected Assembly regards this solution as the surest way to forming a bond of friendship between the Jewish People, and the Palestine Arabs and neighbouring countries.

"The Elected Assembly strongly emphasises the duties incumbent upon the Mandatory, so long as it bears the responsibility, to fulfil its fundamental undertakings and to give the Jew-

ish nation its full right to immigration and settlement in its homeland."

This resolution was adopted by 67 votes against 23, with 14 abstentions. Those who voted against were the Labour Unity group and the Hashomer Hatzair. The Elected Assembly numbers 171 delegates and its composition is given here in figures; two-thirds of the Elected Assembly belong to the General Federation of Jewish Labour, the remaining one-third is composed of representatives of the religious and General Zionists, forming the right wing of the Assembly. A further point which requires illustration is the question of the particular reason for the relatively low rate of voting at the last elections in 1944. On this point I would make the following explanation.

Since the establishment of the Elected Assembly the rate of participation in the elections has been between 57-77 per cent of the total. At the last elections the rate was 67 per cent. One of the reasons for this relatively low rate is the abstention of certain groups of electors, who insisted upon changes in the present electoral law, a demand which was not acceptable to the majority of the Elected Assembly.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Eliash and Dr. Katznelson.

### Hearing of Representatives of the Chief Rabbinate

CHAIRMAN: The next item on the Agenda is the public hearing of representatives of the Chief Rabbi. I understand the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Herzog, will speak first, and I invite him to take a seat at the table.

*(Dr. Herzog took a seat at the table).*

Chief Rabbi Dr. HERZOG: To plead the spiritual cause of my people, I have the honour to appear before you as the representative of the Chief Rabbinate of the Holy Land. As spokesman of the religion of Israel, which, to us, is so dear, so sacred, in the name of the Torah of Israel, of the Talmud in the widest signification of that, to us, so majestic, so awe-inspiring a term, in the name of the Torah which embodies our fundamental national charter, our oldest title is Eretz Israel or Palestine as the Land of Israel.

The recent tragic events in Palestine have placed the physical suffering of the Jews in the forefront of international discussion. Yet this is only the external aspect of that timeless issue. The basic cause of our suffering is our homelessness for the past two thousand years, and that bitter homelessness involves not only the torment of the body but also the suffering of the spirit, of what we call in Hebrew Shechina. The Jewish national revival, of which you have seen the evidence in your travels in this country, has its ultimate roots in the realm of the spirit. It represents a new phase, in a sense of culmination, of that unique phenomenon of faith and suffering which is Jewish history.

Ours is a great quest for freedom, freedom from physical oppression, freedom from everlasting dependence upon goodwill and tolerance, but above all, freedom from spiritual bondage. Our national history, which begins with the Divine redemption of our people from Egyptian slavery, is something unique, without parallel in the annals of man. In a pilgrimage of forty years under the scorching sun of the Sinai Desert, far away from the habitations of men, their memories still fresh with the lesson of man's inhumanity to man, their souls exalted by the impact of manifest providential guidance, our ancestors were vouchsafed that communion with the Divine, that revelation, which has for all time determined our place in history.

The message of the spirit was no abstract formula. It called for translation into the living reality of a national life in a concrete land. The record of that national life, its endeavours, achievements and failings, has become the textbook of humanity. In pursuit of this holy mission, we have endured a martyrdom that has no parallel in the history of the nations. The present return is but the latest phase of that unending quest. It is a protest against an exile which is scorching our soul as it is breaking our body. We are seeking new roots in mother earth so that the soul of our people may live anew. We are seeking them in the land of our fathers, in the land in which so much that is sacred and dear to us first took shape and form. The survival of the Jewish people represents a case which is *sui generis*. There is no parallel to a people preserving its laws and institutions, its language and traditions, its attachment to the land of its origin, and the hope of its eventual return and restoration during more than eighteen centuries of dispersal all over the globe. The Jews are not the only people, not the only small people, whose independence was crushed by mighty neighbours. Other nations suffered the same fate, but they reacted differently. When Imperial Rome drove the nation into exile, the Jews might have accepted defeat and disappeared in the melting pot of the Oriental and Hellenistic civilizations surrounding them. Or, alternatively, they might have left the country en masse and set up their commonwealth in another part of the Middle East, as did other nations before and after them.

The Jews did neither. They chose a very different course. Their state had been destroyed, their sanctuary burned to the ground, many thousands had been sold into slavery, the great families decimated by executions, the mass of the people pauperized. Emigration offered the only alternative to extinction. A remnant remained, clinging stubbornly to the ancestral soil, but the bulk of the nation went into exile. Jews they were, and Jews they remained wherever fate dispersed them. They never gave up their national identity and their religious heritage. Not all phases of their long exile were periods of suffering. At times—as, for instance, in Moslem Spain—they enjoyed a considerable measure of freedom and economic prosperity. But even then

they never ceased to cling with their heart and soul to the country which for all time remained to them the Eretz Israel, "Land of Israel."

What is the source of this unbreakable attachment? It is the experience of the spirit whose impact is recorded in the pages of the Bible and in our post-Biblical sacred literature. It is this experience which has for all time moulded the character and destiny both of the Jewish people and of Palestine.

My friends, it has become fashionable in this cynical age to make light of matters of the spirit and our case has been a principal sufferer from the soulless interpretation of historical record. I was deeply pained to see in the Supplement to the "Survey of Palestine" which was presented to you by the Government of Palestine, an account of Jewish history in Palestine which seeks to reduce the glorious pages of the Bible to a miserable recital of tribal worship and tribal warfare. The Old Testament is quoted as a record of the vicissitudes and the trials undergone by the Hebrews during their rule of Palestine which is arbitrarily fixed at one thousand years, but there is no word to indicate what that period signified in spiritual and cultural terms. While this Survey gives every detail of the sacred associations of Palestine for Christians and Moslems, it is completely silent on the message of Hebrew prophecy which went out from these hills. It has nothing to say of the moral challenge of Isaiah and Jeremiah, of Amos and Micah, of the "cry from the depths" of the Hebrew Psalmist, of the heart-searching and inspiring message of Job, of the pristine beauty of the Book of Ruth, of the anguish of the Lamentations. No mention is made of the high level of political, economic and cultural life which flourished in the golden age of Hebrew rule and to which modern excavation bears ever-increasing testimony. Not a word is said of the great academies founded by the Men of the Great Assembly at the beginning of the rebuilding of the second Temple, nothing of the great developments of the post-Biblical era, as recorded in the Mishnah and the Talmud.

On contemplating this pathetic vacuum of the Palestine Government, one cannot help feeling that a good deal of the failure of the Government's handling of present-day problems may be explained by its unsympathetic uncomprehending and shallow interpretation of Jewish history.

The first Hebrew Commonwealth was destroyed by the overwhelming might of the Chaldean Empire. The bulk of the nation was carried into Babylonian captivity, but from the first hour of their exile they never ceased to pray for their return. They refused to accept an alien land as their home. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning, Let my tongue cleave unto the roof of my mouth if I remember thee not, if I set not Jerusalem above my chiefest joy." Even before they were driven into exile, their eventual return had been predicted to them in prophetic messages of unsurpassed fervour: "I will return

the captivity of my people and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them"—thus had been the divine message through Amos, the Shepherd of Tekoa. Jeremiah, the agonized witness of the destruction of Jerusalem, sent a message from his Egyptian exile to the captives in Babylon: "Again will I build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel . . . Behold I will gather them from the uttermost parts of the earth. They shall come with weeping and with supplications will I lead them . . . And their soul shall be as a watered garden."

On the ascendancy of the Persian Empire under the great Cyrus, the Second Rebuilding began. It continued after the destruction of the former by Alexander the Great, until Palestine fell under the sway of Syria, whose rulers tried to break the spirit of the nation and hellenize the country. The attempt led to the great religious and national revolt of the Maccabees, which resulted in the establishment of the Jewish kingdom all over Palestine and Transjordan, and which gave rise to a new era of spiritual creativeness and material prosperity that lasted until Imperial Rome conquered Judaea.

The Romans adopted a policy of repression and attrition which forced the bulk of the nation into exile. Thus began its national martyrdom, but to whatever part of the globe they were driven, they maintained the memory of Zion with a fierce tenacity. They did not give up their sacred title deeds to their return. It was from the pages of the Bible and post-Biblical literature that they drew strength in the vicissitudes of exile and those pages vibrated with the atmosphere of Palestine. The memories of the land and its clime, its forests and vineyards, its cities and palaces, and above all, of Jerusalem and its sanctuary, became an integral part of the consciousness of the Jewish people. That is why the Jews never disappeared as a distinctive entity. That is why they never attempted to build for themselves a national political life anywhere else. For the sake of their spiritual heritage, they assumed the terrible burden of exile. They did so because they could not do otherwise.

They wove the memory of Zion into every phase of their personal and communal lives. From the cradle to the grave religious rites, prayers and benedictions associated the Jew with the national Destruction and the hope of the Return. At the infant's initiation into the Abrahamic covenant prayers are recited that he might be granted to go in pilgrimage to Jerusalem. At the wedding ceremony the prayer is uttered that "Soon may there be heard in the cities of Judaea and in the streets of Jerusalem the voice of joy and gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride, that Zion may regather in her midst her languishing children." At the burial a handful of earth from the soil of Palestine is placed under the head of the dead so that he might rest in the ancestral soil. What efforts were not made by poor Jews in every age to secure the small sack of Palestinian earth to be placed in their graves.

Exhumation of the dead is, generally speaking, prohibited in our religion but for the purpose of re-burial in Palestine it is not only permitted but encouraged. Wherever the Jew prays he turns his face towards Jerusalem, Palestine! In our liturgy, in the daily prayers and benedictions, Zion and Jerusalem and the prayer for the ingathering of the exiles and the rebuilding of Jerusalem hold a central place. The devout Jew would rise at midnight and sit on the floor, his head covered with ashes to mourn the destruction of Jerusalem and pray for the restitution of her glory. In prayers of mystical ecstasy Zion is described as the "mother waiting for the return of her scattered children," as "the mourning widow refusing to be consoled." "Next year in Jerusalem" is the conclusion of the solemn rituals of the Passover Night and the Day of Atonement. In distant lands we pray for rain and dew when Palestine needs them. Our greatest post-talmudic authority, Maimonides, asserts that the validity of the Jewish calendar, fixing the holy festival and the Day of Atonement, which is binding on Jews all over the world, depends ultimately upon the presence of a Jewish community in Palestine which, if not a fact *de jure*, always remains the centre of Jewish religious authority. In Jewish law, a concrete law, a husband could compel the wife and *vice versa*, the wife could compel the husband, under such legal sanction as was available, to migrate to Palestine.

In the same way the longing for Zion pervaded the Hebrew literature. Though the Jews everywhere acquired the language of their environment, Hebrew remained their medium of prayer, study and literary expression. The return to Zion was equally a central theme in Jewish legal, mystic and homiletical literature. Laws and precepts applying to the soil and its produce in Palestine formed the subject of deep study and research in the Diaspora. In fact the whole framework of Palestine life was kept in existence in institutional form so that it might be set into motion again when the hour of the Return came.

All their existence was rooted, as it were, in a distant land which few ever had a chance of seeing with their own eyes. For whether Palestine was under the sway of the Byzantines, the Arabs, the Crusaders, the Mongol invaders, the Mamelukes or the Turks, there was never any chance of a Jewish mass return. That chance has only come in our generation, and it has not failed to be grasped. But at all times the individual Jews or groups made the "ascent" (the "Aliya") to the Holy Land and there were periods when the longing for the return flared up in Messianic movements of fierce ecstasy which shook the whole framework of Jewish life in the Diaspora.

The mystical flame has not died out; it is alive everywhere in the effort of reconstruction which you see springing up in this country. To say nothing of the orthodox settlements and of the hundreds of synagogues and religious institutions, it is my firm conviction that beneath



all the external trappings of the national rebuilding there surges an intense longing, not only for a refuge but no less so for a spiritual regeneration. This yearning has found expression in the renaissance of the Hebrew language and literature but no less so in a marked degree in the revival of religious study and research in the ever-growing number of the Yishuv's outstanding religious colleges, including the greatest in the world, whose number far exceeds the proportion of the Jewish population in Palestine. Zion has already become the centre of sacred learning for world Jewry. Monumental religio-legal publications have been started here which seem to foreshadow the fulfilment of the prophecy that "out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of God from Jerusalem." The Palestine Chief Rabbinate, about which my revered colleague will speak to you shortly, is one further illustration of this development. Unfriendly critics sometimes describe our national effort as a piece of secular materialism. Nothing is further from the truth. As my saintly predecessor, Rabbi Kook of blessed memory, repeatedly declared, consciously or unconsciously, the new builders are inspired by the ideal of old. That ideal, we feel convinced, we fervently believe, will ultimately come to shape the life and the outlook of the whole Jewish community.

There are enemies of our people who affect a pseudo-spiritual concern for its religious future, and go about saying that all the Jews need is a so-called "spiritual centre," a great religious academy, a university, a central Rabbinical Synod, but no land, no settlements, no towns, no industry no commonwealth.

Here I stand to give the lie to these hypocritical assertions. Spiritual life, particularly in the case of our people, cannot flourish if it is divorced from reality. We cannot be creative unless our lives have roots in the soil. The Jewish Sabbath, the central pillar of Judaism, is crumbling to pieces in the Diaspora under the weight of present-day economic conditions and the stress of minority existence. The preservation of Judaism in its religious aspect, to say nothing of the national and historic aspects, depends in no small measure on the revival of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. Nor only our religious schools, colleges and academies, but also our villages and settlements are dear to us. Our religious and national aspirations find their most significant expression in the building of Jewish religious academies alongside agricultural settlements.

It is this inter-weaving of physical reality with the life of the spirit, this sanctification of human effort, which constitutes our distinctive contribution or rather, one of our distinctive contributions, to the stock of civilized mankind. It was this idea of a Jewish spiritual renaissance based on a national restoration which inspired the many non-Jewish friends and supporters of the Zionist cause from the age of the English Puritans to the days of Byron, Shaftesbury and George Eliot. It was these inspired Christian Zionists who paved the way for the adoption

of the policy of the Balfour Declaration in our own day. Leading Anglican divines like the late Archbishops of Canterbury, Dr. Land and Dr. Temple, and religious laymen like Lloyd George and Lord Balfour, were ardent supporters of Zionism. When, in 1937, the Royal Commission, in proposing partition, excluded Jerusalem from the area of the Jewish State, the late Archbishop Dr. Land made a statement in the House of Lords from which I should like to quote here:

"There is one point here on which I feel the Jews have some legitimate grievance in the proposals made by the Royal Commission. That is the position of Jerusalem itself. It seems to me extremely difficult to justify fulfilling the ideals of Zionism by excluding them from any place in Zion. How is it possible for us not to sympathize in this matter with the Jews? We all remember their age-long resolve, lament, and longing:

*If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning.*

They cannot forget Jerusalem."

And finally permit me to quote Lord Balfour himself. In the great speech which he made on the tenth anniversary of his historic declaration, he said words on the spiritual aspects of Zionism which are very opposite to these days when the effort is made to reduce the Jewish question to a merely humanitarian concern for displaced refugees: "I could never have thrown myself" said Lord Balfour, "with the enthusiasm which I have always felt for this cause into it if it had been merely a question of taking out of most unhappy conditions a certain number of the Jewish race and replanting them in the land of their forefathers. If it had been merely that, I should have been, I hope, an enthusiast for the cause. But I think that it is going to be much more than that. I hope and I believe that the highly endowed people who have done so much for Western civilization in some of the highest walks of human effort will do even more, if you give them the chance, in the original land of their inspiration, to carry out the work side by side with all the great civilized nations of the world—the chance to work side by side with them for the common advancement of knowledge."

Humanity stands at the crossroads of history and there is no greater challenge to it than the Jewish problem. A promising beginning has been made in this country towards the solution of that age-old problem, but the light from Zion shines against the background of the terrible catastrophe which has befallen our people in Europe. I spent six months last year visiting the remnants of our people on the European continent wandering amidst the ash-heaps of what was ten years ago a third of Israel. I saw the fine work UNNRA had done for them and I would like to take this opportunity of recording my deep appreciation of their devoted efforts and of expressing the hope that the new organization I.R.O. will maintain that noble tradition

of succour as long as circumstances call for it. But these camps cannot continue. Conditions in them have almost reached breaking-point. Nothing material can console the mother whose baby was torn from her breast by mad dogs in Belsen or Dachau, or the orphans who saw their parents buried alive and the ground heaving afterwards from their agonized movements. These well-nigh lost remnants must be rehabilitated in spirit, and that rehabilitation can only be effected among their own people in the land for which their spirit longs and where the torment of the past will be forgotten in building the future.

I urge upon you, Gentlemen, to visit these camps and to see the position for yourselves. These people have endured what no human being has ever been called upon to suffer, and it seems to me essential that those who have come to investigate the Palestine question should carry away with them also a direct impression of that most acute aspect of the problem. For let there be no mistake about it: these Jewish survivors in Europe are an integral part of the political scene of Palestine. It is for their sake, no less than for ours, that we plead that the White Paper be abolished and a political settlement be made that will enable their speedy transfer to Palestine.

And while I am on this point, permit me to deal with one special issue which has been repeatedly raised in connexion with the proposed political settlement. It has been alleged that if a Jewish Commonwealth were to be set up in this country, non-Jewish religions would be adversely affected thereby. On this point I should like to repeat what I said last year to the Anglo-American Committee. We, the Chief Rabbis of Palestine, stand here to declare that the Jewish people will not in any form whatsoever seek to impose its religion or traditions on people of other faiths by force, by persuasion, by legislation or by any other means. In the Jewish Commonwealth every community will have full autonomy in administering its religious and cultural affairs in accordance with its traditions within a framework similar to that provided for in the Mandate. Every community will administer freely its own institutions without any interference whatsoever on the part of the State. The Holy Places of the several religions should be under the guardianship of those to whom they are sacred.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you are about to sit in judgment on a case which is without precedent or parallel, on a case which is unique. Judge us not, I solemnly appeal to you, by ordinary canons. Forget your books of law and jurisprudence. Forget all the talk and all the thought of proscription and ousting, and so on. All this will not help us in the least.

You have before you a case for which there is no precedent. You are at this critical point to decide whether that great history of the people called Israel, that four thousand-year-old-history, which has given to mankind two great religions, which has given to humanity the moral and

spiritual outlook of the world, which has given to humanity that great ideal of everlasting peace—which, alas, we have not yet reached—whether that great, wonderful history of this unique people shall lose itself in the gigantic ash-heaps, in the immense mass graves of six million Jews, including 1,200,000 babes and sucklings, or whether that history shall now bring issue in something great and noble, which will form part and parcel of a great divine plan in the history of mankind.

I am at the end of my remarks. The world is again going through the crucible of change. Common men and women in all lands long for peace and for a revival of the spirit. We need to rediscover the basic truths on which all true civilization rests—the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Peace and justice are indivisible. The world will not find its peace until it relieves its conscience of this grave burden—the homelessness of one of the most ancient of its peoples.

I pray to our Father in Heaven that your deliberations may help in bringing about a lasting solution of that most grievous and most challenging problem of our day.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Your Eminence.

I recognize His Eminence, Rabbi Ben Zion Ouziel.

*(Rabbi Ben Zion Ouziel, Richon-Le-Zion, Chief Rabbi of Palestine, spoke in Hebrew. No interpretation of his speech was made, but the following translation was distributed).*

Rabbi BEN ZION OUZIEL: It is a point of honour for us to extend to you at the outset our sincere welcome on your important appearance in the Holy City of Jerusalem, the city of God, to take up your exalted and most responsible task which is so vital for the peace of Israel and the peace of the world. May you be blessed, the distinguished emissaries of all the nations of the world, who are also, according to our conviction, the emissaries of God, the ruler of all kingdoms and the King of the world.

We hope and pray that the Almighty will bless your work which is designed to put an end to the martyrdom and wanderings of the people of Israel that have been continuing now for two thousand years, and to restore to them their freedom and their peace of mind, their land, their state and their dignity among all the nations of the world, as befits a nation so ancient that has given law and ethics to all the nations of the world and has made weighty and substantial contributions to all fields of human endeavor, to science, learning and social progress, even in the course of their long dispersion, while they were driven from one country to another and from one nation to another. We pray that the Almighty will extend His divine grace and countenance to your work, will guide you in the path of truth and impart His wisdom to you, so that your names will be blessed and praised forever after.

Your Excellencies, on behalf of all the Jewish communities which are still extant throughout

the Jewish Diaspora, including the Sephardic communities in the Middle East and in European countries and the United States of America as well as of those Jewish communities which have been completely destroyed, and on behalf of the millions of the sons of Israel who have been savagely massacred by the Nazis and their satellites before the eyes of all the nations who watched passively the shedding of their innocent blood, we join our voice to that of the Palestine Yishuv and of the supreme bodies of the Jewish community of Palestine and to the voice of the people of Israel in their dispersion, and their accredited representatives—the members of the Jewish Agency. We appeal to you with an outcry which comes out of the depths of our heart, and from a suffering of thousands of years of dispersion, and humiliating wandering, and say to you: Palestine is unique among all the countries of the world as the land on which the providential countenance has been concentrated, a country of which it was said in the Scriptures: “the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year.” It was therefore pre-eminently distinguished and made unique as the cradle of prophecy in which the prophets of Israel, who are the prophets of all mankind, prophesied on Israel, their dispersion and their redemption, and on all the nations of the world, and who proclaimed the advent of peace on the basis of truth and righteousness, and whose prophetic messages have remained and will remain forever after the treasured spiritual heritage of Israel as well as of all mankind. This land which is held in sacred veneration by all nations and all faiths was given to Israel as their perpetual possession, through the first Patriarch of our nation, as the Scriptures said: “And I will give unto thee and to thy seed the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession.” By a miracle, the sons of Israel took possession of the country on their entry into it under their leader Joshua, as also much later, under Ezra and Nehemiah.

The Romans who conquered and usurped all nations have also conquered this country by their sword. Since then it has been the wish of the Almighty, enunciated through the mouth of our lawgiver Moses, that the people of Israel should be scattered and dispersed. “And the Lord shall scatter thee among all peoples from the one end of the earth even unto the other.” But so strong was their unshakeable faith in the divine promise (“That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity and have compassion upon thee and will return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the Land which thy fathers possessed and then shall possess it, and He will do thee good and multiply thee above thy fathers.”) that the people of Israel have never abandoned their hope and aspiration to return to their land.

In their firm faith in the law of Israel which is the eternal law, Israel have never acquiesced

and will never acquiesce in the rape of their country and their freedom by violence. That is why there was no time in history when Jewish settlement ceased in the land of Israel which has been designated “the land of life,” for there is no life for the people of Israel without the land of Israel.

For centuries after the destruction of the Second Temple there was a mass settlement of Jews in Jerusalem in defiance of Emperor Hadrian's prohibition which decreed that any Jew who set foot on the soil of Jerusalem would be liable to the death penalty. There was also a large Jewish settlement in Galilee, which constituted the bulk of the Jewish population of Palestine. That dynamic community of Galilee engaged in agriculture and domestic industries, and cultivated its legal and ethical literature which was crystallized by the composition of the Mishnah and the “Jerusalem Talmud.” After the Spanish Exile that Yishuv received important and valuable accretions from among the exiles who included some of the most eminent rabbinical authorities. Thus reinforced, that community has revived the Yishuv in Galilee and Jerusalem and has cultivated our elaborate legal and mystical literature which culminated in the composition of the “Shulhan Aruch” (the Jewish Code of Conduct) and in the standard work of Jewish mysticism.

Notwithstanding the persecutions and the anti-Jewish decrees, the libellous accusations levelled at us, and the inhuman treatment to which we were subjected, and in spite of the life of misery and agony which we were compelled to lead and in which has been fulfilled the most bitter prophecy of the Pentateuch: “And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest” and the vision of the prophet of our dispersion: “Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good and judgments whereby they should not live,” it was thanks to the wonderful divine will that we managed to survive in our dispersion as well as to exist in the divine land in which, and particularly in Jerusalem, a Jewish settlement survived, for as the great Maimonides wrote, “it was far from the will of God that the sons of Israel should be absent from Palestine in which it was promised to them that the signs of nationhood would never disappear.”

Absorbed by this faith, our forefathers took an oath of allegiance and fidelity to their land: “If I forget thee O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.” We have lived up to that oath of fidelity throughout the generations of our dispersion, and have remembered the Holy Land in our thoughts and our actions and in all our movements, and religious even in the last moments of the life of every dying Jew, by scattering the dust of Palestine into his eyes, and have passed it on to our children and to posterity.

No Jew or Jewess has ever agreed of his or her own free will to remove his or her residence from Palestine to a foreign country, because of his (or her) love of the country and his obedience to the commands of Jewish law which

expressly forbade such desertion, save where a Jew is exposed to famine or is in danger of his life. (Maimonides. Kings. V, 5, 6).

During the last few decades, the people of Israel throughout their dispersion were inspired by the Almighty God, and driven to go to the land of their forefathers, rebuild it and bring its wilderness back to life. That was the origin of the modern agricultural settlements which were established before World War I, which were the main and basic foundation of the Balfour Declaration. That was how Jewish immigration from all parts of the Jewish Diaspora turned to Palestine in fulfilment of the prophet's prophecy: "Who are those that fly as a cloud and as the doves to their windows?"

All Israel, in Palestine as well as in the Diaspora, had hoped to see in the Balfour Declaration which was given by His Majesty's Government the continuation of the famous declaration given by Cyrus to our forefathers. Inspired by that declaration and driven by their faith, Jews came to Palestine singly and in groups from all parts of the world. By the grace of God we built entire and well equipped towns, villages and agricultural settlements, including some that based their life entirely on religious foundations.

We built great houses of religious worship in which thousands of our people pursue daily their religious studies and offer their prayers, and a network of religious schools, elementary, secondary and high (Tamud Torahs and Yeshivoth) was established in all parts of the country in which laws and Jewish traditions were taught and cultivated.

Thanks to the concentrated efforts of the individual and the community, we restored to life and prosperity arid and waste lands which we acquired justly and fairly, we tapped the underground waters hitherto unexplored and unused, so that they might turn into a blessing the unirrigated land which was a curse to the people of the country. The fertility thereby restored to the soil of Palestine, is a living monument of the initiative and energy of our pioneering brethren, and testifies to the truth of the biblical appellation of the country as a land flowing with milk and honey.

The gathering in this land of all the scattered remnants of the people of Israel brought about the union and rallying of the people, by the resuscitation of their original Hebrew language, the language of the Prophets, which has come to be used again both as the vernacular of the people and as the language of literature, learning and research, and it is yearly making substantial strides in both directions. It has also resulted in the wonderful cohesion and organization of all the Jews of Palestine under the aegis of the "Knesset Israel" (The Jewish Community of Palestine) which is distinguished for its union.

During the period which has elapsed since the issue of the Balfour Declaration a very important communal development has taken place in the form of the fusion of the two tribes of

Israel, the Sephardim and Ashkenazim, who through the curse of the Diaspora have had to lead a separate communal existence in the East as well as in the West.

During the term of office of the first High Commissioner, our co-religionist Sir Herbert Samuel, a combined Rabbinical Council (better known as The Chief Rabbinate) was constituted under the joint presidencies of two Chief Rabbis, one each representing the Sephardic and Ashkenazic community respectively. That Council acts as a religious Court of Appeal which hears appeals from all local rabbinical offices, exercising jurisdiction in all such cases as are within its jurisdiction under Palestine Order-in-Council, 1922, as well, as acting as an arbitration community under the Jewish Community Rules, 1926.

The re-constitution of that important body is regarded by us as the fulfilment of the biblical prophecies which envisaged the redemption of Zion through the processes of justice and righteousness administered by Jewish Judges. It is also a fulfilment of the vision of the prophet who foresaw the foregathering of all the tribes of Israel and their fusion into one united nation.

To our great distress, however, obstacles were placed by the Government of Palestine in the way of the realization of these noble prophetic visions, the Government having limited and restricted the jurisdiction of the Rabbinate and confined it to Palestine citizens, and worse still, to those of them who are officially members of the recognized community (Knesset Israel), a curtailment of rights which never existed throughout the history of the Jewish people. We venture to express our hope that that defect will be made good, by conferring on Jewish religious courts full jurisdiction applicable to all Jews of Palestine, similar to that which was conferred on Moslem religious courts.

In those years of intensified Jewish effort which brought a blessing to the country and all its people, we have never found real rest and quiet, and our work was disturbed by the riots and disturbances launched by our Arab neighbours, with whom we have always lived and intend to live in relations of amity. These disturbances followed the continuous instigation which was helped by outside sources with malicious intent, and were designed to undermine and destroy the work we have started with innumerable sacrifices of life and property. To these setbacks must be added the ravages of the war which have definitely retarded and slackened our work. Some of our ancient settlements in the country have had to be abandoned, e.g., Ramleh, Shechem, Gaza, Hebron and Pekiin, while the Safad community has had a miraculous and narrow escape. We were constrained to abandon a large area of our Jerusalem settlement too, because of the danger to which we would have been exposed had we continued to live there. These facts are additional evidence which points to the existence of numerous other Jewish settlements which were successively and utterly destroyed, so utterly that not even relics of Jewish

cemeteries could be found in their former sites. They will also explain the paucity of our number in the Palestine before World War I.

But our growth in this country and the expansion of our constructive work in it point to the intense and single-minded devotion of our people to the revival of their ancient land; they also point to the tremendous blessing in all spheres of life which will directly result from the return of Israel to their ancient homeland from which a true and permanent peace will radiate to all parts of the world.

It is with great distress, however, that we must record our profound disappointments at the constantly increasing restrictions on immigration which have been decreed by the Mandatory Government, restrictions which have culminated in the White Paper that have virtually invalidated a solemn international pledge, restricted our settlement numerically and geographically, and purported to crystallize our community into a permanent minority, and, worse still, one that will be alien in its own land, for the bulk of the country has been closed to Jewish settlement under that White Paper.

That ruthless and cruel measure has closed the country to scores of thousands of our refugee brethren who, at the risk of their lives had hoped to find safety in this country after having escaped the barbarities and outrages of their cruel persecutors.

I cannot describe to you in words the tragic calamity that has befallen us as a result of the savagery of the Nazis and their satellites. The story in all its bestiality is only too well known, and anyone born in the image of God must be filled with shame at the monstrous outrages which have led to the extermination of six million Jews and Jewesses, including children and infants, among whom were some of the most learned and eminent of our people. Who knows how many of our children still remain among non-Jews leading a life of captives and prisoners? Although over two years have elapsed since the Armistice, nevertheless scores of thousands of our people are still behind barbed wire in the concentration camps or wandering about from place to place without finding any rest for their weary souls. Mention should be made of the anti-Jewish riots which were organized during the war and since V-Day in Tripoli, Iraq, and Egypt, and of the rule of terror which prevails in Syria and Afghanistan. These outbreaks were grim evidence of the present condition of our brethren in those countries and of the even darker future that awaits them there. In face of that tragic plight so unique in its bitterness, that characterizes the life of Israel in the years of their dispersion, Your Excellencies will the better appreciate the justification for the outcry of Israel in their agony when they appeal to the civilized world in words of deep humanity: Have we not the same Father, the same God? Why, therefore, are we so singled out and discriminated against? Why are we worse than all nations?

The one and only remedy is the restoration

of Israel to their State and their freedom in which they might develop and utilize their gifts, reconstruct the land and the soil by the sweat of their brow for the good of all those who inhabit the land, without any discrimination, as we are commanded by our law: "But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself . . . and shall not vex him" (Leviticus 19,34).

By the standard of those high ethical precepts, we shall treat our neighbours whom we recognize today, and shall hereafter recognize as full-fledged citizens with absolutely equal rights as regards the exercise of their religious worship, the observance of their religion and all other civil rights. Restore Israel to their land and state, so that he might be a member of the comity of nations and make his own specific contribution to progress and enlightenment for his own benefit and for the benefit of the whole world.

This statement gives expression to only some of my feelings and my pain. I can only conclude with the prayer that you might be the trusty agents of Providence, of the God of Israel who is the God of the Universe, so that by your work, you shall fulfil the prophecy of the prophet: "I will gather them out of all countries whither I have driven them in my anger and in my fury and in great wrath; and I will bring them again into this place and I will cause them to dwell safely . . . I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land, assured with my whole heart and my whole soul." (Jeremiah 32, 37, 41).

CHAIRMAN: I thank Your Eminence.

I am now going to adjour the hearing for ten minutes, but I shall be obliged if Your Eminence would stay for the questions that will be put by the Committee.

The hearing is adjourned for ten minutes.

*(The hearing adjourned for ten minutes).*

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the meeting is called to order. Will His Eminence Chief Rabbi Dr. I. Herzog, and His Eminence Rabbi Ben Zion Ouziel kindly come up to the platform.

*(His Eminence Chief Rabbi Dr. I. Herzog and His Eminence Rabbi Ben Zion Ouziel took their seats at the table).*

CHAIRMAN: I, for my part, have no questions to ask. Does someone on the Committee want to ask some questions?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Mr. Chairman, I have very great respect for spiritual and religious heads of every community, and hold them in reverence. But, in my humble view, they should remain above political controversies. And, out of respect for their positions, I shall not put questions in regard to political matters, which were inter-mixed in their speeches, but would just put a few questions which do not concern politics.

Your Eminence, are those who, although they were once Jews, now believe in Christ as one of the Holy Trinity to be regarded as Jews?

Rabbi HERZOG: I have the honour of replying to the distinguished Indian delegate, Sir Abdur Rahman. A distinction must be drawn between a good Jew and one who is not a good Jew. The adoption of another faith does not make the Jew into a non-Jew from the Jewish religious aspect. I will give you an instance: Marriage between a Jew and a non-Jew is, in our law, not valid. Marriage is a religious bond. The same thing is true between a Jew and a Christian woman, or any other religion. But, marriage between a Jewess and a renegade Jew can only be dissolved through divorce as prescribed by the Laws of Moses. In short, a Jew who has abandoned Judaism for another faith continues in a legal sense to be a Jew, but he is certainly not a good Jew—he is a renegade Jew.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN: Would you therefore regard Christ as a Jew in religion as he was so by descent?

Rabbi HERZOG: I do not know. I think, Sir Abdur Rahman, you are treading upon very delicate ground. I do not think it is advisable to introduce this subject. But, of course He was a Jew. There is no question about it that He was a Jew.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): What was the extent of the Kingdoms of Kings David and Solomon, peace be on their souls, in Palestine?

Rabbi HERZOG: Well, it was very, very wide. It extended practically from Wadi el Arish into Syria. I do not have a map before me just now. If you desire precise details I can let you have them.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Please, Your Eminence.

Rabbi HERZOG: David and Solomon—I can let you have it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When did they rule over these countries?

Rabbi HERZOG: About the 9th Century before the Christian era.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): My last question is, Your Eminence, which of the tribes grew out of Ishmael, son of Hagar and Abraham, peace be on their souls?

Rabbi HERZOG: You know that Ishmael and Isaac were the sons of Abraham.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am only asking of Ishmael.

Rabbi HERZOG: The Arabic tribes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The Arabic tribes were the outgrowth of Ishmael?

Rabbi HERZOG: Yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And the Edomites?

Rabbi HERZOG: The Edomites were the sons of Esau. Esau was the son of Isaac. The Edomites came from Esau.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The Arab tribes were the outgrowth of Ishmael?

Rabbi HERZOG: Ishmael, yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is all.

CHAIRMAN: Does any other member want to put some questions?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN: Then, I thank your Eminences. The next item on the agenda is the hearing of representatives of Agudath Israel. Will Rabbis Lewin, Klein and Glikman-Porush come up on the platform.

### Hearing of Representatives of Agudath Israel

(Rabbis Lewin, Klein and Glikman-Porush took their seats at the table.)

CHAIRMAN: I recognize Rabbi I. M. Lewin (Chairman of Agudath Israel).

(Rabbi Lewin spoke in Hebrew.)

Rabbi I. M. LEWIN: In the name of World and Palestine Agudath Israel, I wish to welcome you here and say how much we all hope that you may succeed in your task.

I think this is a first and unique event in history of representatives of fifty-five nations organized in the United Nations having come to the Holy Land, to Jerusalem, in order to hold an enquiry into the question of Palestine and of the Jewish People.

We appear before you as the representatives of independent orthodox Jewry organized in Agudath Israel in Palestine and all over the world.

It is our view that Divine Torah alone forms the eternal constitution of the Jewish people, and that it, and it alone serves as the foundation and essence of the existence of the Jewish people as the nation of the Lord; that Torah alone is the soul and backbone of that nation, and that whatever is formative in Palestine and within the Jewish people can be of lasting value and can have a right of existence only inasmuch as it is connected with and flowing from, the Almighty's Torah.

This, our view, presents an unbroken tradition of about 3,000 years, one that has for ever been absolutely based on the Bible and its teachings, both written and oral, and that is independent and uninfluenced from any other spiritual foundation. In making this short address to you, I should like to assist you in solving the difficult problem in connection with which you have come here from this our point of view.

First of all: we declare the following to be our main aspiration, in which we feel united with the entire Jewish people.

The land of Israel and the People of Israel form one complete entity forever inseparable. In practice we demand, therefore, that the gates of the Holy Land be opened to all Jews wishing to come here; that the absorptive capacity of the Land be developed to the only possible limit; and that a political regime be established capable of guaranteeing free immigration, the development of the country and exploitation to the full of its absorptive capacity.



You have been able to ascertain details of our demands in the memorandum which we have submitted to the Committee.

This demand of ours we hold to be dictated by justice and morality, and I should like to state reasons for my assertion. You will, gentlemen, before going deeper into your assignment, have to clear your minds on the question as to the essential meaning of what we call the "Jewish People."

May I, as a son of an old people, speak to you in a language as peculiarly singular as the People of Israel.

In 2,000 years this people has been wandering over the face of the earth and has failed to find a resting place under its feet; it has undergone the most hellish and inhuman sufferings and has been tossed about the wheels of nations, rulers, governments, regimes and parties.

The forms of war against the Jews have been varied, and evil plans, campaigns and persecutions have incessantly changed: but the People of Israel has preserved its life and existence outliving its torturers and persecutors who have vanished from the arena of History. You can destroy or assimilate large parts, but no power in the world can liquidate it or bring into oblivion the living memory of its past.

Since mankind split into nations, when the world turned against its Creator, the war of man against man has started. Then rose Abraham our Father and demonstrated that there is a Divine Leader guiding the world. It was Abraham our Father who revealed to the world its Creator, who brought the Lord's message to mankind. To him the Lord promised that he should be father of that Israel, which was to fulfil a sacred destiny: "You are my witnesses, saith the Lord." "This people I have created that they shall tell my glory"; who shall go through History as the Lord's nation and demonstrate in their very being and existence that there is a Creator unto this world.

It has thus been the destiny of Israel to realize in its life those great ethical principles laid down in the Torah and the messages of its Prophets.

By far the greater part of the Torah's precepts depends for realization on active settlement in the Land of Israel. In the Land of Israel, and nowhere else, can Israel fulfil the mighty mission with which the Almighty has entrusted it.

The land of Israel was promised to the first Jew, to Abraham our Father; and from the day on which the Lord spoke: "For all the land which thou seest, to thee and to thy seed shall I give it until eternity," there has been woven an eternal connexion between the people of Israel and its Lord.

In the Torah, in the Prophets, and in the words of our sages the idea finds forever recurring expression, that the final destiny of the land of Israel as the Land of the Lord, and the destiny of Israel as the People of the Lord, which become realized only when joined together, when both shall be bound to the Creator of Heaven and Earth.

In this Land alone it is given to the Jew to reach spiritual elevation and completion. Here

men of Israel have reached the extreme light of human achievement: Prophecy. Here the Prophets have seen their visions. The air of this our land our great teachers of the Law have breathed, those giant leaders of the People of Israel, those greatest of its holy men.

That connexion of the Jewish people with Palestine has remained unbroken also after our people's expulsion from its soil by the Romans.

There have at all times been Jews who left the comfort, or comparative comfort, of the countries of their dispersion and in often immediate danger of life flocked to Jewish Land, land that was waste and utterly destitute. The degree of Israel's loyalty to its land was reflected in the land's loyalty to its people. Not a single one of the country's conquerors throughout past centuries succeeded in returning to blossom the land's destitution. The Torah's words: "And your enemies shall be waste on it," was literally fulfilled. The land refused its yield to the stranger. The people of the Diaspora was become barren in the distance, longing and yearning for the land; and the land remained barren, longing for its sons.

On your recent tour you have seen with your own eyes the great wonder: the barrenness of parts of this land uninhabited by Jews, and blossoming freshness wherever the Jew has grown attached in love, sacrifice, and devotion, to the soil of the land. May, that this miraculous sight before your eyes shall become living evidence and manifest proof of the metaphysical connexion linking Israel with the Land of Israel, a connexion imprinted by the Divine Creator from the days of Abraham to the end of Messianic days.

In the course of 2,000 years of dispersion we have been persecuted to unending lengths, but these two treasures: the Lord's Torah and the Lord's Land we have never forgotten.

The Jew's love of his land knows no limits; it suffers no comparison with what is called love of country. In his land the Jew sees not merely the land of his birth but land hallowed by the Divine Creator, the cradle of prophecy chosen by Him and whereon rest the eyes of the Lord your Lord from the beginning of the year to the end of the year.

From the moment of his birth to his departure from the world, in all his thoughts and contemplations, during his meals, in his hour of mourning and of joy, the Jew raises the land of Israel to his lips in prayer for his return to the Land. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget" is the oath we have taken, and the very course of our history speaks out to the fact that not for a single moment have we forgotten the Land of Israel.

The settlement of Palestine stands out in the commandments of the Law of Torah. And ever since the beginning of our dispersion settlement has never ceased. Every stone, plant, each grain of sand of our land has been dear and hallowed to us for the love of people and land is in truth a divine inspiration forever present in the soul of every Jew.

It is, then, only natural that we can imagine the nation's existence in its land on no other but the Torah's foundations.

A well-known statesman has said that there is a war going on between Jews and Gentiles. We cannot, with regret, admit this. There has been and still is going on a wholly one-sided war against the Jew. As I have stressed before, that war is being conducted in many different forms and for various excuses. That war runs like a red line throughout history from Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, Haman, Titus, Torquemada, Chamilnitzki, up to Hitler. How many are the persecutions run over our heads, and why should we have been so persecuted?

Are not we all sons of one father, has not one God created us all?

Have we not brought to the world the recognition of God? How many are the values of goodness, truth, magnificence, righteousness and justice which the nations have accepted at the hand of this most ancient of their number? Why, then, are we persecuted?

Our answer to all this is: whenever the forces of evil have risen in rebellion against the Creator of the world they have spent their ire against this people, the People of Israel; their hatred against Israel sprang from a hatred against the preachings of Torah, the visions of the Prophets.

You have come here in the name of the United Nations. In your own time the disaster occurred. We should be in need today of an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, to pronounce their probation against the nations.

We are sustained by knowledge of a Lord, the Leader of Creation. We are persuaded that no amount of suffering and cruelty is ever lost; that the sufferings of our people through thousands of years are summed up in one total account. There is justice and there is a judge in this world. But what happened during the years 1940-1945 is unprecedented in the annals of world history.

It may appear boring to re-open the chapter of the destruction of six million Jews, but we cannot help repeating and again repeating the subject; six million Jews have perished. Europe's Jewry has been put to destruction.

The slaughter took place in Poland. It was my privilege to have been one of Poland's three million Jews. They stand in front of my eyes. Every one of them a world to himself, a heavy treasure of Torah and life's wisdom. We look about forlorn for one-third of our people, but in quality by far the most important part. Europe once contained the reservoir of our people, the brain and heart of world Jewry. But all that has vanished from the face of the earth, vanished in the most cruel and most horrible deaths, the victims of unrivalled sadism and evil ingenuity. Old and young burned alive.

I lived in Poland. I lived the life a Jew lived there. I was brought up on the principles of faithful Judaism. I lived among my people, my family. My brothers and sisters were done away. Three of my beloved grandchildren were burned together with all the other children of Israel;

in all one a half million Jewish children, innocent and ignorant of sin, of whom every one might have become the pride of our people and of mankind.

I am one of those who as if by miracle was saved from the wide-open jaws of the monster. I do not know why I of all should have been privileged to escape the fire that enveloped us all in the crematories of Trablynka and Auschwitz, or is it that I should be their messenger to bring their cries before you?

We, of Agudath Israel, have suffered perhaps the greatest losses. The best of our leaders and friends are no more.

Six million Jewish souls stand crying before you, their blood storms and cannot find rest; it moves the very foundations of the universe. One an a half million children! When has the world heard of such a like? When has such war happened? Can you at all imagine the meaning of these words? One and a half million dear children, whose hands we were not allowed to kiss before they ascended to the flames to be burnt alive in the ovens. How can mankind, how can any human being stand such unimaginable sadism.

And how they went from us? In sanctifying His great name, in speaking thus to their oppressors: You may destroy our bodies, but never our souls! Their blood continues to storm and shake the foundations of all living. World, world, where art thou? And through you may I ask the world: Where is their conscience?

Truly, the freedom-loving nations fought Hitler, but not our fight. Hitler's fight against the Jews preceded the World War by five years.

Hitler sent up experimental balloons to find out how far the world was prepared to let him go in his evil. When in 1939 the refugee vessel "St. Louis" with her 700 Jewish passengers on board was cruising the seas, there was not a single country, including America, that was ready to accept the Jews, to the accompaniment of Hitler's barbaric laughter. Having accomplished minor "action," that is to say, slaughter of Jews on a small scale, before the eyes of a silent world, he proceeded to larger "action." Again the world was silent. And so at last he continued on his path of insane cruelty to the work of most awful destruction the world has ever witnessed.

I do not propose to put before you here facts showing how Jews might have been saved, and a world stood by our blood motionless.

While the White Paper bears undoubtedly a great share in the responsibility for inactivity in the rescue of Jews, the world at large, and particularly the great Powers, cannot be freed from answering this charge.

We do not feel ourselves sitting in the dock. Permit me to say that it might be more rightful to place in it all those who must accept responsibility for the destruction of our people.

We cannot believe that in any natural way it will be possible to comfort us and to find a substitute for our disaster, for the loss of six million brothers. What then is the problem?

There have remained alive one and a half million Jews who have escaped destruction.

Jews have no longer any place in the world. They must therefore be enabled to return home, to the land of their fathers. You will have to visit the camps yourselves, see their position, find out what has happened, what is there still to be seen. You will then convince yourselves that Jews no longer can nor want to stay in the European graveyard. They simply cannot go on living where their families and everything dearest to them was murdered. In a part of those camps which Hitler had set up for them, complete with barbed wire, these our unfortunate brothers continue living an imprisoned life within a world liberated two years ago.

You have toured the country. You have seen wonderful cities and flourishing settlements. All this could have been worked only by that enormous love for Eretz-Israel. Beginning with the so-called "Old Yishuv" who had maintained Jewish settlement in past generations, those orthodox Jews who became the founders of Petah Tiqvah, the mother of our settlements, and others more, from all those who laid the foundation for the modern Yishuv, right down to our contemporary builders, who with the sweat of their brows moistened the desert land and transformed it into the greenery of settled land.

You have also seen the destitution awaiting hands, awaiting its builder sons. The land awaiting the Jews, the Jews expectant for the land: how can their reunion be stopped?

The Jews have become mere remnants, one in a town, two in a family, having lost their dearest and nearest, and whose only desire is to come up to the Land of Israel and kiss its stones: how can one deprive them of this?

Here, within the Yishuv itself, there is not a house where there is not one dead. And should there have been left a survivor in the dispersion whose only longing is for coming here and joining his family, and his family here aching for the last survivor of its house; how can they be kept separated?

We have not stolen a thing from the Arabs. Whatever we took we have dearly paid for. Their standard of living we have raised, we who have gone through exile and have learnt to value the lives of others. The Jewish people wants peace with the Arab people. There is room for us all in this country.

Mending but little the unrighteous done to the people of Israel, there is need for good will, for finding the courage in your hearts to a decisive and energetic step.

The United Nations will be bound, we should think, to brace themselves for really generous action, action that will not merely permit the Jewish people to return to its land, but to aid it in developing the country and settle it.

If you are willing to set mankind on a moral basis, on a basis of justice, the union of nations, and the repair of our world, repair then the great injustice done to the People of the Lord.

The Creator, who seeth and observeth the

world, what has that world done for His people?

Hitler, starting with the Jews, wanted to enslave and destroy an entire world. If you wish to help return the world into its joint, you will have to start repairing the injustice done to the Jewish people.

In 1914 the First World War started, and its result was the creation of a "League of Nations." Mankind was then filled with the hope that at last we were approaching disarmament and the brotherhood of nations.

With the world starting to reconstruct the devastation left from the war, the Balfour Declaration was given as a measure of compensation for the sufferings of the Jewish people. Had there been a will to fulfil it in the spirit in which it was given, who knows but that the world might have been saved a renewed outbreak of the flames of war. The Declaration was not materialized, and disarmament turned into preparation for a second world war. We are once again going through all that. The world is trying to rebuild the ruins left by the last war and has organized in the United Nations for the establishment of peace. The world will need the grace of Heaven to prevent itself from falling into the most awful and most deadly of all wars. May the world be privileged of such grace by rendering justice to the Jewish people.

We are fortified and confident in the knowledge that our redemption will be by the Lord, and that we are approaching that redemption.

Just like the days of our exodus from the first exile, the exile of Egypt, through the desert, to the Lord's revelation on Mount Sinai, so are we wandering today through the desert of nations, stepping forth towards Israel's redemption and that of the entire world.

Thus we trust in the Almighty that He may help us!

But the day of reckoning will come and the question go out to the nations of the world: What have you done? Where were you when great parts of the People of the Lord were murdered?

What have you done to repair and make good the terrible evil?

Who will measure the benefit to the nations and to mankind should they be able to give affirmative reply in now doing the first important step on behalf of our suffering people?

An historical feat will have been accomplished, gentlemen, in your assistance towards such aim. May the Almighty help you and stand by you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Rabbi Lewin.

I recognize Rabbi Klein.

*(Rabbi Klein spoke in Hebrew)*

Rabbi KLEIN: I have been charged with the important and honourable task of welcoming you as a member of our Central Executive and Central Agudath Israel in Palestine.

Central Agudath Israel constitutes the territorial branch of the World Organization, and is responsible for matters of education, religious

There have remained alive one and a half million Jews who have escaped destruction.

Jews have no longer any place in the world. They must therefore be enabled to return home, to the land of their fathers. You will have to visit the camps yourselves, see their position, find out what has happened, what is there still to be seen. You will then convince yourselves that Jews no longer can nor want to stay in the European graveyard. They simply cannot go on living where their families and everything dearest to them was murdered. In a part of those camps which Hitler had set up for them, complete with barbed wire, these our unfortunate brothers continue living an imprisoned life within a world liberated two years ago.

You have toured the country. You have seen wonderful cities and flourishing settlements. All this could have been worked only by that enormous love for Eretz-Israel. Beginning with the so-called "Old Yishuv" who had maintained Jewish settlement in past generations, those orthodox Jews who became the founders of Petah Tiqvah, the mother of our settlements, and others more, from all those who laid the foundation for the modern Yishuv, right down to our contemporary builders, who with the sweat of their brows moistened the desert land and transformed it into the greenery of settled land.

You have also seen the destitution awaiting hands, awaiting its builder sons. The land awaiting the Jews, the Jews expectant for the land: how can their reunion be stopped?

The Jews have become mere remnants, one in a town, two in a family, having lost their dearest and nearest, and whose only desire is to come up to the Land of Israel and kiss its stones: how can one deprive them of this?

Here, within the Yishuv itself, there is not a house where there is not one dead. And should there have been left a survivor in the dispersion whose only longing is for coming here and joining his family, and his family here aching for the last survivor of its house; how can they be kept separated?

We have not stolen a thing from the Arabs. Whatever we took we have dearly paid for. Their standard of living we have raised, we who have gone through exile and have learnt to value the lives of others. The Jewish people wants peace with the Arab people. There is room for us all in this country.

Mending but little the unrighteous done to the people of Israel, there is need for good will, for finding the courage in your hearts to a decisive and energetic step.

The United Nations will be bound, we should think, to brace themselves for really generous action, action that will not merely permit the Jewish people to return to its land, but to aid it in developing the country and settle it.

If you are willing to set mankind on a moral basis, on a basis of justice, the union of nations, and the repair of our world, repair then the great injustice done to the People of the Lord.

The Creator, who seeth and observeth the

world, what has that world done for His people?

Hitler, starting with the Jews, wanted to enslave and destroy an entire world. If you wish to help return the world into its joint, you will have to start repairing the injustice done to the Jewish people.

In 1914 the First World War started, and its result was the creation of a "League of Nations." Mankind was then filled with the hope that at last we were approaching disarmament and the brotherhood of nations.

With the world starting to reconstruct the devastation left from the war, the Balfour Declaration was given as a measure of compensation for the sufferings of the Jewish people. Had there been a will to fulfil it in the spirit in which it was given, who knows but that the world might have been saved a renewed outbreak of the flames of war. The Declaration was not materialized, and disarmament turned into preparation for a second world war. We are once again going through all that. The world is trying to rebuild the ruins left by the last war and has organized in the United Nations for the establishment of peace. The world will need the grace of Heaven to prevent itself from falling into the most awful and most deadly of all wars. May the world be privileged of such grace by rendering justice to the Jewish people.

We are fortified and confident in the knowledge that our redemption will be by the Lord, and that we are approaching that redemption.

Just like the days of our exodus from the first exile, the exile of Egypt, through the desert, to the Lord's revelation on Mount Sinai, so are we wandering today through the desert of nations, stepping forth towards Israel's redemption and that of the entire world.

Thus we trust in the Almighty that He may help us!

But the day of reckoning will come and the question go out to the nations of the world: What have you done? Where were you when great parts of the People of the Lord were murdered?

What have you done to repair and make good the terrible evil?

Who will measure the benefit to the nations and to mankind should they be able to give affirmative reply in now doing the first important step on behalf of our suffering people?

An historical feat will have been accomplished, gentlemen, in your assistance towards such aim. May the Almighty help you and stand by you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Rabbi Lewin.

I recognize Rabbi Klein.

*(Rabbi Klein spoke in Hebrew)*

Rabbi KLEIN: I have been charged with the important and honourable task of welcoming you as a member of our Central Executive and Central Agudath Israel in Palestine.

Central Agudath Israel constitutes the territorial branch of the World Organization, and is responsible for matters of education, religious

communities, and other Palestinian matters as pointed out in our joint memorandum.

Agudath Israel is the organization of the People of the Torah. A tradition unbroken for over 3000 years speaks in our voice.

Central Agudath Israel represents within its ranks also a great many native inhabitants of Palestine and numerous generations in the past who came to this country from an attachment to the Holy Land, and who have done very much for the upbuilding of the country.

We would ask you to recommend the opening of the country's gates to our brothers and sisters and thereby to rescue thousands and tens of thousands from physical and moral deterioration; and in this connexion to wipe out the White Paper with its radical discrimination against us, a discrimination like of which was not heard in Palestine since the days of Adrian, that notorious Jew-Baiter.

Unrestricted immigration and the chance to develop the land in order that its sons may return and live here a life of rest and dignity, these are our demands.

Moreover, we shall stress that we, orthodox Jews, who comprehend the Torah as the ultimate life-aim of our people and the foundation of all its existence, we who do not recognize popular sovereignty apart from the sovereignty of the Torah, we demand most emphatically that in this Land of Israel everything shall be done in accordance with the Laws of the Torah, and that to all our organizations and to all our congregations there shall be accorded an absolute legal freedom to act entirely according to our conceptions.

We see in the fact that the United Nations have sent out a fact-finding committee here, a revelation of the conscience of the world which has finally stirred in favour of the oppressed people of Israel.

We do firmly believe that Israel's redemption shall come as witnessed by our Prophets on the mouth of the Almighty, the Leader of the Universe.

And we believe that the Almighty helps those in search of Justice and Truth to find them, and may He guide your hearts to finding justice and righteousness.

Do then recommend such steps as we have asked.

May the Almighty's blessing be in your work.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Rabbi Klein.

I recognize Rabbi Glikman-Porush.

*(Rabbi Glikman-Porush spoke in Hebrew)*

Rabbi GLIKMAN-PORUSH: May I be permitted to address you briefly on events in our lives here, in this Holy Land, during the past generations.

I am a native of Jerusalem, a member of a family which has been living in Jerusalem uninterruptedly for eight generations.

My forefathers came to Palestine under great self-sacrifice, after a dangerous voyage of months. With love and devotion they took upon themselves great privation, knowing full well that conditions of life in Palestine then were far

from comfortable, but it was this, their only desire, just as this Land of Israel is the heart's desire of every Jew; for over half of the precepts of the Torah are for their realization entirely dependent on life in this Holy Land, and are devoid of meaning abroad.

Relations between ourselves and the Arab neighbour were extremely good; we lived in one and the same yard with the Arabs, and there was real friendship between us. In those days we would journey from Jerusalem to Tiberias or Safad through Arab towns and villages for three days and three nights on a cart or on the back of a donkey without any fear. Frequently we would night in Arab villages or in towns inhabited solely by Arabs, and never an apprehension of fear of the Arabs would rise in our minds.

As a native of this country and one permanently domiciled here, I would state from definite knowledge that at the time of the publication of the Balfour Declaration on the reconstitution of the National Home for the Jews in Palestine neither the Arab leaders nor the Arab masses thought anything but that Palestine had in reality been given to the Jews. At that very time the territories of the Ottoman Empire were divided into various states for the Arabs, such as Iraq, Hejaz and Syria, and the territory which we were always wont to call "Eretz-Israel" was believed as in fact having been given to the Jews.

That relation between ourselves and the Arab neighbours remained excellent even after the Balfour Declaration, and right down to the events of 1936 we would call on the heads and notables of the Arabs at the time of their feasts, among them the Mufti of Jerusalem, at the offices of the Supreme Moslem Council or at his residence.

It was the orthodox Jews who had come to Palestine who built Jerusalem and its surrounding fifty-two quarters. They built the towns of Tiberias and Safad; they built the quarters on the outskirts of Jaffa; they laid the foundations of the agricultural settlement in Palestine, in Judea, in Samaria, and in Galilee. A great many of them were carried away in early youth by malaria and swamp fever. We never wavered, here we saw the fulfilment of one of the precepts of the Torah. It was our faith that inspired us, that in our lives and our deaths we were laying the foundation-stone for the Jewish Yishuv here in the Land of Israel, the Land of the Torah.

Orthodox Jews set up public institutions, religious and charitable foundations, schools, centres of Torah study, and "Beth-Yaaquv" girls' schools; they set up hospitals, orphanages, free-loan societies, and welfare institutions.

As one of the natives of this country, and as one whose family have been domiciled here for many generations, I can bear evidence on the astounding development which Jewish immigration has brought to us in Palestine. We, natives of Palestine, know that the entire population of the country, both Jews and Arabs, heartily greeted the rise in the standard of liv-

ing and that tremendous uplift in the atmosphere of this country as a result of Jewish immigration.

You have toured the country and cannot have failed noticing the large tracts of land which to this day have remained destitute.

Let me, then, ask you to wipe off from this country and from ourselves the shameful blot of the White Paper.

Open up the gates of Palestine; for how long shall we be left to shame and disgust! Have mercy on the cities of Judea and Jerusalem, and may you thus become a blessing to this land!

May there be given us a chance in this land, chosen by Supreme Providence, to bring a sure home to the people of the Lord and the Torah of the Lord.

CHAIRMAN: I myself have no questions to put to the representatives of Agudath Israel. Does any other member wish to put a question?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Are the Arab tribes living in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Transjordan the descendants of Ishmael?

RABBI KLEIN: The majority are sons of Ishmael.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): I read here on page 13 of your statement recommendations for the solution of our problem. I see here one of your recommendations is the repeal of the White Paper of 1939 and a return to the terms of the Palestine Mandate. Another recommendation is the opening of the gate for the elect, and so forth.

All these are recommendations which refer to the Jewish community, but it seems to me that we all, and you, too, are conscious that the question which we are considering is a question of Palestine: this means that it is not a question of the Jewish community alone, but also the question of the other population in Palestine, the question of the Arab side, too.

As you make here some recommendations regarding the Jewish community, I should like very much to hear your recommendations in regard to the whole question of Palestine.

Rabbi LEWIN (*Interpretation from Hebrew*): We have already expressed orally as well as in our memorandum, that what we ask is unrestricted immigration and the possibility to develop the country to its full absorptive capacity.

Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): I know this, but this refers only to the Jewish community, but on the question of the whole of Palestine, taking into account that there are in Palestine 1,200,000 Arabs?

Rabbi LEWIN (*Interpretation from Hebrew*): We believe Jews and Arabs can live in peace. We have raised tremendously their standard of living. All that Jewish immigration could bring to them is great benefit. In all differences between one community and another there will have to be political negotiations. If those should lead to no results, a supreme authority, the United

Nations, would have to decide on the basis of Justice and right. I think that in the Holy Land a start should be made, an attempt should be made, to settle political differences, not by bloodshed, but by political negotiation. I am convinced that justice is with us. If the United Nations make a decision they will, of course, have to safeguard the authority of the supreme body, and only thus can there come peace and order.

I should like that the Palestine problem serve as a first trial and I wish you success in giving that to us and the whole world.

CHAIRMAN: Any more questions? If not, then I thank you.

We have now gone through the agenda for today. The hearing is adjourned until tomorrow morning at 11.30.

*The meeting adjourned at 12.35 p.m.*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y. M. C. A. Building, Jerusalem,  
Palestine, Friday, 11 July 1947 at 11.00 a.m.*

### *Present:*

MR. SANDSTROM, Sweden, *Chairman*  
MR. HOOD, Australia  
MR. RAND, Canada  
MR. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
MR. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
MR. VISWANATHAN, India  
MR. ENTEZAM, Iran  
MR. BLOM, Netherlands  
MR. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
MR. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
MR. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

MR. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*

MR. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I declare the Twenty-seventh Meeting open. The hearing has been delayed owing to our having been detained on the flight we made over the Holy Land this morning.

The agenda contains two items: One, public hearing of representatives of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland; and public hearing of representatives of the Jewish Women's Organizations of Palestine. Shall we adopt that agenda?

*(No objection voiced)*

CHAIRMAN: It is adopted.

### Hearing of representatives of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland

CHAIRMAN: I understand that His Lordship The Right Reverend W. H. Stewart, Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem, and the Reverend W. Clark-Kerr, Moderator of the Church of Scotland in Jerusalem will speak on behalf of these Churches. Will His Lordship please come up to the platform?



*(His Lordship, the Right Reverend W. H. Stewart, took a seat at the table).*

Rt. Rev. W. H. STEWART (Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem): The Moderator of the Church of Scotland and I have already submitted in writing a joint memorandum prepared especially for the meetings of this Committee. Each of us has also submitted a copy of memoranda put in by our respective Churches to the Anglo-American Committee last year. I presume that you do not wish us to read today the memorandum which we submitted some time ago, and which is, presumably, in your hands. It is, perhaps, inevitable that there should be a little repetition between the documents that we put in last year and the joint document we have put in this year. I hope there is not so much repetition as to make them valueless.

The Moderator and I are here, of course, prepared to refer, each of us to our respective documents of last year, and both of us to our joint document of this year. Speaking for myself, in both of those documents I have tried to confine myself to those aspects of the problem which seem to me to be rightly the concern of the representative of a religious body. In the documents that we have put forward as more or less an official expression of the views of our respective Churches, we have tried not to volunteer political views or to impinge on political questions. For myself, I feel—and I believe my colleague feels—that if the Committee wishes to ask us question on the more political side, it is our duty, and we shall be prepared to answer them, but that so far as anything that we volunteer is concerned, we have endeavoured to keep on the religious and the ecclesiastical side. May I, sir, first refer to two items in these two documents, one of which, I think, requires correction, and one of which is perhaps liable to misunderstanding. In the larger document, which I submitted in March, 1946, and on the first page of it, there is a sentence towards the end of the first paragraph in which it may seem that the Churches somewhat complain of the attitude towards our schools that was taken by the Department of Education. I should like so far to correct that as to point out that since March, 1946, when that document was written, there has been a change in the Directorate of the Department of Education, and a change also in their attitude towards our schools. In so far as this thought suggests any complaint against the Department of Education, I believe they would allow me to say in so far as it suggests a complaint of theirs against our mission schools, I should wish to withdraw it entirely in view of the circumstances of the present day.

A second point I would like to make is in regard to our joint memorandum of this year. At the close of the first paragraph there is a sentence about the Mandatory Government which reads as follows: "The Mandatory Government is mainly Christian in its composition, but for that very reason has so scrupulously re-

frained from any bias in the Christian interest that it has sometimes been accused of being biased in the opposite direction." I am given to understand that some people have taken that to be a criticism of or a complaint against the Government. It was meant to be a sincere compliment. But I do think it is true that sometimes in its very considerateness to the religious feelings, practices, and customs of non-Christians, the Government has, for example, been reduced to being rather hard on the religious feelings of Christians.

Mr. Chairman, will you allow me, with no discourtesy, to suggest an example within your own experience. I do know that Christians have been hurt that this Committee, in its right and proper respect of the holy days of other faiths, have found it necessary to sit on Sundays. You will forgive me for saying that, sir. It is an example that sometimes occurs with the Government and it is something that we bear in mind with regret.

Now, sir, may I turn to what I think are the two main factors in our joint document of this year. We have emphasized, perhaps somewhat severely, what we regard to be really the lack of true religious freedom in this country, particularly when religious freedom is interpreted, and we hold it should be, to allow freedom of conversion from one faith to another. We have also said, at the bottom of page 4, that we know there are many, far more than is commonly recognized, both amongst Arabs and Jews, who deprecate, though they dare not say so, the intransigence of their own political leaders. May I, sir, in support of those two statements, record very briefly four incidents that have taken place in my own study since this memorandum was submitted to you.

Only yesterday I received the enclosed letter which is addressed to you, sir, with the request that I submit it. I do not know the author. I have never heard of him. He writes describing for your benefit the experiences of a Jew who wishes to worship in a Christian church. I think the rest of the letter speaks for itself, and it is not for me to read it. It is significant perhaps that the writer sends it through one of my clergy to me to pass on to you in the hope of preserving his anonymity, though he does sign his name to the letter.

Equally, only yesterday, I was appealed to to assist in getting out of this country an Arab convert to Christianity, now ruined and in fear. Both these things happened to me yesterday.

A few days ago, again since this memorandum was written, two Christian Arabs came to me. They were from Transjordan, which I know excludes them from your purview, sir. But the parallel is interesting. They came to complain to me of the results of independence and its effect on the Christian minority. I said to them: "Yes, but did you not clamour for independence?" And, the answer was: "Of course we did. We dared not do anything else."

The day after that three Orthodox Jews came to call on me, and they asked me to plead with

this Committee for the right of the strictly orthodox Jews to be organized as a religious community, apart from the Knesset Israel, and its organization, the Vaad Leumi. It is, I believe, a fact that such application has been made several times in the past to the Palestine Government and has been refused. All that they are allowed to do is individually to drop out of the Jewish community. I asked them how many there were of them. I had no means of checking their figure, but the answer was "twenty-five thousand now and another twenty-five thousand in a week, if we were allowed to be a religious community."

That group at any rate, and indeed the persons concerned in all those four incidents that I have tried to retell, are to my mind evidence of the point that I am trying to make—that on every hand there is a bigger element of co-operation—may I say of co-operability—than the political leaders either recognize or admit, and that you will find that element amongst the religious people. It may seem strange that the people of whom I have spoken, other than actual converts to Christianity, should come to me with their complaints and their difficulties and ask for my help. The fact remains that they do, and I am proud of it. I believe that it is there you will find the Arab and the Jew having no quarrel with one another. It is in the godly and religious elements on both sides that you will find the makings of peace. And, it is to me a tragedy that a group, neither of my own race nor of my own creed, should come to me to ask to be allowed to be a religious community outside the community of their own people, once the mainspring of the religion of the world.

Sir, I have no more to say, myself, unless in answer to questions. I do not know if my colleague wishes to speak. I will be happy to answer questions if I can, or if I may.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, your Lordship.

Right Reverend Clark-Kerr, have you something you would like to add to what his Lordship has said?

Rt. Rev. CLARK-KERR: There is very little that I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, except merely to emphasize that memoranda from the Christian stand point to other commissions have usually confined themselves to stressing what we call briefly among ourselves "Shrines and Souls," that is, the protection of Holy Places and religious liberty. As we have stressed in our present memorandum, in thinking of Holy Places we are not merely thinking of a few ancient buildings in Jerusalem and Bethlehem; to at least the Western Christian mind this whole country is a Holy Land and perhaps even more holy than the few buildings. The whole atmosphere of the country, its tradition and its history, are sacred: there is no part of it that lies outside of our sense of reverence and sense of its sacredness.

In answer to the question of religious liberty, which has been much stressed already, no matter what statutes are on the statute books of countries, and particularly this country, religious liberty is not protected by lines written into the

law. Something more is required, and that something more we have tried to underline in this memorandum—that is, that whatever system of government is formulated for this country in the future, because of Christian world interest and because of our desire not only for Christian liberty for ourselves but for the other religions in the land, we feel that each religion should be adequately represented in the administration of the country. This has led us a little further in this memorandum than others have gone. We have attempted to stress that some form of co-operation between the communities, and particularly between the religious people in the communities, should be worked out for the development of the country along religious, cultural and humanitarian lines, seeking to lift the country out of the realm of politics and put it back to where it has been—a Holy Land, not only for the three great faiths, but pointing the way to co-operation and enlightenment for the whole world.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you. I read in the joint memorandum on the last page that some form of positive and constructive co-operation between the communities is the inescapable conclusion. Does that also refer to the political issue?

Bishop STEWART: I think, sir, it must mean that at least in any projected form of government, assuming this to remain a unitary state, the Christian voice in government and the Christian share in any governing body should be sufficiently clear and strong to maintain justice towards the Christian minorities as well as to non-Christian majorities.

CHAIRMAN: Do you want to develop how you have sought this co-operation? Do you feel that you will enter into these political questions or do you wish to avoid touching on them?

Bishop STEWART: I rather think, sir, that perhaps the Moderator could answer that more fully than I. It is true that we considered and finally decided not to submit any possible draft scheme. We felt it was not our business. I do not think, myself, that it would be possible to ask the representatives of small Christian bodies to produce a scheme of government for this country which started from their own desire for a fair share in it. I do think that if we were presented with any projected scheme we might be able to say how and where we thought Christian interests should be protected. But I should not, myself, feel competent to begin from that and then find myself having to deal with all the rest.

CHAIRMAN: Will you say then how the Christian interests ought to be protected?

Bishop STEWART: Only if we knew the shape of government in which we were asking for protection, sir, could I answer that.

CHAIRMAN: Well, then, I do not want to push my question.

Mr. VISWANATHAN (India): I can quite understand that when the right of conversion is exercised, if a Jew or a Moslem happens to be converted to Christianity the social group to

which he belongs gets up in arms against him and uses pressure of various social forms against him. But how exactly would you provide in a constitutional or administrative way against such kind of pressure on the new convert? I do not think such a provision has been made in the government or the administration of any country, and I am afraid this is a phenomenon which is common to the whole world.

Bishop STEWART: Yes, it does seem to me, and we have really tried to make the point, that there is a difficulty about religious liberty which has not been adequately realized. If we, as Christians, ask for religious liberty for the Christians, we are of course prepared to concede religious liberty to anyone else. But there are tenets in, for example, the religion of Islam, which in themselves are in conflict with the religious liberty of other people. I do not know. It is a matter for lawyers how that can be evaded. We have suggested that at least any future government should have a strong enough Christian element in it to protect us against that kind of thing. I am not lawyer enough to know how it can be done, but I have in mind a Moslem work on Moslem jurisprudence which makes it perfectly clear, for example, that difference of religion is in the Moslem faith and the Moslem law, which are identical, I think. Difference of religion is an absolute bar to inheritance. Therefore, a Moslem adopting any other religion is automatically disinherited. It is commonly said and believed that the penalty for apostasy from Islam is death. I am, I believe, right in saying that that is nowhere clearly laid down in the *Koran*, but that the Hadith traditions are unanimous in interpreting the *Koran* in that way. Disinheritance and death are not religious sanctions but civil ones, and the difficulty we are suggesting is that it is undesirable that civil penalties should be attached to change of religion. You asked me how to get out of it. I wish I could answer you. I was hoping that this Committee would answer the question.

Mr. VISWANATHAN (India): When we sit down, for example, to draw up the constitution of your country, how exactly would we provide for this—if we tried to provide for this?

CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the question, please.

Mr. VISWANATHAN (India): If we are trying to draw up some kind of a constitution for this country, how exactly would the Lord Bishop like us to put this sort of thing into the constitution as a safeguard for the right of conversion? Do you have any concrete suggestions in the matter?

Bishop STEWART: I do not think, quite frankly, sir, I should like to see any regulation of any faith which imposed civil sanctions abrogated even at the cost, which I admit, of to that extent infringing on somebody else's religious liberty.

Mr. VISWANATHAN (India): In the recent past there has been no danger of any kind to any of the Christian institutions in this country. The world, as a whole, has helped Palestine preserve the sacred character of everything in this land. Is there any special need for any special action

to be taken in the future? Are not the present conditions satisfactory?

Bishop STEWART: Those are, I think, two different points, sir. In regard to the first, there being no danger to Christian institutions, I wish I could agree. I could name two or three Christian schools which we have been obliged to evacuate because we were told it was not safe for our European staffs to work in them. I could name one which had a bomb deposited upon its doorstep only three or four weeks ago. I do not think it is entirely true to say that there is no danger, though I do not think any of us Christian workers would for a moment wish to make much of the danger or to exaggerate it—and, indeed, most of us cheerfully, frankly, laugh at it. But, it is there. The other question, as to the character of the whole country, seems to me quite a different point. The danger there is not a question of physical danger; it is a danger of secularization of sacred things and of sacred places. It is a danger of, shall we say, "corruption of atmosphere." We have spoken of it to some extent in our memorandum, and the Anglo-American Committee referred to it in one particular case which happened to catch their eye, though it was by no means the most outstanding case they could have selected. I think we do feel very strongly that, for example, Galilee has a character and association for the 700 millions of Christians which is being slowly, and sometimes rapidly, undermined.

Mr. VISWANATHAN (India): One more question. You have suggested a share in the government for the Christians. Would you base that share of Christianity in the Government of Palestine on the basis of the Christian minority population of the country, or on the basis of Christianity being one of the three religions concerned with this country?

Bishop STEWART: I think, sir, the answer is in our memorandum. I would say, sir, as I have said before, that it would depend on what proportion of representation was given to other religions. It is at the moment a fact that the interests of the two other great religions are being weighed not on their proportion in the country but on their proportion in the world. All Jewry is interested in the Jews in Palestine. All Islam is interested in the Arabs in Palestine. And, all Christianity is interested in the Christians in Palestine. If the first two were to be adequately represented, we plead the third should be equally represented.

Mr. VISWANATHAN (India): Not merely on the basis of the minority in this country?

Bishop STEWART: Not merely on the basis of its minority.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN: Then, I thank you.

### Hearing of representatives of the Jewish Women's Organization of Palestine

The next item on the agenda is the hearing of representatives of the Jewish Women's Organizations of Palestine, and I understand that for

these Organizations, Mrs. Rachel Katznelson-Rubatchov and Mrs. Rebecca Sieff. Will you please come up on the platform.

I recognize Mrs. Katznelson-Rubatchov.

*(Mrs. Katznelson-Rubatchov spoke in Hebrew. The following translation was circulated.)*

Mrs. KATZNELSON-RUBATCHOV: The Council of Jewish Women's Organizations in Palestine has asked for the privilege of appearing before you, not in order to repeat the comprehensive evidence which you have already heard from the representatives of the Yishuv and of the Jewish Agency, but because we feel that a consideration of the woman's role in the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home might help to clarify that problem for which you have been delegated to find a solution.

Among our people, as among all modern peoples, woman's part in public life has been growing, and there is no doubt that a great part of this progress is due to the activities of the organized women's movements, which have a history of some 100 years in the democracies of Europe and America.

The women's organizations in whose names we are speaking are part of this international women's movement. But the women's movement in the Yishuv and in Zionism has two distinctive features. Although our movement also concerned itself with safeguarding women's particular interests, its main concern was to take its full share in the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home. This is natural for women of a persecuted and oppressed people struggling for freedom. Another characteristic is the urge to develop basic services in health, education, and social welfare—which is typical of the women of a pioneering people.

In order to show to what extent and in what manner the upbuilding process has been influenced by the work of women, I shall cite only a few instances, since the special memorandum submitted by the Council of Jewish Women's Organizations in Palestine describes these in greater detail:—

One of the aims of the Zionist movement has been to imbue Jewish youth with a desire to do manual labour—primarily agricultural work. This objective could not have been so largely achieved if the women's movement had not educated generations of young women here and in the Diaspora to respect physical work, particularly on the land. A considerable part of the effort and the money which women's organizations have poured into the country, have been for the agricultural training of girls. In the years since the first Girls' Farm School was established in 1911, thousands of women farmers have come out of the educational institutions set up and maintained by the women's organizations. And it must be remembered that it was these formerly city-bred girls—far removed from work on the land—who played so large a part in agricultural development in Palestine. Out of their desire to create a people of workers and qualify the women for all fields of work, general vocational

training in addition to agricultural became one of the chief aims of the Zionist women's movement in Palestine and abroad.

In a community of diverse origins and backgrounds, Hebrew is today the unifying element. It is the language spoken in the home and in social life; it is the medium of instruction in the school. A common Hebrew culture is being fashioned from the rich sources of our past and the creative efforts of the present. We could not have attained this without the effort of the Jewish mother, who not infrequently had to learn the language with her children and the active co-operation of the woman in every field of our cultural endeavour in the country.

The transition was difficult for the immigrants who came several decades ago—a transition from an established society in Europe to a strange and desolate land, in which there was no organized Government, no housing, no medical facilities, and only primitive means of transportation. The pioneer women of that period, despite rampant infectious diseases and the trials of a climate hard on people from northern climes, succeeded in raising families—the first generation of modern Palestine—a healthy working generation filled with the joy of living. And so the foundations of the new Yishuv were laid.

These self-same mothers, having raised their children under such adverse circumstances, later turned their energies and talents to creating organizations that covered the country with a network of educational and social welfare institutions for the care of children of mothers working outside their homes, of children of new immigrants, of underprivileged children. It was a Zionist Women's Organization in the United States which, at the end of the first World War, laid the foundation of a health programme for Palestine to combat endemic diseases, to train nurses, to extend medical aid and provide special care for the mother and child. Without this early service pioneering would have been even more hazardous.

During your tours of the country, you saw some of the medical and public health institutions, the schools, the immigrants' hostels, which were established through the efforts of women in Palestine and abroad. The funds which made these projects possible did not come from the rich. They are the result of the intensive work of women in Palestine and of their sisters in the Diaspora.

And at this point I should like to make a remark which seems to us pertinent. You have seen our beautiful farms and institutions—but there is another side to this picture of which you may not be sufficiently aware—the daily struggle for existence of part of the Yishuv.

The first years of their adjustment are difficult for all immigrants, and how much more so for the refugee of today, who has lost all his dear ones and been robbed of all his earthly possessions by the Nazis. And in contrast we have an immigration of families with numerous children who are making their way into Palestine from neighbouring countries—from the Yemen, from

Syria, from North Africa. They come out of love for Palestine and out of a deep need to escape from a life of degradation and serfdom. Their numerous children are a blessing to Palestine, but they require education and care. The women's organizations have gladly taken upon themselves the task of initiating social welfare and health institutions, but they have received little assistance from the Government.

And there is another important sphere of life (of which you will undoubtedly hear in detail from representatives of the Jewish Federation of Labour) in which there has hardly been any Government assistance, and that is the provision of proper working conditions and the assurance of a fair wage for women workers.

It was only through our efforts in co-operation with the organized workers' movement that these objectives have to some extent been achieved, and that women in the liberal professions receive equal pay with men, while women can continue to work in all occupations after marriage. In the same way, in our democratic Jewish community—the woman enjoys the right to vote and to be elected to municipal bodies (except in mixed communities where this right is denied) and are represented in the elected bodies of the Yishuv and the Zionist movement.

As pointed out at the beginning, it is not the fight for her rights which is the main objective of women's public work in our community. We do not rest content with our contribution to the development of our agricultural economy, education and literature, nor with the fact that Palestinian women took their full share in the war effort and volunteered in their thousands to the auxiliary women's services and war industries. It is quite clear to us that these achievements are practically and ethically valueless if we are to remain a minority in this country and the gates of Palestine are to remain closed for Jews who are waiting to begin life anew in Palestine.

While still a small group of women pioneers we began to assume our responsibility towards the Diaspora. In the pioneer movement which served as a reserve corps for the upbuilding of the country, men and women from Palestine worked together. Palestine women travelled from country to country and brought to a dispersed people the message of Zionism and organized the women of the Diaspora for the upbuilding of the Homeland. Jewish women partisans from Palestine died in foreign lands, in the hope that they might save those destined for extermination by the Nazis. Thousands of Palestine women joined the active services not only to fight the common foe but because they wanted to reach Europe and help their kinsmen, the victims of Nazism.

Together with the Yishuv the Jewish women of Palestine resisted the edicts of the White Paper which closed the gates of Palestine and forced refugee-laden ships to be sent away to Cyprus, and in these acts of resistance precious lives were lost.

And today women from Palestine are in the D.P. camps of Germany, Austria and Italy; among them are mothers who left their families in Palestine. They are taking care of children and orphans and young people who were the victims of Nazi terror. They are restoring their faith in humanity and filling them with the hope of beginning life anew. And they are able to do so because of what Palestine means to them.

Last winter I worked for several months in a German camp in the American zone. There I met boys and girls and young people, and thus I can touch on this question. And I say to you, not only as a Zionist but as a Jewish mother: there can be neither spiritual nor physical rehabilitation for these children so long as they remain in the camps.

Quite apart from any basic political solution, we ask you to urge that the children and young people from the D.P. camps in Europe and Cyprus be allowed to come to us. Here we mothers will receive them. Here they will not lack affection. And if it is experience which is required for the bringing up of these thousands of boys and girls, our teachers, nurses, social workers in the Yishuv, have the necessary experience.

We believe that there can be no argument against this plea of ours, that a people mourning a million children, put to death by foul hands, should yearn to give to the few survivors an opportunity to live in the Homeland, for only the Palestine air and climate—physical and spiritual—can give them what they need.

May the rescue of these children be your first step towards paving the way for a solution that will bring to an end the distress of the Jewish people.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose that the writing we have been given contains the exact translation of your address, and therefore I think we need not have an interpretation given to us now. I thank you, Mrs. Katznelson-Rubatchov.

I recognize Mrs. Sieff.

Mrs. SIEFF: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I have been asked to preface my statement by enumerating the organizations that are represented here today: Hadassah—the Women's Zionist Organization of the United States of America; WIZO—the Women's International Zionist Organization; the General Council of Women Workers; the Zionist Women's Organization in Palestine; Mizrahi—the Women's Organization in Palestine and in America; the Pioneer Women's Organization in America; the Women Workers' Organization of Mizrahi; the Women's League for Palestine in New York; the Jewish Women's Equal Rights Association of Palestine. The Mizrahi, as I dare say you have learned, represents the religious organizations.

I should like to join my colleague in expressing our appreciation of your consent to give us a hearing. We would not have further burdened your heavy agenda had we not felt that such is the plight of our people that the voice of the

Jewish woman should not go unheard before this international forum.

In order to complete the picture drawn by my colleague of the woman's part in the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home, I should like briefly to outline the role played by women in the Zionist World Movement. The original constitution of the Zionist Organization as adopted by the first Zionist Congress fifty years ago gave full and equal rights to women, thus emphasizing its democratic and progressive character. In consequence, the first women Zionists were able, from the outset, to devote all their energies to the task of enrolling the Jewish woman into the Movement and enabling her to make her specific contribution to the renaissance of her people. As it is a *sine qua non* for the modern woman to fulfil a dual role, so in addition to these specific tasks, Zionist women have also played a notable part in the raising of the great national funds.

In the memoranda submitted to you by the various women's organizations and in the joint summary presented by the Council of Jewish Women, we have endeavoured to give a concise record of their specific character and activities. These organizations sprang up under regimes with such diverse social and economic conditions as those which prevailed in Tsarist Russia, the free United States of America, liberal Great Britain, extending to all countries of Europe, to the Latin Americas, the British Commonwealth, and even to the smallest Jewish communities in the Far East. The essential unity of the Jewish people is reflected with crystal clarity in this very fact that Jewish women under such diverse conditions and in face of the special difficulties common to all women, have organized themselves for one fundamental ideal—the rebuilding and return to their Ancient Homeland. Throughout all the bitter centuries of the exile, the Jewish woman has joined in the daily prayers for the return to Zion and zealously guarded those age-long religious traditions and festivals indissolubly bound with the life and soil of the Land of Israel. In the lullabies she sang to her child, the Jewish mother expressed this deep yearning and passed it on from generation to generation. To translate this deep-rooted faith into terms of concrete world-wide organization, embracing close on half a million women, has been no light task. It has indeed demanded untiring devotion and constant personal sacrifice.

Women had to learn the significance of the woman as pioneer, to shoulder the responsibility for clearly defined tasks, of which my colleague has given you a picture, and finally, to raise the funds required for their material realization in the land of their prayers.

The rise of the Nazi regime with the incredible suffering it brought in its wake for the Jewish people, demanded an immediate intensification of our efforts and a wide extension of all our institutions and services. That we were able in no small measure to meet the situation, was due to the basic soundness of our work and our organization.

It was a woman—herself a potential victim of the Nazi fury—who conceived the idea of Youth Aliyah—the rescue of Jewish youth from the Fascist hell by bringing them at an early age to Palestine, the one place in the world which could compensate these victimized children for the loss of their parental home and offer them the prospect of a full life as free human beings. This moving idea made a powerful appeal to the maternal instincts of Jewish women the world over, who accepted these children spiritually and materially as their precious charges—brands snatched from the burning! It was a great woman in Israel to whom was entrusted the task of absorbing them into the life and soil of Palestine. In this she had the enthusiastic co-operation of the whole of the Yishuv which opened its arms to embrace the disinherited.

Another new problem now presented itself—the reorientation of the older women from Nazi-occupied Europe, coming in the main from the so-called middle classes. New and very practical ways and means had to be evolved in order to enable them to adjust themselves to the entirely new conditions of life in Palestine. Again, the Jewish woman everywhere responded to the appeal of her uprooted sisters and found the material wherewithal for this great work of rehabilitation.

Then came the war. Millions of Jews trapped in the European inferno; every avenue of escape barred and bolted! In this desperate plight our Zionist women came to the forefront, displaying invincible courage, qualities of leadership and heroism under conditions never known before in human history. What gave them this courage? It was the strong sense of national pride and dignity which they had developed during two decades of intensive Zionist activity. They had already rejected every possibility of individual escape, in order to hold together their shattered and disrupted communities in the different stages on that road of martyrdom which led to the concentration camp and the gas-chamber. They kept alive the cultural heritage of the Jewish people so long as there was a breath in their bodies. They risked and lost their lives in that strangest of all smuggling activities, spiriting away the children over forbidden frontiers or hiding them in hospitable non-Jewish homes. Many of them went underground to find their way to the partisans, fighting by their side on mountain and in forest. In that last heroic stand of the Warsaw ghetto, that unique battle for freedom in the world's history, our young women fought and fell. A mere handful have survived to tell the tale.

In the countries at war the Jewish women, despite the heavy demands naturally made upon them as citizens for the war effort, did not for one moment neglect their work for the national upbuilding. On the contrary, they increased their



activities, firstly in order to fill the gap caused by the obliteration of our Federations and Groups in Europe; secondly, to meet the new demands which I have already described and which gained further momentum even during the war; and thirdly, to take care of and participate in the financial responsibility for large numbers of women, young people and children who came to their respective countries as refugees.

It is significant that the vast majority of the young people who so escaped looked upon this period only as a transition and preparation for their future life in Palestine. In England, for example, since all the young people had either joined the Forces or made a valuable contribution to the war effort as agricultural workers, there was no obstacle placed in their way of becoming British citizens. This they did not accept since their one desire was to come to their own Homeland. Many are already here; the others are eagerly awaiting their day.

But whatever we have been able to achieve, what does it avail us if, after the great extermination, the remnants of our people still languish in Displaced Persons Camps and still live in daily terror of their lives in countries to which they were compelled to return, since the one way they would have chosen is barred to them? Perhaps only those, who, like myself, have visited the D.P. camps in Germany can fully realize this bitter humiliation that the survivors of the first people outraged by the Nazis should be placed in a category lower than those who are responsible for launching this hideous war upon mankind, instead of having been made the first consideration of the victorious nations.

I should like to interrupt my statement for a moment to express our gratitude to UNRRA for what it has done in Europe, and to countries like Sweden and Switzerland, which did all they could to help to rescue and take care of the thousands that found their way over the Nazi-occupied countries to their hospitable shores.

Despite this, such is the attachment of our women to their ideal that even behind the barbed wire of the Displaced Persons camps they have spontaneously re-grouped themselves under the banner of Zionism, not only trying to prepare themselves for the future but organizing once again social and cultural service for their fellow-prisoners.

Only men and women desperate to go home and nowhere else, could muster up the strength to break through these barriers imposed by their so-called liberators to sail the high seas in such perilous craft and under such indescribable conditions. Amongst them are large numbers of expectant mothers and women with babes in arms. Need one say more? It takes the force of the British Navy to prevent this human flotsam

and jetsam from landing in the homeland, and to escort them to the new concentration camps in Cyprus where only yesterday the hungry proclaimed a hunger strike to protest against the degrading and foul conditions under which they are being held.

The prolongation of this agony is a stain upon humanity which can only be effaced if the state of homelessness of the Jewish people is ended. We identify ourselves fully with the political demands of the Jewish Agency for free and unfettered immigration into Palestine and for that independent statehood through which alone this can be achieved.

But there is one vital matter which brooks not a moment's delay and which we as women and mothers feel our sacred duty and our moral right to place before the United Nations: that the 30,000 children surviving in the Displaced Persons camps in Europe in the American zone and the 2,000 now in Cyprus be given at once into the care of the Yishuv. How can we make the world realize that almost all these children are the sole survivors of whole families and entirely without kith and kin. Can you imagine the psychological state of such a child—after what his eyes have witnessed and after that which he has survived? Laughter is banished from his lips. Even in the games which I saw children playing in a newly established camp outside Frankfurt, there was no childish joy, nor that spontaneity which should be every child's birthright. The Jewish woman longs to restore this birthright in so far as it is humanly possible. Where else can this be but in that vigorous life which is Jewish Palestine, together with its healthy normal young generation.

Gentlemen, this is no situation that can be dealt with through ordinary formulae or through normal channels of procedure. We ask you, as representatives of the United Nations and as simple members of the human race, to join in our demand for the immediate release of our children.

We shall not rest nor, gentlemen, shall we give you rest until we have brought our children home.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mrs. Sieff. Does any member of the Committee wish to ask any questions?

*(No response.)*

CHAIRMAN: As that is the case, I thank you once more. We have now gone through the agenda for today, and I therefore adjourn the hearing until Sunday at 9.30 a.m. I regret that we must have hearings on Sunday, but the time at our disposal is so short that if we want to get through we have to do it. The hearing is adjourned.

*The meeting was adjourned at 1.25 p.m.*

# VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-NINTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building,  
Jerusalem, Palestine,  
Sunday, 13 July 1947, at 9.30 a.m.*

## *Present:*

Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Sweden, (*Chairman*)  
Mr. HOOD, Australia  
Mr. RAND, Canada  
Mr. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
Sir ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
Mr. ENTEZAM, Iran  
Mr. BLOM, Netherlands  
Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
Mr. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
Mr. BRILEJ, Yugoslavia

## *Secretariat:*

Mr. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order. The agenda for today's hearing contains two items: Public Hearings of Representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine, and the request of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community to postpone their hearing until one day next week. Do you adopt this agenda?

(No objection)

## *Hearing of representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine*

CHAIRMAN: The agenda is adopted. I understand that for the Communist Party of Palestine the following are going to speak: Mr. Mikunis, Dr. Ehrlich, and Mr. Vilner. Will these gentlemen please come up to the platform.

(At this point, Mr. Mikunis, Dr. Ehrlich, and Mr. Vilner, Representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine, took their seats at the table).

CHAIRMAN: I recognize Mr. Mikunis.

Mr. SAMUEL MIKUNIS (*Secretary of the Communist Party of Palestine*):

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Commission, many Inquiry Commissions have visited our country since the British occupation at the end of the First World War. With every new commission, the trust of the inhabitants of this country in their usefulness diminished, till they were no longer taken seriously. In the meantime, the political and economic situation in Palestine went from bad to worse, until matters reached the present climax.

The reason for this changing attitude on the part of the peoples of Palestine is to be found in the fact that all these commissions were biased commissions—commissions set up by British imperialism. Their task was not to advise and assist our country and its enslaved peoples towards liberation; their task consisted in investigating and proposing measures to the British Government to consolidate its rule and strengthen its strategic and economic positions in Palestine. More than that—their task consisted in increas-

ing, by the methods of their work and proposals, the political tension and furthering the Imperialist policy of "divide and rule".

Since the end of the Second World War, with the smashing of the fortress of German-Japanese fascism and imperialism on the field of battle, with the powerful growth of the forces of democracy and peace throughout the world and the strengthening of the national liberation movement in the colonies, conditions have changed.

Owing to the pressing claims of the peoples of Palestine for freedom, the British Government was no longer in a position to continue unaided its "investigations" and the further consolidation of its position in Palestine. It was compelled to call for American assistance. Thus, the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission was called to life at the end of 1945—behind the back of United Nations. This Commission was the expression of the political as well as economic penetration of the U.S.A. into Palestine. This was a common Inquiry Commission of the two principal Imperialist Powers, and the role it played was therefore similar to that played by the various British Commissions preceding it. Its recommendations, in consequence, were also rejected by Jews and Arabs alike, as they did not contain even the shred of a just solution of the Palestine problem.

In a different spirit altogether you, the UNSCOP, are welcomed by us. The masses of this country, struggling for freedom and independence, are welcoming you with open hearts. You have been sent by the highest world organization—by the United Nations to whom all freedom-loving peoples in the world over turn their eyes in the hope that it will give a lasting basis to the peace and freedom for which millions shed their blood in the Great Anti-Fascist War. Already your presence in this country, as the representatives of the United Nations, is an achievement for us, the peoples of Palestine; it signifies a higher stage in our struggle for the solution of our problem by the only internationally authorized body. Your presence symbolizes that the endeavours of the Jewish and Arab masses to take their problem out of the hands of Imperialism have to some extent succeeded.

The Communist Party of Palestine has the right to state before this forum that it has had a considerable part in this development towards the intervention of the United Nations in our problem. We were the first and most consistent fighters in this country for the mobilization of the masses of the people in the struggle for the transfer of the Palestine problem to the United Nations. In this we had the assistance of world forces striving for peace and democracy. This does not imply that we have failed to notice, or have failed to warn the people of this country of the dangers of the many intrigues carried on inside and outside the United Nations, of the imperialist endeavours to detract from your importance by declarations reserving beforehand the right of acceptance of non-acceptance of your proposals. And the most significant success of these Imperialist intrigues has been the staying away of the representatives of the Arab people

of Palestine from the internationally constituted forum.

But we, the peoples of Palestine, are going forward, forward—in spite of everything. And firm is the resolution of our peoples to keep up the struggle until the full realization of independence and the freedom of our country will come true.

We regret that for Imperialist reasons—namely, to prevent the participation of the Soviet Union in this Commission—the Governments of Britain and the U.S.A. have, at the United Nations session of May 1947, brought to fall the proposal to include the big powers in the present Commission.

This has rendered your task more difficult. But we can assure you that with some measure of goodwill on the part of all concerned—above all, on the part of the Arab and Jewish peoples of Palestine—the way for a just solution will be found. For you should not forget that the peoples of our country do expect from your work and your decisions the outcome of a just and final solution at the September session of UNO.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Commission, British imperialism has maintained its hold over Palestine for 30 years, ruling our country on the lines of a Crown Colony. These have been years of oppression, of political, economic and military domination over the entire population of Palestine—Arab and Jewish alike. Years of misery, unemployment, outrages by army and police forces, planned and conscious effort by imperialism to preserve the economic, social and cultural backwardness of our country.

These have been years of terror and oppression directed against the upsurging National Liberation Movement and the peasantry, against anti-Imperialist and patriotic forces; years of imprisonments and deportations, collective fines, police terror and martial law. A bloodstained colonial regime of oppression, of encouraging and preserving tension and antagonism between Arabs and Jews, denial of elementary civil liberties and of exploitation of the people. Poverty in agricultural areas, sweated labour in towns and villages, poor conditions in citrus plantations, an appalling housing situation with no efforts on the part of the Government to clear the slums at the outskirts of the major towns and villages. Prisons instead of schools, concentration camps instead of hospitals!

During World War I, the British posed as liberators of the Arab peoples, promising independence to all Arab countries—Palestine included. At the same time they were making promises to Zionist circles for the establishment of a National Home for the Jewish People. Since then, nearly 20 different committees have visited our country.

The Anglo-American Commission marked a "new" phase of combined Anglo-American action in favour of continuing the colonial rule, based on the "fact" of Arab-Jewish antagonism, presenting the problem of Palestine not as a problem of the liberation and independence of the

country from foreign domination, but as a problem of Arab-Jewish rivalry.

This was followed by a committee of experts, whose recommendations were rejected by the British Government. Then—the Morrison Plan, or the Federal Plan, or the fourfold partition of Palestine, and afterwards the Bevin Plan for Cantonization under British rule, called "Trusteeship"—all these plans mark only additional steps in the general plan to perpetuate Imperialist rule. After all these Committees and Declarations one thing has remained—British rule and Arab and Jewish enslavement.

Though Palestine is but a small country in the geographic sense, it is of sufficient strategic and economic importance for British imperialism to have made it into a formidable military base. This base is directed not only against the inhabitants of Palestine, but against all the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the Middle East.

But the huge military base which the British Government has been building up in Palestine greatly surpasses any needs even of a colonial army of oppression directed against the people of Palestine and the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the Middle East.

The British manoeuvres, held some time ago in the desert adjoining Palestine, where troops were made to fight an imaginary Red Army that had invaded the Middle East, give a clear indication against whom British reactionary circles intend to direct these military preparations in Palestine.

About the intentions of British imperialism regarding the future of Palestine, information can be gathered from the book *Great Britain and Palestine*, published in 1946 by the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London. There it says: "Whatever be the regime in Palestine, from the point of view of the British imperial lines of communication, it is as important as Egypt. From the strategic standpoint this is an advanced position in the East against any potential threat to the Suez Canal. It is the terminus of the oil pipe line from Kirkuk; it is a landing on the international air route to India and farther on, and the starting-point of the high road through the desert to Iraq".

The vast resources of oil in the Middle East are obviously one of the principal reasons why the imperialist powers wish to retain their hold over the countries of the Middle East.

Palestine occupies a key position as an outlet of oil pipelines and as the place of one of the largest refineries in the Middle East. Palestine is also of the highest importance for the mineral wealth of the Dead Sea. In addition to this it offers an attractive market for the exporting industries of Britain and the U.S.A.

To retain its hold over a freedom-seeking population, the British Government has introduced a military and police rule in our country, so ruthless as in few other colonial countries of the world.

Military and police forces in Palestine have been increased to such an extent that there is now one soldier or policeman to every 13 citizens;

yet, with the increase of the so-called "security measures", insecurity has increased.

According to official Government figures, expenditure on the "Maintenance of Law and Order" for the period 1920-45 amounted to £143 million while expenditure on all other services totalled £96 million including £22 million expenditure on special measures arising out of the war. According to the budget for the year 1947-48, estimated expenditure will be about £24.5 million. Of this, the principal item of expenditure refers to Police and Prisons, and amounts to £7 million or 30 per cent of the total budget.

The police and military rule in Palestine is expressed not only by the magnitude of police and prison establishments, but also by the orders and regulations giving every policeman and soldier nearly unlimited power over every citizen. The Defence (Emergency) Regulations 1945, published in the Supplement to the *Official Gazette* of 27.9.45, have abolished the last remnants of personal freedom, freedom of conscience, speech, press and assembly.

The methods of such "defence" rule have made the citizens of Palestine completely defenceless against police cruelty. Special British squads are reported to have kidnapped Rubowitz and nothing has been heard further of the victim. Our comrade, Sjoma Mironjanski, has not been seen again after he fell into the hands of the police on 7 July, 1941. Before the war anti-fascist political refugees were deported to fascist countries on suspicion of being communists.

Court Martial against soldiers who have committed murder or robbery, if they are taken up at all, usually end with the acquittal of the accused.

It is obvious that, in the circumstances described above, there is no such thing as civil rights existing in Palestine. The inhabitants of Palestine take no part in responsible governmental work. "The senior officials both in the central departments and in the districts were British"—says the Peel Report.

Jews and Arabs alike are barred from any legislative work of the Government. Censorship of the press was imposed from the beginning and renewed from time to time. Press Ordinance 1933 prohibited even the keeping of a printing press without a permit.

The political life of Palestine, after twenty-nine years of British rule, is characterized by the absence of all democratic legislative or executive institutions. British rule has prevented the democratization of the country, sabotaging even the most elementary initial measures.

Even the Advisory Council established in 1936 is comprised exclusively of British officials.

All power is vested in the High Commissioner. The system introduced by the British military administration after the conquest of Palestine is still in force today.

The executive is composed entirely of colonial officials. Likewise, all higher government posts in the central as well as in the district administra-

tions are filled by officers of the Colonial Administrative Service. Palestinians are excluded from all higher administrative posts.

Nor are the municipal and local council areas governed democratically. The franchise is subject to various qualifications, including rate-paying requirements; in the majority of municipal and local council areas, the right to vote in the election of councillors is vested solely in the propertied classes—at the last Jerusalem elections held in 1935 only approximately 7,000 out of 70,000 adults had the right to vote. In Jerusalem, Haifa, Jaffa and in almost all smaller towns and villages, women are disfranchised.

The High Commissioner may appoint mayors and deputy mayors from among the councillors against the majority vote of the Municipal Council—as has been done in Tel-Aviv. The High Commissioner is free to dismiss a mayor, a deputy mayor, or a whole elective municipal council—as has been done in the case of Jerusalem and nine other municipalities.

Existing municipal, local, and village councils have very limited powers. They are not allowed to expend even the smallest item without the written consent of the British District Commissioner.

Elections to municipal councils are postponed by the Government time and again in order to keep reactionary majorities in power; in most municipalities no elections have taken place for the last twelve years.

Only recently a further retrogressive measure in the administration of Arab rural communities was introduced by the Village Administration Ordinance of 1944, abolishing council elections.

As in any colonial country within the Empire, the British Government uses the people and resources of Palestine as objects of the grossest exploitation. The principal economic positions of the country are in British hands, such as the Dead Sea and electricity concessions, oil refineries and pipelines, insurance companies, large banks.

The mineral wealth of the Dead Sea—the most important raw material of Palestine—instead of being used to finance the improvement of the conditions of the people of Palestine, their health, education and standard of living, is extracted solely for the benefit of the British shareholders of the Palestine Potash Company. No tax is levied on the Company, nor has the Company to pay customs duties on imports. Major control in the Palestine Potash Company is in the hands of I.C.I.

The oil refinery at Haifa (The Consolidated Refineries Limited) is a foreign concern exempted from all payment of customs duties.

Monopoly concessions have been granted to the Iraq Petroleum Company and to the Trans-Arabian Oil Company. These concessions include the right—free of royalties, taxes, import duties or other payments, charges or compensations—to lay pipelines through any part of the country, to expropriate land, to seize any wood, stone, water and other local materials required, to import cheap labour regardless of existing immi-

gration laws, to pass freely the border of Palestine, to build and use their own harbours, railroads, aerodromes and wireless stations, to exact port taxes for harbouring and loading, and to keep their own police force. The population of Palestine does not derive even cheaper oil and petrol from these concessions, granted by the Government without any consultation of the people.

Monopolistic concessions have been granted to two foreign concerns for the supply of electricity in Palestine. The concessionaries have the right—without payment of any royalties and taxes—to exploit the water power of Palestine and to fix exorbitant rates. They have to pay no import duties on machinery, nor any other import duties until a tax-free dividend of eight per cent is secured to their shareholders. No steps are taken by the government against them, when failing in their obligations to supply the public with electricity—as in Jerusalem.

The power of foreign monopoly capital can be gauged from the fact that in 1943 two companies, the Palestine Electric Corporation and the Palestine Potash Company, owned over forty per cent of the total industrial capital investments in Palestine.

The British Government uses Palestine as a market for British goods and, in the interests of British trade, it hinders the development of competitive local industries.

War conditions compel the Government to permit an expansion of certain local industries within the limits of war requirements. But since the end of the war, the Government does everything in its power to strangle industrial development through an import and control policy maintaining inflationary conditions in this country which heavily burden the masses of the consumers. The means employed towards this end are:

- 1) Restrictions on the import of modern machinery. For example, during 1946 out of total imports amounting to £70 million, only three millions were spent on machinery.

- 2) Restriction on the import of raw materials, combined with a licensing policy directing the purchase of raw materials for Palestinian industries towards the most expensive sources. An outstanding example is offered by the present crisis in the textile industry. It emanates from the high cost of production, the causes of which can be traced to a great extent to the high prices of raw materials allocated to Palestine. When a bundle of yarn costing £40 in Italy reaches this country, its price comes to £130—that is, over three times the export price.

- 3) Maintenance of a high cost of living by a policy restricting imports of cheap foodstuffs from so-called hard currency areas, closing of cheap Empire sources of foodstuffs to Palestine consumers. Maintaining a purchase monopoly for certain foodstuffs from countries with inflationary price levels; restricting the import of cheap building materials with the purpose of creating a high level of rents for workers' flats and industrial premises; and enforcing a large

number of unsocial measures burdening the masses of the population.

A few examples illustrate the supply policy of the Government. Wheat flour has been bought by Government at a price of £68 per ton, while similar flour is obtainable from Australia at £27 per ton.

Sugar is sold at exorbitant prices. In Australia jam manufacturers pay £16–18 for one ton of sugar; in Britain, £20–20.5; while the Palestine Government sells sugar to jam manufacturers for £64 per ton. But even this price is only on paper; actually the black market price at which most of the sugar is sold has reached £300 per ton, that is, five times the official maximum price. This fact also illustrates the lack of effective price control on the part of Government.

All these facts can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that Government has no intention whatsoever to import low-priced goods into Palestine, which would reduce local prices, but is interested in an inflationary price level that will ensure an open market for British export goods.

The importance of the agrarian problem in Palestine is indicated by the fact that the majority of its inhabitants live on and from the land.

As in other colonial and semi-colonial countries under British rule the British Government in Palestine does not support the development of a well-balanced agricultural economy, supplying the requirements of the local market, but directs its policy towards an excessive expansion of a mono-cultural products—citrus—which renders the country dependent on the metropolitan market, and the large planters subservient to British interest. The complete neglect of general agriculture is illustrated by the allocation for agriculture of a mere 4 per cent of the total budgetary expenditure.

During the thirty years of British domination, the Department of Survey has not "succeeded" in completing its work and in presenting a clear picture of the land conditions in Palestine. This is in line with the policy of the Government to conceal the gloomy picture of the life of the broad masses of the peasantry; to conceal its agrarian policy of preserving the backward agrarian system in Palestine, thus enabling exploitation and eviction of the tenants.

No legislation exists for the protection of tenants against eviction. No institutions of assistance for agriculture, for obtaining interest-free loans (among Arabs, interests on loans amount to 30 per cent; among Jews, to 11 per cent), modern equipment, fertilizers (chemical fertilizers cost 2½ times more in Palestine than abroad), and means of irrigation. All these problems of the daily life of the village are as burning today as they were before the war.

The large banks—Barclays', Anglo-Palestine and other institutes representing foreign banking interests—heavily burden local agriculture with exorbitant interest rates. Through this policy, the Government has strengthened the position of usurers in their dealings with tenants and small farmers.

The Government does not support any irrigation schemes. The import of modern agricultural machinery is restricted by an unsympathetic import policy. During the war, the import of fodder was handed over to a private monopolist who drew huge profits from poultry and dairy farmers. There are no Government laboratories for undertaking research in agricultural problems.

The Budget, dictated by the Government without consultation of the population, is characteristic of the colonial policy of exploitation and repression—as regards both revenue and expenditure.

More than 50 per cent of the revenue is obtained by indirect taxation, such as customs duties for imported articles and excise duties on local products. From year to year, indirect taxes are growing relatively and absolutely, burdening the masses of the population. Only a quarter of the total revenue is derived from direct taxation.

Capital taxation or death duties to be borne by the propertied classes do not exist, while on the other hand such taxes as animal tax are still in force.

Income tax—only recently introduced—burdens particularly the small taxpayer, since inflation of prices has drawn a large number of workers and employees into the orbit of income tax payment, while the large incomes are relatively little affected. The huge incomes of the foreign concessionaries, extracted from the resources of the country, are not subject to income or other taxes and duties. Local companies pay a flat rate of 25 per cent on declared profits.

Of the huge sums extorted from the masses of the people of Palestine, hardly anything is spent towards economic, social, educational, or hygienic improvement. Over 30 per cent of the total expenditure is used to finance the oppression of the people—police and prisons.

On education, health, and other social services, the Government spends about 8 per cent of the total budget. The disgraceful state of education in Palestine illustrates this side of colonial policy.

Among the Arab population, only 32 per cent of children between the ages of 5 and 14 are accommodated in schools. 23,000 Bedouin children do not receive any schooling at all. After 30 years of British rule in Palestine, 70 per cent of the Arab population are completely illiterate.

Even among the Jewish community, which greatly contributes towards its own educational system, about 10,000 children do not receive any school education. 30 per cent of children at the age of 10 years, 40 per cent at the age of 11 years, 55 per cent at the age of 12 years, and 65 per cent at the age of 13 years do not attend school.

The small number of professional schools and agricultural institutions existing in Palestine, have been established by private means without Government assistance.

Only 445 beds in seven hospitals serve the Arab population. 800 Arab villages have only 21 Government clinics, 41 sanitary clinics and 30 infant and temporary welfare centres—that is all for the Arab population. The Jews have two

beds for every thousand of the population, while in England there are 8 beds for every thousand.

The non-existence of a progressive labour legislation in Palestine, which seriously affected workers in the past, has made itself felt even more during the last few years, when owing to the industrial development during the war, the working class greatly increased in numbers.

The few laws for the protection of women and children introduced in 1927, and the amendments of 1944–45, are insufficient, all the more as they have remained on paper, the Government having taken no steps to enforce them.

Elementary rights, such as the right of forming trade unions, the recognition of trade unions, the right of assembly and strike, the limitation of working hours, minimum wages, compensation in case of discharge, payment for absence due to sickness, annual leave and leave on public holidays, are not even mentioned in the labour legislation of the country.

In many industries and factories child labour is still common. The Government itself employs children from the age of 10 on at extremely low wages in road-making, building, etc., especially in Arab districts in southern Palestine.

It is clear that such a foreign policy State could not be run against the united will of the two peoples of Palestine.

Therefore the British Government has made every effort to divert the attention of the peoples from the main problem of their oppression and arouse and strengthen chauvinistic demands against one another. While extreme nationalist propaganda was never suppressed in Palestine by the C.I.D. created for "Law and Order", efforts of Arab-Jewish rapprochement were either eliminated behind the screen or openly destroyed.

In June 1930, a society called Workers' Brotherhood was founded in Palestine with the object of organising Jewish and Arab workers in common trade unions. The manifest of this society was signed by Arab and Jewish workers and progressive Zionist intellectuals. (One of the last mentioned, Dr. Bergman, was the Director of the Hebrew National Library.) The paper of this society and the society itself was suppressed and prohibited.

The Government reaps its political fruits from the policy of "Divide and rule" and its support from reactionary forces among both Arabs and Jews in that it has not to face a united struggle of the Arabs and Jews in Palestine for the abolition of colonial rule, independence and democratisation of the country; instead, the Government has succeeded in fomenting hostilities on national lines around such problems as immigration, fear of national domination, purchase of land, employment in Government service and public works, import policy, industrial and agricultural development, taxation, education and health services.

A striking example of this policy is the keeping of Jewish quarters on the common border



of Jaffa-Tel-Aviv in the Jaffa Municipality, thus inciting Jews against Arabs, and at the same time inciting the Arabs against the Jews by including an Arab village in the Tel-Aviv Municipal area.

The Government has succeeded in making the reciprocal boycott propaganda of the Jewish and Arab reactionary leadership a characteristic feature of the political and economic life in Palestine, thereby furthering not only its own political end, but also the sale of British products to the detriment of local production.

The boycott called by the Arab League in Cairo against goods of Jewish production has lasted for nearly two years. During this period the initiators and executors have helped considerably to incite the political atmosphere and deepen national antagonism in the country. Throughout this period the Government has not lifted a finger in an attempt at prohibiting racial propaganda and activities and has not interfered in the Arab boycott, just as previously the Government did not put an end to the Jewish boycott of Arab foods and labour.

Until the declaration of boycott on Jewish industrial products on the part of the Arab League, followed by the reaction of the Association for Jewish Products calling on a counter-boycott on Arab agricultural products, economic relations between Jews and Arabs were normal and satisfactory. The Jews offered an important market to Arab agricultural production. In 1945, Jewish purchases from Arabs amounted to £2.5 million, or three times as much as in 1936. On the other hand, Arabs purchased from Jews industrial products to the amount of £850,000 in 1935, and £3 million in 1943.

Government agents encourage the mutual boycott which results in an increased volume of British exports to the Middle East, as illustrated by the record of the British Food Ministry which states that in 1946 British exports to the Middle East increased five-fold. During January-September 1946, British exports to Syria and the Lebanon rose from £686,726 in 1945 to £3,518,199. The above facts clearly show who derives the benefit from the deterioration of economic relations between Jews and Arabs.

Here is another example of the "Divide and Rule" policy. A few weeks ago the High Commissioner delivered a speech at Lydda, declaring that his words were "not political". Nevertheless, he found it necessary to devote the crux of his speech to communal provocation by stating that 70 per cent of the Government income came from Jewish pockets, whereas 69 per cent of the expenditure was directed for the benefit of the Arabs.

With these words the High Commissioner revealed his real aim of increasing national tension during the visit of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine to this country. Thus he tried to conceal the simple truth that the majority of taxes flow from both Jewish and Arab pockets into the Government Treasury, to be spent on building prisons, promoting po-

lice activities and strengthening the British strategic bases in this country.

The Government's latest intrigue is the Benzine Tax. The tax imposed on benzine in the beginning of July 1947 is the latest example of Government's policy of "divide and rule". This tax is intended to provide Arab reaction with material for anti-Jewish provocation—"Jews blow up and Arabs pay"—and Jewish reaction with material for anti-Arab provocation—"the surplus income will be spent on developing Arab areas at the expense of the Jews". The truth is, that from the material point of view, both the Jewish and Arab masses have to bear the cost of the tax, since they are forced to pay higher prices for benzine, while the Government, together with its partners among the oil company owners, derives material as well as political benefit from the large sums extracted from the population, and from the communal antagonism being fostered and intensified.

Before concluding this part of my address, I deem it necessary to add a few words about the question of immigration into Palestine. Imperialism has greatly exploited the people's interest in this question. This is one of its important "secret weapons" to divert the peoples of this country from their fight for freedom and incite them instead against each other.

Imperialism well knew when to allow a certain amount of immigration to serve its purpose and when to stop it altogether. In the first instance, Imperialism incited the Arabs against the Jews, in the second, the Jews against the Arabs. Imperialism knew to exploit for its own purpose both the disaster of persecuted Jews, and the misery of the oppressed Arabs, both of which peoples desire nothing but peace and freedom. Imperialism was assisted in this game by reactionary forces among the Jews and the Arabs.

It must be plainly understood that the overwhelming majority of the Jews who immigrated into Palestine, did not come to find an easy and comfortable life in this country—this is not to be found here—neither did they come for political reasons. They came to this country, as well as to other countries, as a result of anti-semitic and fascist persecutions. Without the policy of Imperialism and that of "conquest of the country" of the Jewish Agency, the question of immigration would never have acquired its present character.

Everybody knows that for long periods there has not existed any hatred of rivalry between Jews and Arabs and we are confident that the two free peoples—the Jews and the Arabs—in a free independent Palestine will find a just and democratic way to offer fraternal help and a home to persecuted persons, as befits free peoples.

However, even under the particular circumstances of today, Imperialism endeavours to use and utilize the immigration problem for its own ends. On the one hand, it is Imperialism that is responsible for the detention of hundreds of thousands of displaced Jews in camps, preventing them from entering other countries and finding there a new life, home and hope. On the other

hand, the Government tracks down those who come to the shores of this country, and deports them to Cyprus.

The terrible tragedy of the Jewish people is generally known. Millions of persons of different nations have been annihilated by the fascist criminals. But there is no people whose blood has been shed so much as that of the Jewish people. However, a quarter of a million of those who have survived this horrible destruction, is still pining away—two years after the end of the war—in camps under terrible conditions. This fact in itself, is a disgrace and a mark of Cain on the forehead of those who like to talk so much about "Western Culture" and who open the door of their countries wide to fascists and nazi collaborators, while they keep them firmly shut before the Jewish victims of fascism.

While Jews in Eastern Europe take their part in a normal and productive life, they are, in the British and American zones of Germany, detained in camps as Displaced Persons.

Nobody can think of the plight of the Jewish people without burning memories of Naidanek and Belsen arising in his mind, without a feeling of profound horror at the crimes committed by the fascists against European Jewry. It is imperative to liquidate the camps in Western Germany, Austria, Italy and Cyprus, where hundreds of thousands of Jewish victims of fascism are still suffering.

It is an urgent duty of the United Nations Organization to provide every help and opportunity to those displaced Jews, to enable them to live a normal and productive life. Immediate liquidation of the camps is an absolute necessity.

The United Nations Organization should provide every facility to displaced Jews desirous to return to their countries of origin where democratic regimes have been established, as well as to those interested in emigration to other countries including Palestine, taking into consideration the desire to join relatives. This is the way to solve this urgent problem, and to eliminate the "Divide and Rule" speculations of imperialism.

To sum up: this is, in short, the history of the British Mandate, a history of colonial oppression and exploitation. This is the picture of Imperialist interests in Palestine and of the constant endeavour to subjugate the Arab and Jewish peoples of our country to serve its purpose. This is the history of military and police terror, of colonial administration and economic strangulation. This is the gloomy picture of the manner in which the "Divide and Rule" policy has been applied in the specific conditions of our so much suffering country. It is a self-explanatory history covering about thirty years. It is the severe accusation put before you by both peoples—Arabs and Jews alike—against the Mandate, against its Imperialist patrons!

British Imperialism had to face the resistance of the masses of the people against its domination, from the very beginning. The Arab and Jewish masses have never submitted to the yoke of dependency and foreign rule. They have

struggled—on many occasions and in many ways—for the removal of the Imperialist domination and for their national freedom. During disturbances or open revolts, as well as in the tense intervals, the masses of the people have been doggedly fighting for their independence and peace.

All British Commissions tried to underline and to emphasize the Arab-Jewish animosity, making it a cause, instead of an outcome of the Mandate policy. The Mandatory tried always to distort the problem of Palestine, representing it as an Arab-Jewish rivalry and not as a struggle of Arabs and Jews for their liberation from Imperialist rule.

But, of course, the integrity of this "theory" is doubtful, as the working masses of the Arab and Jewish peoples have been undermining it periodically. The striking facts of Arab-Jewish co-operation in the economic as well as in the political fields—intensified during the last two years in spite of unfavourable political tension—have created a serious gap in this Imperialist front of traditional argument.

Both peoples of our country—Arabs and Jews—claim the abolition of the Mandate and the termination of British rule!

The demand for evacuation of the British Army from Palestine is a common demand of both the Arab and Jewish masses.

People understand now very well that those two demands are but one, as nothing is gained by the abolition of the Mandate, if foreign troops remain in our country. Both the Arab and Jewish peoples of Palestine fight for their just elementary rights for national independence, for an independent, free and democratic Arab-Jewish Palestine. This just and elementary demand must be fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Committee: various sides have tried to present the relations between the Arabs and Jews in the worst possible light. Too many prominent leaders—Arabs and Jews—the so-called traditional leaders, advocate a theory that Arab and Jewish aspirations could not be reconciled. This would, of course, be in line with the Imperialist interest in the partition of Palestine.

Nothing can be further from the truth than such a theory. History, even that of recent years, teaches us that many peoples living in one country can very well march together and co-operate, provided there is no foreign domination and intervention creating division and antagonism. As an example we may take the new Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, etc.

Put an end to the Mandate, evacuate the British troops, proclaim the independence of Palestine and the two peoples of our country will unite and work together for the realisation of a prosperous Arab-Jewish democratic state.

We emphatically reject the idea of partition, as it is contrary to the economic and political interests of the two peoples. We advocate the plan that Palestine should be constituted as an independent, democratic, bi-unitarian state,

which means, a single state inhabited and governed by the two peoples, Jews and Arabs, having equal rights.

The termination of British rule and evacuation of troops will create the preliminary conditions, essential for free negotiations between the two free peoples, in order to arrive at a decision on the future political structure of the country in their best interests. Under such conditions of free Arab-Jewish collaboration and removal of the artificial obstacles from the way of the democratic forces, Arabs and Jews will be free to decide on the character of the independent state, built on a bi-national or a federative settlement.

Only the abolition of the Imperialist Mandate, the complete evacuation of the British Army and the opportunity for Palestine of free economic development, the setting up of democratic governing institutions, hand in hand with social reform, and the consolidation of the national and civil democratic rights of the peoples—Arab and Jewish—will secure the complete independence of Palestine.

I come now to our Requests for immediate action.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Committee: The British policy is fraught with great danger for the peace of Palestine. The situation is grave. You are commissioned by a world authority of great importance, by the United Nations Organization. And all of us, the peoples of Palestine and world public opinion, are justified in expecting your assistance to release the tense situation of Palestine.

We raise our voice of protest against the colonial terror and lawlessness maintained by the British Police and Army of oppression. And we present our requests, which are the requests of the masses of the people whose immediate implementation the United Nations Organization should demand from the Mandatory Government:

1. To give back and extend the civil liberties of which we are being robbed;
2. To abolish all Emergency Regulations;
3. To abolish capital punishment and refrain from carrying out the death sentences recently passed;
4. To abolish the system of banishment of Palestinian inhabitants from the country, irrespective of their nationality and their political views;
5. To promulgate laws for the recognition of the rights of Trade Unions.

We call upon you, upon all progressive forces in the world, to assist our peoples in their just struggle for liberation. We are part of a worldwide front, striving for peace and freedom, for national liberation, social advance, and democracy.

And again—you should not forget that the Arab and Jewish peoples of this country expect from your work and your decision the outcome of a just and final solution at the September session of the United Nations Organization.

Thank you!

Mr. EHRLICH (Member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Palestine): Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Committee, having visited so many parts of the country, you must have seen the huge police fortresses dominating villages and towns, security zones in the cities, barbed wire and dragon teeth, tanks and armoured cars racing over roads and streets, one military camp close to the other, armed soldiers and policemen everywhere. Though you have been accommodated by the Government in the Kadimah Flats and other out-of-the-way places, you will have felt the tension, the insecurity and instability reigning in the country; you will have seen the expression of hatred with which the people, Jews and Arabs, look upon the tanks and carloads of soldiers rumbling through the streets. You should know that during this month much has been improved for your benefit. This YMCA Building has been removed from the Security Zone. For long months Jerusalem was subjected to intermittent curfews and martial law. For long months soldiers have not shown the restraint they now assume. The intensity of oppression has fluctuated. There were periods of open terror and there were periods when some illusions of freedom were created. More than that: there were periods when the main weight of oppression was directed against the Arab population and periods when the main weight of oppression was directed against the Jews—so that the other community should appear as “privileged”. In this way, the direction of oppressive measures was exploited as an instrument of “divide and rule”.

On the whole, oppression has been steadily on the increase. Take the figures published by Government on the maintenance of “Law and Order”. It started with less than £400,000 annually, reached nearly £5 million in 1944–1945 and this year, according to the statement by the Financial Secretary of 4 June 1947, it will be about £7 million; yet these figures do not include expenditure for the Army. These £7 million represent 30 per cent of the budget of £24½ million. In the same statement, the Government explained that the “Security” budget has made it impossible to provide adequately for education, health and social services. But in the years before the Second World War, when the Government surplus amounted to not less than £6.3 million, those services were not better provided for.

When the Communist Party appeared before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in 1946, we stated that there was then in Palestine one policeman or soldiers for every eighteen inhabitants, a figure that has since been widely quoted abroad. In the meantime, the figure has been reduced to less than thirteen inhabitants for every policeman and soldier, 150,000 policemen and soldiers being actually stationed in a country of 1,900,000 inhabitants.

You have heard the argument of the Government. This huge army is deemed necessary to defend the so-called Law and Order and to protect one community against the other. This is a traditional and well worn-out Imperialist argu-

ment that cannot be taken seriously by anybody. Even the Government Survey submitted to you says: "Since the British occupation, there have been but few intervals when the problem of internal security has not been a major preoccupation of the Administration of Palestine", and that means insecurity came to Palestine with the British occupation and has become the main feature of the life of the country for the last thirty years.

You will have observed that the Police and Army are not guarding the buildings of Arab or Jewish leaders or the houses or institutions of these communities but their own strongholds and military and civil establishments. In Trans-jordan where there are no Jews or Arabs to protect from each other, you will nevertheless find a large British Army and military bases. All this proves that the British are not here to safeguard Law and Order or to protect the Jews and Arabs from the so-called "threat" of mutual attacks. If the Army and Police are not needed to protect one people from the other, what are they really needed for?

Their only task is to maintain and strengthen their strategic bases, directed against the freedom of Palestine and the forces of peace in the Middle East and the world at large. Army and police actions against the people of Palestine are based on a system of dictatorial laws issued by the British Government. Already in 1933 various regulations for the prevention of crime gave unlimited power to the police authorities, so that the consent and sentence of a court are made illusory. Such methods developed from stage to stage, starting with the military administration, through the Collective Punishment Ordinances as early as 1926, until it created the situation described by the Anglo-American Committee in the following terms:

"In 1936 . . . the Government issued regulations authorizing seizure and use of buildings and road transport, the imposition of curfews, the censorship of the press, the deportation of undesirables, and unusual privileges of arrest, search and collective fines."

What was the situation in 1946, according to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry?—"Recently . . . the Government has again taken extensive recourse to emergency regulations, some of them newly issued and revised in 1945 and 1946. Orders of detention may be issued against any citizen on the authority of an Area Commander, and these orders are not reviewable by any court of law."

This system of oppression is now being carried out on the strength of the so-called Emergency (Defence) Regulations of 1945 which have lately been amended so as to deprive the population of the last remnants of liberty. It is a pity that the bulky Survey and Supplement submitted to you by Government do not contain the text of these regulations. The reason is not far to seek. According to the "Law" of Palestine, there is no personal freedom, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of press, or freedom of assembly. Any person may be placed under police

supervision, banished, detained or deported from the country. We have submitted to you a petition by Jerusalem citizens, calling on you to intervene in the case of their sons and daughters who, without trial or indictment are detained in prison camps for months and years. Young people may be whipped, and many cases of flogging have been officially reported; requests for writs of Habeas Corpus have been rejected by the judiciary with the argument that the District Commissioner's powers under these Regulations are absolute and that he is not obliged to give reasons when he acts under the Regulations.

The description of the Emergency Regulations of 1945 should not lead to the impression that before that date colonial oppression in Palestine was mild. There were long years, culminating in 1941, when terror was exerted against the progressive forces of the country and especially against the Communist Party of Palestine.

I want again to say a few words not contained in my written speech. The Shaw Commission (1930) declared itself against "the policy of reducing the garrison in Palestine" and encouraged "the creation of an adequate Intelligence Service" against "every form of subversive activity in Palestine". Sir Herbert Dowbiggin, Inspector General of Police, Ceylon, proposed in the same year, 1930, "a new Criminal Investigation Department". The Criminal Investigation Department, characteristically, had very little to do with ordinary crimes. It was "re-organized" in 1932, as the Peel Report says with satisfaction for political repression and persecution of the people, against "political movements, particularly communism" to "arrange deportations" and the like.

Communists were arrested, several hundred deported and the remainder detained in the prisons of Palestine. The slightest suspicion of sympathy with anti-imperialist aims or any, even private, connections with a party member, were deemed sufficient reason for an order of detention. In 1936 the refusal to grant the detainees the rights of political prisoners caused the hunger strike that lasted 19 days and was widely supported by the population. During those years, the import of progressive literature or any books or periodicals regarded by the authorities as Left-Wing, was prohibited.

The Government regards the police as a panacea which can cure all difficulties it encounters. To quote an example: last winter a severe drought affected the Beersheba district and the people cried for help. The Government did help—it appointed a few hundred temporary constables as a measure against unemployment.

Allow me to say a few words as a citizen of Jerusalem. What have they done to our city? Hundreds of families have been evicted from flats, shops and offices. We were given forty-eight hours to leave and take our belongings wherever we could. The quarters from which the people were evicted are wired in. There are four so-called security zones which cut the two main roads of the town. Armed camps have been established in the midst of our ancient city, a striking example of military occupation. Security zone pass-

ports are issued, with the "race" of the bearer inscribed often with the letter "J", standing for Jew, in the same way as the Nazis marked the passports of German Jews. For weeks night curfews were imposed, and for many days day curfews as well. Curfews in Palestine are imposed as collective punishment, without moral or legal justification.

Martial law was imposed on an important part of Jerusalem, on Tel-Aviv, Ramath Gan and Petar-Tikva. For three weeks in March 1947, the Army suspended essential public services, including post, telephones and telegraphs, the transport of passengers and goods, and the entire apparatus of civilian administration and law courts. Martial law affected hospitals, physicians and emergency cases. Workers were cut off from their places of work, factories had to close down, 15,000 workers became unemployed in Tel-Aviv, 1,650 at Ramath Gan, 6,000 in Jerusalem. Total martial law unemployment at one time reached the figure of 25,000. Workers had to walk several miles a day in order to reach workshops under the constant danger of being shot during the hours of darkness. Work in the Tel-Aviv Port ceased; one million cases of citrus fruit went to waste in the port areas. In the coastal districts citrus remained unpicked in an area of 15,000 dunums, or 15 square kilometres. At Tel-Aviv all places of entertainment had to close down by 10 p.m. In Jerusalem, the martial law area was under curfew for 21 hours a day, later for 17 hours. On 10 April 1947, the Government published new Emergency Regulations for "Controlled Areas". According to these Regulations, in the Areas to be placed under control, all Government Offices, including railway stations, would be closed, all—except police stations. No business would be transacted. Civil courts would be closed; there would be exclusive jurisdiction of military courts, even for offences committed before the imposition of Control, even for pending proceedings. No telephone, telegraph or postal services would be allowed. There would be no entry into, or exit from Controlled Areas without special permit, for person, vehicle, vessel, aircraft or thing. The authorities would have power to remove persons from the Area and power to requisition.

But, to be clear, even without the imposition of these special measures most of the powers mentioned have already been, always and everywhere, vested in the authorities. For all practical purposes the whole of Palestine is a controlled area with no rights for the inhabitants.

Immigration into Palestine has been exploited by the British Government for a whole series of provocations. Unarmed refugees are received here by the British Navy and Army with battle-ships and tanks. Tear-gas has been used against them; on numerous occasions they have been fired at and several were shot or beaten to death. The rest are put into cages and interned behind double rows of barbed wire in Cyprus.

In spite of a flood of laws and orders, law and order do not prevail. Security measures have reached their peak and security has vanished

completely. The Government Memorandum on the Administration of Palestine under the Mandate speaks of the paramountcy of law and of the liberal regime—but actually the law is regulated lawlessly and the regime is liberal only towards its high officials and towards the soldiers, who may act at their pleasure.

The soldier who was stationed in Palestine during the anti-fascist war was friendly towards the people and the people were friendly towards him. Today, soldiers stationed in Palestine are systematically trained in the spirit of racialism, and the spirit of an Army of Occupation in enemy territory. They have been fed on the poison of anti-semitism. General Barker, the former Officer Commanding, instructed his soldiers in a secret order: "Strike the Jew on the sole place where he feels it, on his pocket".

It is a strange understatement when Ben Gurion told you "that it was a matter of surprise that the unofficial assaults were so few". There were only too many, and they comprise murder, rape and pillage.

Let us start with murder. On 30 June 1946, the curfew imposed on Tel-Aviv was lifted at midnight. Ten minutes past midnight Amram Rosenberg, walking with his sister in Ben Yodua Street, was shot by a British officer in the back and killed. The officer confessing to the murder was merely sentenced to be discharged from the Army.

On 24 April 1946, a soldier, Carson by name, was on guard on the Jaffa-Tel-Aviv border, when a group of six Arabs approached, one wearing two wrist watches. The soldier demanded one of them, and when the Arab replied that it belonged to a friend, Carson killed him and robbed him of his watch. There were many eye-witnesses but the soldier's claim that the bullet had escaped his rifle was accepted by the British Court and Carson was set free.

On 8 April 1947, Moshe Cohen, a Jerusalem merchant, 43 years of age, was shot dead by an Army patrol on his way home.

Estrer Tobi was shot dead while waiting at a bus station. Aboud Mizrahi was shot dead on his way home accompanied by his daughter; Kati Shalom, a 4-year old girl, was shot dead while standing on the balcony. Ismail Ibn Mahmud, a young Arab boy, was killed near the bridge at Hertzelia. When his mother hurried to his assistance she was beaten, kicked and trampled on by the soldiers. The murder of 16-year old Alexander Rubowitz who was kidnapped by a British terror squad under Major Farran is known to you from the press. During the disturbances of 1936-39 a British constable was injured. Thereupon a British patrol picked three youngsters at random in the nearest village, Gilat el Harithiya, and murdered them in the village yard.

Neither the Army nor the Police show any regard for the citizens' homes or property. Flats have been entered by day and by night, for checks and searches, with destruction of property and robbery. People used to say "Don't leave any valuables at home—there may be searches".

During the disturbances of 1936-39 large scale destruction of property was caused in Arab villages—in some cases by bombing from the air; fourteen houses were destroyed at Masmiya Village in the Gaza District. Last year, houses, store-rooms and stables were destroyed at the searches of agricultural settlements, such as Doroth and Ruhama.

Women and girls have been molested and have been raped.

There was a night in Tel-Aviv—the inhabitants called it the Night of Horror—the night of 8 March 1947—when soldiers fired with machine guns from armoured cars, killing 4 and injuring 15. There were days of pogroms committed by the soldiery in Tel-Aviv and Nathanya.

It is a sombre picture, but the knowledge of these facts is essential for the understanding of the gravity of our situation and of the criminal nature of the activities of the Army and Police apparatus in Palestine. Until today, the British Government which has confessed to the failure of the Mandate, has not confessed to the crimes committed in our country.

In the British Government's policy of "Divide and rule", the Army plays an important part. Jews and Arabs in uniform are put in action for objectives and in areas and quarters where this in itself must contribute to national hatred. The Transjordan Frontier Force, for instance, was employed against the Jewish settlement of Kfar Giladi in a way that placed responsibility not on the British officers but on the Arab soldiers.

Already in the Spring of 1946, when the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry was here, the facts were so obvious that the Committee was compelled to state that Palestine is an armed camp and to admit that even from the point of view of the budget, Palestine has become a Police State. Today the situation is still worse than a year ago.

To sum up: Whichever political proposals your Committee will recommend, they should clearly and unequivocally include the demand for the evacuation of the British armed forces from Palestine. This is the common demand of the Jewish and Arab masses of Palestine. The feeling of the masses you may judge from the 27,000 picture cards sent to you by the people of Palestine demanding evacuation of the British army—although the censor has forbidden the publication of these pictures in our newspaper, Kol Ha'am. The posters displaying the pictures were torn down from the walls in Jerusalem, and in Haifa on the day of your visit, by the military.

The evacuation of British troops from Palestine is imperative for the peace and development of the country. It is one of the most important and most urgent steps to be taken to free the inhabitants of this country from the instrument of colonial oppression, and to make Palestine independent.

The evacuation of British troops from Palestine is imperative for the peaceful development of the Middle East. The Police-State built up in

Palestine is also a threat to the neighbouring countries.

For the sake of the peace in this country, for the sake of its free development and democratic co-operation between the peoples, for the sake of the maintenance of international peace and security, Palestine must be freed and cease to serve as a military camp for the Imperialist army. In the name of the wide masses of both peoples of this country, we appeal to you and through you to the United Nations who have, in their Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small, to direct the British Government to withdraw its troops. To quit Palestine!

Mr. VILNER (Secretary of the Communist Party of Palestine): In my testimony I shall have the honour to acquaint you in a more detailed form than has been done in the memorandum submitted to you with the plan of the Communist Party for the solution of the problem of this country in a just and democratic way.

Before laying this plan before you, I shall take the liberty to clarify some of the fundamental premises serving as a basis to this plan and to analyse and reject those other plans which in our opinion are not in the interests of the inhabitants of this country and of world peace.

Let us take The Problem of Independence.

In the period after the Second World War, when the democratic forces in the world grew in power and vigour and when the struggle of the colonial peoples for national liberation and for independence reached a new peak, Imperialism began to adapt its tactics to these new conditions, without changing its policy and its objects even one whit.

One of the methods the British Government has been using in its colonial policy after the war is the distortion of the conception of independence. The classical example thereof is Transjordan. In order to prevent a discussion on this mandated territory before the United Nations Organisation, the British Government concluded a so-called agreement with one of its agents, the Emir Abdullah, according to which Transjordan has been proclaimed an independent country and Emir Abdullah its King. But everyone will understand that there is nothing but deceit and hypocrisy in all this. Transjordan, allegedly "independent" now according to the Treaty with Great Britain, serves as one of the mighty military bases of the British in the Middle East. A strong British army and air force dominate little Transjordan. This Transjordanian State is therefore in effect a British colony and an important strategic center. Its alleged independence is nothing but an illusion proclaimed in order to block the fight for the real independence of Transjordan.

In the same way British Imperialism has attempted to "solve" the Palestine question. In the autumn of 1946 it convened the official representatives of the Jews and the Arabs in order to solve the problem of our country accord-



ing to the Transjordan pattern, behind the back of the United Nations, so as to place this organisation before a *fait accompli*. The Government of the U.S.A. publicly demonstrated by its participation in the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission that it is hand in glove with Great Britain in the imperialist intrigues in the Middle East and in the undermining of the authority of United Nations, which is the sole international body competent to deal with the problem of Palestine. This, because Palestine is first, a mandated territory, and second, because it is an important strategic area which under the present circumstances is serving as one of the points where the preparation for a new world war is being carried out by the Anglo-American imperialists.

The London Conference, an Anglo-American imperialist intrigue, was a complete failure on account of the Anglo-American rivalry which goes hand in hand with collaboration, and on account of the contradictory attitudes of the Jewish and Arab official leaders. Only after this failure was Britain forced to transfer the Palestine problem to United Nations. The official leaders of the Arabs as well as of the Jews appeared at Lake Success only after Mr. Bevin had already arrived there.

The negotiations in London and the plans that were presented there by Britain have proved that the real objects of the British Government were to grant the country an "independence" *a la* Transjordan; it is to turn Palestine into a British military base "by agreement".

In view of these designs of British Imperialism, we regard it as necessary to stress the following: When speaking of the independence of Palestine we have in mind no fictitious independence, but full and true independence, the meaning of which is—evacuation of the British Army and Police from Palestine and the removal of the British military bases; independence which further means removal of the economic subjugation of the country by foreign monopolies, a subjugation brought about with the help and collusion of the British civil and military authorities.

The abrogation of the British Mandate and the evacuation of the British Army from Palestine are pre-conditions for any solution. No plan for the independence of Palestine can possibly be realised while British rule continues and the foreign army remains on the territory of Palestine.

Let us take The Morrison Plan.

One of the proposals of the British Government in the recent past is the so-called "Morrison Plan". According to this plan an "Arab province" is to be established in 38 per cent of the country, a "Jewish country" in 17 per cent, while the Negeb and Jerusalem are to remain British reserves. The most interesting point, however, is that the central rule is to be vested in a government appointed by Britain. We have here before us one of the most instructive examples for the real stand of the British Government. The British Government proposes again and again new schemes, which do not grant even a bit of real

independence to the country and which are designed only to incite Jews and Arabs against each other.

According to the Morrison Plan which is incorrectly called a Federation Plan, all real power remains in the hands of the Central British Government. The High Commissioner would be empowered to intervene in all matters of the so-called "autonomous regions", the Jewish as well as the Arab, in addition to the direct rule over the districts remaining under British rule.

Military, police, courts, foreign affairs, customs, transport—all these would remain in the hands of the British Central Government. It thus becomes obvious that the British plan does not weaken in the slightest degree the present imperialist rule and only creates new points of friction between Jews and Arabs on questions of boundaries and the size of the territories in the so-called "Jewish" or "Arab" districts.

The British Government is here behaving in the same way as the cunning fox in the ancient legend. The fox saw two monkeys quarrelling between themselves over the division of a piece of cheese they had found. He offered his mediation and brought a pair of scales. Then he divided the cheese into two parts and put them on the scales. Naturally one piece was heavier than the other and since each of the two monkeys was keeping strict watch that the other should receive no more than his share, the fox bit a piece off the larger part; of course enough to make the other part heavier so that he had again to bite a piece off that one; and since the two monkeys were so intent only on seeing that the other did not receive more than his due, they let the fox continue his mediation work until all the cheese had gone, eaten up by the third party.

Such a plan of foxy cunning is the Morrison Plan. We do not oppose it on account of the federation idea it contains. We are against it because it does not remove British rule in Palestine and is not construed on the basis of Palestine independence and its liberation from foreign political, military and economic subjugation.

The Morrison Plan is one of the outstanding examples of how British Imperialism is searching for means to maintain the colonial rule over Palestine by new constitutional forms which do not affect the foreign rule and which are calculated to evoke clashes between Jews and Arabs.

Let us now take the Bevin Plan.

On 7 February 1947 the British Government proclaimed a "new" plan. This plan is built upon the creation of Jewish and Arab cantons in Palestine; but it too starts from the imperialist principle that the foreign rule must be maintained. The British High Commissioner will be the "guardian" of the minorities in the different cantons. The Central Government would be appointed by Britain. In the hands of the High Commissioner will remain the supreme legislative and executive power. This regime, which was to continue for five years, is called "Trusteeship". After that period there was to be transition to independence provided that Jews and Arabs agree to a new constitution.

This plan is thus built upon the idea of a transition period to independence, but in fact it is only apparently so: the British Government is the main factor interested in a split between Jews and Arabs in order to prevent a joint fight of both people against it for liberation. The whole policy of the British Government in this country is based, as in other British colonies (India, Ceylon, etc.) on the fostering of national and religious antagonisms, in accordance with the imperialist principle of "Divide and rule". A "transition period" under the protection of Imperialism cannot bring nearer the independence of Palestine and peace between the peoples. It can, on the contrary, be directed only towards the gaining of time for the consolidation of the foreign rule and the fostering of new national antagonisms. In reality the British "Mandate" in Palestine should have been a transition period towards independence. But in fact it is known that Great Britain, the Mandatory on behalf of the League of Nations, not only did not foster independence but did everything possible to prevent such a development. And thus after thirty years of British rule we are witness to the fact that the mandatory system has gone completely bankrupt and not only that Palestine has not become independent, but the most elementary democratic rights, and even security of life, have been robbed from the inhabitants of the country.

To sum up: the plans of Morrison and Bevin have one thing in common, namely the tendency to create new points of friction between Jews and Arabs on the basis of a fight about imaginary boundaries of districts with illusory self-government, while over all the "cantons" and "federative districts" hover uninvited peace angels—the British aeroplanes—for the protection of oil, the military bases and the superprofits of monopoly capital.

The plan for partition of Palestine is the plan of the British Foreign Office, kept in reserve for the event that "Federation Plan" *a la* Morrison and "Cantonisation" *a la* Bevin fail. The British Partition Plan is founded upon the conception of increasing the split between Jews and Arabs and perpetuating British rule. The intention underlying it is to divide Palestine into three parts, one Jewish, one Arab and the third British. The Arab and Jewish parts are to enjoy an imaginary independence on the lines of Transjordan. The intention is to camouflage the British military bases through fixing formal political boundaries which in reality would not change in the slightest degree the actual state of affairs. For there is no independence if British districts are maintained in Palestine. There is no independence without the evacuation of the foreign army.

The Partition Plan was first proposed by the Peel Commission in 1937. According to this plan there were to be established a "Jewish State", an "Arab State", and in addition a British "enclave" or corridor extending from Jerusalem to Jaffa.

The afore-mentioned Partition Plan drawn up by the Peel Commission of 1937, proposed

the creation of a "Jewish State" more than one-third of whose inhabitants would have been Arabs. The report itself says:—

"It is, of course, too much to hope that after partition there will be no friction between Arabs and Jews, no 'incidents', no recriminations, keeping open the wound which partition must inflict . . . the question of the minorities must be boldly faced and firmly dealt with".

In partitioned Palestine there will be no peace between Jews and Arabs, but suspicion and the wish for revenge and territorial extension. The latest proposal of Mr. Ben Gurion for retention of the Mandate in the Arab part of the partitioned Palestine, can leave no doubt as to the intentions of the advocates of partition.

The whole scheme will only strengthen foreign imperialist rule in all parts of Palestine. Whether or not parts of the country will remain under direct imperialist administration, there can be no doubt that imperialist control will be the overriding force in every part of Palestine. The sections of the country will compete for imperialist assistance, for "protection of minorities", for expansion, for loans, for weapons, offering strategic basis, exploitation of raw materials and economic key positions.

The struggle for genuine independence will become more difficult in the divided parts owing to the fostered antagonism between Arabs and Jews and the newly created minorities.

The partition of Palestine is advocated by Abdullah, King of Transjordan, who, with the help of some politicians in other Arab countries, tries to organise a bloc of Arab countries. This scheme, known as the "Greater Syria" plan, provides for the creation of a state which would include the Arab part of Palestine and which would serve as a *cordon sanitaire* and a strategic base for Anglo-American Imperialism under a Hashemite crown. Advocates of partition within the Zionist camp regard a "Jewish State" in part of Palestine under imperialist "protection" as an instrument for future conquest of the remaining part of the country while Right-Wing Zionist groups want to include Transjordan in the future Jewish State.

Economically partition would be disastrous for both the Arab and Jewish peoples in Palestine. There is no natural frontier cutting Palestine into two sections. The partition of the country would entirely and arbitrarily destroy the economic unity of Palestine. Arabs and Jews are in general not living in clearly separated areas.

The important mineral deposits of the Dead Sea which form the basic natural wealth of Palestine would, in a partitioned country, only serve sectional interests.

For any development scheme involving the vital plans of major irrigation throughout Palestine, the waters of the Jordan are essential.

Partition would cut the railway system of Palestine into several sections. The main railway line of Palestine, that connecting Gaza and Haifa,

crosses the frontiers proposed by the Peel Report not less than five times. The main roads carrying the major portion of Palestine's passenger and freight traffic, would be similarly affected.

Industries are mostly concentrated in Haifa Bay and the industrial belt of the Tel-Aviv area. In the partitioned Palestine, the industrial zones would be cut off from the mainly agricultural parts of the country. TO SUM UP: Partition would not solve the problem of Palestine. It would be a catastrophe for the economy of the country and would retard social and economic progress for a long time to come. It would increase the antagonism between Arabs and Jews and block the way to freedom of both peoples; it would strengthen the domination of imperialism and local reactionaries and would ease considerably the upbuilding of the Anglo-American bastion against the movements for National Liberation in the Middle East and against peace.

It may also be that the British Government will try to carry on with its colonial oppression and the retention of the military bases by changing the word "Mandate" into the word "Trusteeship" without altering the contents of these terms and without in the least abandoning its positions. It is also possible that it will attempt to reach an agreement with the U.S.A. regarding a joint Anglo-American trusteeship. The Arab and Jewish masses of Palestine will oppose British or Anglo-American trusteeship, as a camouflaged colonial rule.

Why are all plans of the British Government based on the denial of the possibility of fraternity between peoples and upon the "necessity" to retain the British regime and armed forces allegedly to guard the peace between Jews and Arabs. The reason is neither accidental nor does it affect Palestine alone. It is a direct consequence of the general international policies of Britain and the inherent oppressive nature of Imperialism.

In this country the large-scale construction of military bases is under way. The military preparations of the colonial rule are actually as feverish as in war time.

Tens of thousands of workers are in the employment of the Army. Palestine is turning into one of the main British military bases in this part of the world. Strategic and oil interests. They are guiding British policy in Palestine.

The political programme of the Jewish Agency as it has just been proclaimed before you is a plan for the establishment of a Jewish State. From the answers of Mr. Ben Gurion it became clear that the Jewish Agency are willing to consider Partition.

In reality the plan of the Jewish Agency is the same as that of Dr. Weizmann, the only difference being that Dr. Weizmann clearly and openly says what he wants, while the Agency wants to retain the possibility of bargaining and fear that if they propose partition publicly and outrightly their chances or bargaining in ensuing discussions will be reduced. In particular, the Agency do not dare to appear openly in favour of Partition, because this solution is not

at all popular among the Jewish masses. The vigorous opposition of the Agency to a bi-national State originates above all in their opposition to Jewish-Arab co-operation and an agreement which would take into account the just national aspirations of both peoples of Palestine and would guarantee them equality of rights.

The Agency has proclaimed for the first time that they do not support the continuation of the British Mandate. Even if this proclamation was made only in order to comply with the sentiments and anger of the masses of the Yishuv against Imperialism, it does express the feelings of the Yishuv with the exception of a small group of miserable servants of Imperialism.

All the Yishuv is united in its view that the *status quo* can no longer be continued. The masses have had more than enough of the British rule of oppression.

Likewise, the overwhelming majority of the Yishuv is opposed to the partition plan of the Jewish Agency and of Dr. Weizmann. Workers' parties such as the Hashomer Hatzair, the Ahdut Avoda and Poale Zion Party, which vehemently protest against the partition of this country have been forbidden by the Agency to appear before you and to give testimony. Among many sections of the middle class too there is opposition to partition on economic grounds. When the Jewish Agency demand the partition of Palestine, they do not express the public opinion of the Yishuv.

It is also known that the Arabs of Palestine are united in their opposition to Partition. They regard it, and quite rightly, as an obstruction to the possibilities for the achievement of national liberation and as a consolidation of the position of the foreign rule in the whole country. Those British agents—of the kind of King Abdullah of Transjordan—who demand partition of Palestine out of their subservience to the British strategic schemes in the Middle East, do not express the opinion of the Arabs of this country nor of their own countries.

The Arab Higher Committee has not appeared before you, but its political programme is, as known, the establishment of a Palestinian State, by which is meant an exclusively Arab State, while conferring minority rights upon those Jews who already were in the country in 1918 and to their descendants. This programme disregards the reality, the existence of two peoples in Palestine. The programme is only playing into the hands of the foreign rule to divide between Jews and Arabs—a plan of domination which can serve no one but the imperialists.

The democratic forces among the Arab people which have grown considerably during recent years and have an especially decisive influence among the Arab workers, are opposed to this reactionary attitude to the Jews in Palestine.

To the vital question "Is Jewish-Arab co-operation possible?" we reply clearly and unequivocally in the affirmative. Even under the present conditions of colonial incitement co-operation is on the increase. So much the more will it be possible in an independent and democratic Palestine.

I shall now give some examples of identity of interests and co-operation between the Jews and the Arabs.

In spite of all efforts by very influential elements in Palestine to antagonize the Jewish and Arab workers, cooperation between them is increasing and embracing more and more workers of both peoples in the common struggle for the protection of their rights and the achievement of improved wages and working conditions, as illustrated by the increase in the number of joint strikes of Jews and Arabs during the years 1943-1947.

There were three such strikes in 1943; one in Jaffa, where 130 municipal sanitary workers, Jews and Arabs, struck for higher wages, cost of living allowances and improved social conditions. In Jerusalem, there were two common strikes of municipal workers: 385 Jews and Arabs struck for improved conditions and the right to acquire permanency in their jobs. These strikes amounted to a total of 2282 working days.

In 1944 the number of participants increased from the previous year's 515 to 1300. In Haifa about 1250 Arabs, Jewish and Armenian railway workers struck for higher wages and improved social conditions. In Jaffa, Jewish and Arab industrial workers struck against unjust lay-offs and for improved conditions. The total of this year was 5640 working days of common strikes only.

In 1945, 1300 Jewish and Arab workers in a military labour camp struck in opposition to arbitrary dismissals and for the recognition of the workers' organization. (Up to date the Government has not yet recognized the workers' committees and trade unions of military camps' workers). This strike lasted a full week and was accompanied by common meetings and demonstrations which were received with great sympathy by the population. Again 130 Jewish and Arab telephone workers struck for improved conditions. The strike lasted three days and resulted in success. In Haifa, 1100 workers employed at the railway repair shops stopped work in complete discipline and solidarity. Total participants in common strikes during 1945 were 2530, involving 8500 working days of common striking.

In 1946 the strike wave of Government workers reached a peak. Employees of the Department of Posts and Telegraph, Wireless, Civil Servants (Second Division) and Railway Workers, engaged in a strike which completely paralysed the entire Government machinery. The number of Jewish and Arab strikers amounted to 30,000. Political and religious leaders, as well as influential newspapermen of all sides, were mobilized for the purpose of breaking the strike. Provocative rumours were spread and all means were used, but the strikers remained united and maintained their solidarity and were thus able to realize the major portion of their demands. Only by false promises the Government succeeded in preventing a widening of the strike to include the 45,000 military camp workers and thousands of oil workers, who were on the verge of participation.

In addition to the many common meetings, a number of joint demonstrations took place in all

parts of the country, and especially in the large cities, carrying slogans of "Unity of Arab and Jewish Workers means Victory". These demonstrations were received with sympathy and support by the general Jewish and Arab population.

In May 1947, following a period of common strikes in the oil companies such as Shell, Manta-cheff and Socony Vacuum, the three large trade union organizations—the Histadruth, the Congress of Arab Workers, and the Arab Workers' Society—for the first time in the history of the Palestinian working class arrived at an agreement to organize a warning strike of military camp workers. The strike took place on 20 May, 1947 and passed in complete unity and solidarity. The participants numbered 40,000 Arab and Jewish workers.

It is significant to emphasize that these common strikes took place in times of severe national tension inflamed by the Government and its supporters among Jews and Arabs.

These common strikes and the solidarity expressed by Arab and Jewish workers, have grown beyond the limits of a purely economic struggle, and have become a manifestation of political struggle and a demonstration against the colonial administration and chauvinistic incitement.

As an instance of how the common man views the question of co-operation, I quote the words of an Arab villager during a joint anti-locust action covering 2,500 dunums in the Sharon Valley. He said, according to the paper *Haaretz*: "If the locusts will lay their eggs in the earth of the 'combania' (as the Arabs call the Jewish collective settlements) naturally in two weeks the insects will invade my fields too and eat of my crops. It is a chain, and Jews and Arabs are links in equal measure in this chain."

It was inspiring to see the Arab and Jewish villagers intermingled going forward shoulder to shoulder in long lines to combat the common enemy.

In addition to the common actions which express the co-operation of the Jewish and Arab toiling masses, there were further examples of Arab-Jewish co-operation. In its memorandum to the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission, the Government was forced to state a number of typical examples of successful co-operation among Jews and Arabs. The memorandum said:

"The General Agriculture Council which contained equal numbers of Arab and Jewish members, had unbroken existence of over 10 years and came to an end only because its main functions passed into other hands. The most significant example is perhaps in the Citrus Control & Marketing Board, established by law in 1940 and 1941 respectively. Both contain equal numbers of Arabs and Jews and have continued to maintain a singleness of purpose in dealing with the affairs of the citrus industry which has been most refreshing. A joint Transport Advisory Board was successfully formed. The mixed Haifa Municipal Commission has successfully remained in operation since its appointment."

The numerous facts of economic collaboration in common working places, in mixed municipal councils and on various occasions between Jewish and Arab neighbors have emerged beyond the limits of pure economical interests and become a political demonstration directed against the desire of the Government to provoke quarrels and sow division between the two peoples.

In addition to these facts a long series of attempts, made by Jews and Arabs, to come to a political agreement, may be recorded.

In view of the importance of these attempts, some instructive examples will show how various circles of Jews and Arabs worked unceasingly for a political agreement.

In the beginning of 1922, a Pan-Arabian Congress was convened in Cairo. At this Congress proposals were discussed for a Jewish-Arab agreement and political and economic collaboration between the two peoples. Negotiations were opened between the representatives of the Arabs and Dr. Eder, member of the Zionist Executive Committee. Mr. Saphir from Jerusalem was the mediator. Dr. Weizmann was kept informed of the course of the discussions, and approved of them. But the negotiations were interrupted after Dr. Weizmann informed the British Government about them. The officials of the British Government demanded to "postpone" all negotiations in view of the fact that the approval of the Mandate was on the agenda.

(Medzini: "Ten Years of Zionist Policy")

Dr. Magnes revealed before the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission that in the negotiations between Arab Leaders and the Jewish Agency in 1936 the former agreed to considerable Jewish immigration. The number of Jews in this country was to reach 800,000 in 1946 or 40 per cent of the total population.

Why did this agreement not come off? Moshe Shertok revealed this on 26 March, 1946, before the same Anglo-American Inquiry Commission, where he stated:

"There were Arab leaders who were inclined to give their consent to a very considerable Jewish immigration, but they made conditions that could not possibly be accepted. It was impossible for the Jews to agree to the immediate liquidation of British Mandatory rule; that was not their function and in those days, they were not enthusiastic about such an eventuality."

These few examples show that:

1. During the years of British occupation the Government has directly or indirectly disturbed all attempts at a Jewish-Arab agreement.
2. There have existed and still exist Jewish and Arab circles who desire and are ready to come to a political agreement.
3. The problem of immigration did not present an unsurmountable obstacle to mutual understanding.
4. On the basis of joint struggle against colonial rule and for complete equal rights between Jews and Arabs, political agreement is possible.

5. The numerous common actions which have found their expression in the solidarity strikes of thousands of Arab and Jewish workers, prove the strong desire of the masses of the people for a peaceful life and mutual understanding.

6. The abolition of the colonial rule will create the conditions for the achievement of peace and brotherhood between Jews and Arabs.

The problem of Palestine is not the Jewish-Arab antagonism. The Palestine question is the question of a colonial country subjugated by foreign rule and thirsting for freedom. The real issue of the Palestine question lies in the clash of interests between British imperialism and the population of this country, Arabs and Jews alike. The tension which exists between Jews and Arabs is no justification whatsoever for British rule and for British troops being stationed in our country. On the contrary the reverse is true: 30 years of British rule in our country is the main reason for the present relationship between Jews and Arabs. The colonial rule is the main source of the national antagonism existing in our country. The abolition of the British Mandate, the evacuation of the British Army from our country, and the setting up of a democratic and independent Arab-Jewish State — is the only solution to the Palestine question.

The reactionary plans of the Arab Higher Committee and of the Jewish Agency do not express the real feelings and opinions of the Arab and Jewish masses at the present juncture. Ask the ordinary Jew, the ordinary Arab in the street and they will tell you how far away the masses are from the schemes of domination hatched by their reactionary leaders. You will then convince yourselves how strong the desire is for the establishment of friendly relations between Jews and Arabs based on peace and equality; how both peoples yearn for liberation from the foreign yoke.

The proposals of the Communist Party express these demands of the masses and of the common Jew and of the common Arab. The Communist Party holds that any political solution to be acceptable to the broad masses of both peoples in Palestine to fulfill their just national aspirations and to correspond to their common interests, must be founded on the following two principles:

1. Full independence of Palestine; that is,
  - (a) Abrogation of the Mandate.
  - (b) Evacuation of the foreign armies.
  - (c) Abolition of the economic domination of foreign monopolies; and
2. Recognition of the right of both peoples to independence in a single free and democratic Palestine, based on the principle of full equality of civil, national and political rights.

We submit the following plan for the realization of our independence:

1. As a first step, the United Nations should proclaim the independence of Palestine and

the abrogation of the Mandate. The United Nations should fix a date at the shortest possible time for the evacuation of the British Army and Police from our country.

2. The Security Council of the United Nations should appoint a Commission to carry out the appropriate decisions taken by the United Nations and to restore the democratic liberties of which the inhabitants of Palestine have been deprived. The United Nations Commission to be appointed should convene representatives of both peoples of Palestine democratically elected who are to determine the future regime of this country on the principle of two free peoples with full equality of rights. Jews and Arabs, freed of foreign pressure, will decide of their own free will whether independent Palestine should have a bi-national or federative structure.

The restoration of democratic liberties and the abolition of the imperialist terror regime are pre-conditions for the free expression of the will of the two peoples, for the growth of the foundations of their brotherhood. You should not forget that the British Government, during the 30 years of its rule, has suppressed all forces struggling for Arab-Jewish friendship. Until 1942 the Communist Party of Palestine was illegal, hundreds of its members were deported, hundreds more thrown into prison and concentration camps, accused of mobilizing the Jewish and Arab masses for the struggle against colonial oppression and for friendship between the peoples.

During all these years the British Administration has encouraged the chauvinistic forces among Arabs and Jews in order to prevent the common fight of both peoples against the foreign domination.

To put the question as to whether there will be peace between Jews and Arabs after the evacuation of the British Army, is to put the cart before the horse. It is British rule which is the main source of the national antagonism. For many years the two Semitic peoples have lived in peace and brotherhood; they have had periods of common happiness and progress, of co-operation and brotherhood. Again and again British Imperialism has done its utmost to incite both peoples against each other.

The Greek philosopher Archimedes once said: "Give me a fixed point and I shall move the earth."

We say: "Give freedom to Palestine and the Jewish and Arab masses will find the way to co-operation."

No doubt, the British Government will try to sabotage your work and recommendations in order to prevent a final and speedy solution. But the Arab and Jewish masses are united in their demands for the immediate termination of the regime of colonial oppression.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Commission, if you will help the Arab and Jewish peoples of Palestine in their struggle for freedom, you will lay the basis for peace not only in Palestine but

in the whole Middle East. You will make an important contribution to the cause of international co-operation, to the cause of world peace.

*A brief recess was called by the Chairman at this point.*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order. Will the representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine please come up to the platform?

Will you please give us the number of the members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MIKUNIS: The Communist Party in Palestine works under very difficult conditions. That is why our membership is a membership of militants. Our militant membership is 1,400. In addition, we have thousands of supporters of our daily paper and of other different enterprises of the Party.

CHAIRMAN: How many copies of your paper are produced?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Five thousand copies.

CHAIRMAN: Do they all go to the public?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So when you speak of the wishes of the masses of the Palestinian population, you do not found yourself on your high membership?

Mr. MIKUNIS: No, but we know the mood, we know the desires and the wishes of the Arab and Jewish masses.

CHAIRMAN: Does the Communist Party embrace both the Jewish and the Arab sections?

Mr. MIKUNIS: It does not.

CHAIRMAN: Does it embrace only the Jews?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Yes, only the Jews—the Arab Communists work in the League for National Liberation.

CHAIRMAN: Why have you not succeeded in co-operation between the Jews and the Arabs in the Communist Party?

Mr. MIKUNIS: It has nothing to do with this. The matter is that in all basic problems of Palestine, the Communist Party of Palestine and the League for National Liberation are of the same opinion. It means our common fight for independence, for a democratic state, for an abrogation of the Mandate, for evacuation of the troops and against partition of the country.

As for the second part of your question, it is a question of organization which has nothing to do with the success or lack of success in co-operation.

CHAIRMAN: You mean it does not show unwillingness on the part of the Arabs towards co-operation with the Jews in this political organization?

Mr. MIKUNIS: It does not show anything of the kind. It is a question of internal organization of both the Communist Party and the League for National Liberation.

CHAIRMAN: On the economic data you gave, I should like to put only a few questions. You speak of the interest that Jewish and Arab landowners have to pay on land.

Mr. MIKUNIS: The peasants.



CHAIRMAN: Yes, the peasants. You made us understand that interests are very high, that is, usury interests. Now I wonder if the indebtedness is great. Is the indebtedness great?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You quote, in your memorandum that was handed in some time ago, the figure for the indebtedness of the Jewish landowners as £14,000,000, and I understand that the indebtedness to a large extent, perhaps to the largest extent, is an indebtedness towards Jewish organizations, and that perhaps the bigger part of that indebtedness will be written off.

Mr. MIKUNIS: In our memorandum we state a figure of £14,000,000 that being only for the communal Jewish settlements. As statistics for the Arab tenants and peasants are not available, we judge only from the Jewish debt how large and enormous the sums of indebtedness of Arab peasantry to the usurers or the landowners or to banks can be.

CHAIRMAN: But has not the tendency during the war rather been that the Arab peasants have had great profits and paid off their debts?

Mr. MIKUNIS: The situation during the war was that very poor peasants and tenants, the part of them who could not continue on the land, left to find employment in the military camps, and the general picture during the war was certain strata in the village became richer. It does not mean that they could pay all their debts, or even fifty per cent of their debts, because we judge by the communal Jewish settlements which during the war could not pay even fifty or fifty-five per cent of their debts.

CHAIRMAN: As to the Jewish settlements, we can understand that, because what we have heard is that they paid very high prices for the land, but the Arabs who owned their land, I suppose, have not paid these high prices?

Mr. MIKUNIS: No. The debts of the Jewish communal settlements are not due to the high prices of land. They obtained their land mainly from the Jewish National Fund for ninety-nine years, and they paid very little for it. Their debts are a result of the economic system which the British Government introduced in this country. It means the high prices of the necessary raw materials, the inflationary system and the monopolistic companies — they are mainly responsible for all these heavy debts on the Arabs and the Jews alike.

CHAIRMAN: To go to another matter now: do you think that Jewish immigration should be favoured and go on?

Mr. MIKUNIS: In my address I spoke about the problem of Jewish immigration, and I concentrated on the burning question and on the burning matter of these days, and the burning need is to solve the problem of the Jewish victims of Fascism concentrated in the camps for displaced persons. I have shown that this must be the concern of the United Nations Organization, to close the camps, to liquidate them, and to enable those of the displaced Jews who want to emigrate to other countries to do so — to other new countries, including Palestine, on the basis

of relatives, because there are many Jews who have relatives in Palestine. That is how we regard this question today.

CHAIRMAN: What, in your opinion, represents the reaction from the Arab side with regard to an increased Jewish immigration?

Mr. MIKUNIS: It is that the Arabs have shown during the last years more understanding for the major issue of Palestine. They understand that the major issue of Palestine is the independence of the country, and my comrades here have shown also that during the last twenty years there were many influential Arab sections and leaders who understood that the major issue of Palestine is not immigration, — which is used by Imperialism to divide and rule — but to fight for the independence of the country, because it is quite natural that, in the free independent country of two peoples with equal rights, two peoples are willing to solve all their questions, including questions of immigration, like other free peoples, like other free countries.

So in respect of the terrific sufferings of the Jews in Europe, we think and we are confident, — if this is not turned into a major issue of Palestine, as many reactionary circles are interested in making it — it will be a normal matter that Palestine should share in solving this problem, and there will be no difficulties on the Arab side.

CHAIRMAN: If there were formed here, right now, an independent Palestine State on ordinary democratic lines, I suppose the first question to come up for decision would be the immigration question. What decision do you think would be taken in such a state if the Arabs held the majority?

Mr. MIKUNIS: I am confident that the preoccupation of a free, independent Palestine will be, first of all, to guarantee this independence and democracy. The first preoccupation of the peoples of Palestine will be to create conditions against any foreign intervention in this independent and democratic Palestine. We are also confident that on the basis of the past which we have shown you, on the basis of the past, there will be no difficulties between the Jews and Arabs in settling in common vital questions of Palestine, settling also on a democratic and just basis the problem of immigration, and that a free Palestine and two free peoples will offer refuge to victims of Fascism or other persecutions like other free countries and other free peoples in the world.

CHAIRMAN: But is that opinion of yours based upon what you know about prevailing opinions in Palestine? You think that Arabs would vote for Jewish immigration?

Mr. MIKUNIS: We know that the Arabs fight for the independence of Palestine, and we know that the Jews fight for the independence of Palestine. We know, in addition, that two free peoples in an independent state will find, like other peoples, — and our people are not worse than others — will find a common way for co-operation and for the solution of all problems concerning those peoples in Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: Is it not right, then, that Arabs are against immigration?

Mr. VILNER: I should like to add something on this question, and if my English is not so good, or, rather, bad, you will excuse me.

First of all, in our proposals we have not suggested a simple independent democratic Palestine. We have suggested a democratic independent Palestine based on the recognition of the existence of two peoples in Palestine, two peoples with equal rights. What does it mean? That in either one or another constitutional form leading towards the future structure of Palestine, both peoples will have in each case the same right in determining the questions of Palestine. In other words, we assume that the situation now in Palestine is not what it was before the war. We have stressed in our addresses that both Arabs and Jews are ready for agreement, are ready for co-operation, and this readiness will express itself also, among others, in the question of immigration.

Secondly, the question of immigration was never a question isolated from the other problems of Palestine. I have not heard that Arabs were opposed to immigration because of immigration. I have not heard this. They were opposed to immigration on political grounds. It is not a question of immigration isolated from the other points. It is a political question on the ground of independence, on the ground of equality of rights, on the ground of eliminating foreign intervention. We have no doubt that, as experience also teaches us, — negotiations between Dr. Magnes and Arab leaders, and other experiences — we are sure that only foreign intervention made the question of immigration so difficult in the past, but in new conditions this will not be an obstacle to independence or co-operation between the two peoples. It is a political question connected with all the Palestine problems.

CHAIRMAN: But do you think you can separate this political aspect of the question from other aspects?

Mr. VILNER: I have not said we can separate it. I have said that we cannot separate this question. It has a common solution, which the Jews and Arabs will also find; the question of immigration can and will be solved.

CHAIRMAN: But if you are wrong in your supposition and if the Arabs still oppose immigration, as they have done hitherto, and you further assume that the Jews and Arabs in a democratic State which was going to be formed would have equal rights, who would then decide the question? Would there not be a deadlock?

Mr. VILNER: No, we think that both Arabs and Jews are willing to be independent, and that they will both oppose any foreign intervention in any question. They are not interested and they will not be interested in intervention by foreign rule. The question of immigration, as I said before, can be solved on the basis of an independent Palestine which would guarantee the real and just national aspirations of both peoples. Of course, the question of immigration

cannot be solved outside the problem of independence. But the agreement between the two peoples, as we proposed, after the United Nations Organization will decide upon the termination of the Mandate, will, in and of itself, create a new situation in Palestine. The masses will know that from then on they will have no foreign intervention. Then the problem for them will be one of calling in the foreign imperialist again, or of solving the questions among themselves. We are sure they will decide to solve the questions among themselves. You have heard before about Balkanization. It meant a fight between the people in the Balkan States. All the difficult questions were and are solved. I think that the same situation will be true in Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: But I must point out that all my questions were put under the assumption that there would be a free and independent Palestine, and that there would be built up here a free and democratic State. I assume also that there would be no intervention from the outside in your life as a State. Therefore, my question remains, and I understand you mean that the Jews and Arabs could agree on immigration; is that right?

Mr. VILNER: Yes, I think so. In fact, I am sure.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Mr. Chairman, if I understand him correctly, does he want the new State, after it is formed, to decide the question of immigration?

CHAIRMAN: I have taken it to be so.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is it correct that he wants the new State after it has come into existence to decide the question of immigration?

Mr. VILNER: That is right, but that is only one part of the question. We have stressed that we see a special urgent question of displaced Jews which must be immediately solved by the United Nations Organization on the basis of international arrangements, including immigration for those who are interested in immigration into new countries, including Palestine.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Would you kindly say whether when you say "equal rights" you mean equal votes for the Arabs and for the Jews. I do not understand the words "equal rights"? Are all the rights and civil liberties guaranteed to both without any difference of votes? I do not understand what you mean by the words "equal rights" to the Jews and the Arabs?

Mr. VILNER: "Equal rights" in two meanings: "equal rights" for every citizen, and "equal rights" for both peoples.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Equal numbers?

Mr. VILNER: It is not a question of numbers. It is a question of rights. I think that the constitution may be in this or that form, and we think that the question of a detailed constitution will be actual after the decision of the United Nations Organization to bring an end to the British rule. The principles which we have laid down in our addresses and in the memorandum are equal citizen's rights for every citizen, and equal national rights for both peoples as peoples.

It may assume various forms in the conditions of Palestine, which we stressed are special conditions. We cannot find another example in other countries.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): When we find that the present position is that the two communities, Arabs and Jews, are not equal in numbers today, what should we, according to you, recommend to the United Nations General Assembly as to the form of Government—whether they should have parity, equal rights and equal votes, or they should not have these things?

Mr. VILNER: Our proposal is that irrespective of numbers both peoples must have equal rights.

CHAIRMAN: I understand from what you said in your statement that you mean a kind of bi-national or federative state should be made; is that so?

Mr. VILNER: Perhaps I can add something to the statement which will make it clearer. We are for a solution that will guarantee full independence, the greatest agreement and the greatest unity of the two peoples and of the country. Our party advocates a unitarian bi-national solution, but under the conditions of full independence. A federative solution agreed upon by the two peoples of Palestine will also, in our opinion, meet their common interests and national aspirations. I think that is quite clear.

CHAIRMAN: Well, if you speak of equal rights between the two groups, I suppose you must envisage that even in an independent Palestinian State there would be various opinions on the questions to be solved. In this State with equal rights for the two sections, who would decide the differences of opinion?

Mr. VILNER: I think that the members would decide that for themselves. The problem would be for them either to call in foreign rule to decide, or to decide their differences among themselves. And I think that every Arab and every Jew would not be interested in foreign, military and police rule, as they have experienced in the past, and as they are experiencing now.

CHAIRMAN: But we are discussing now entirely on the basis that there is an independent Palestine, no foreign Mandatory or anything of the kind. Do you think there would be dissension between the two groups?

Mr. VILNER: I think there would be also other dissensions between employers, workers and others—not only on a national basis. All the difficulties will be solved by the people—by the institutions of the country themselves. In other words, we suppose and we are sure that of the two possibilities we will be faced with, either foreign rule or settling the difficulties between the peoples themselves, we are sure that no people will be interested in foreign rule. They will find the way. We are asking the United Nations Organization to give us that chance: give the peoples of Palestine the chance to be free. Declare the abolition of the Mandate. Declare the evacuation of troops. Then, call the

newly elected representatives of those peoples to come to an agreement—of course, to an agreement on the constitution and on the difficulties of an independent Palestinian State. In these conditions, the independence of Palestine will be assured as an outcome of an Arab-Jewish co-operation and understanding, provided foreign intervention is to be abolished and finished.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (Interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, my question is the same type of question which has been put here. I see in the speech of Mr. Mikunis that they are not in favour of a partition of Palestine; that they proposed a bi-unitarian State. It is the same question which you, Mr. Chairman, and Sir Abdur Rahman have put. I understand your idea, of course, Mr. Mikunis. You want to end the Mandate and you want to create an independent Palestine which would not be subject to any foreign influence. Suppose, for instance, that we were to solve that problem that way—that there were no Mandate in Palestine any more and that Palestine were independent. You would then be faced with the problem of creating a Government, and as you say, “a democratic Government”. If you had not said that you wanted equal rights, I would understand your proposition, because you would then be faced with the task of finding a form of Government for this country. But you have already prejudged the case. You have already decided upon the Government you want. You said you wanted a democratic government, and an independent Palestine, with equal rights for Jews and Arabs. Now, if you want an equal State, that presupposes that you will have majority and minority problems, and the principle of majority and minority rule, and you must accept it. If not, and you simply say that you want equal rights on the basis of equal rights for Jews and Arabs, then what will result will be a bi-national State. If this is your solution, then you must find some solution for problems on which such a bi-national state may not agree. Therefore, I do not want this problem to go any further. In general, I might say that I am sympathetic with your proposal. But, I would like to ask you this question: What do you mean by equal rights, and how do you expect to reconcile problems on which there may be a division of opinion and disagreement in the bi-national state which you proposed? How will you reconcile the ideas of equal rights and the principle of majority and minority rule?

Mr. MIKUNIS: What is significant in our programme is that our programme reflects exactly the realities in this country. You are hearing us after your visits in the country, and you must have noticed that Palestine is not a question of numbers of a minority or of a majority. You can see that the Jews and the Arabs contributed very much to the economic and cultural development of this country. It means that there was no question of a nation dominating the country and a certain minority, but you could see two peoples working, trying to create their homes. Yes, and it means that our programme, speaking about two peoples in Palestine with equal rights,

reflects realities in Palestine. You think in terms of majority and minority. But the problem of Palestine is not a problem of majority and minority. The reactionary forces are interested in speculating on this question for their purpose of domination. The slogan of the Jewish Agency of turning Palestine as a whole into a Jewish State is certainly a slogan of domination of one people over the other. The programme of the Arab Higher Committee to erect a national — that means to say a Palestinian-Arab State with rights for the Jews in Palestine, is also the same slogan of domination — of one people over another people. We want, in the interests of the peoples, and in the interest of peace, to avoid such a solution of domination — of one people over another. That is why from this viewpoint, which is a democratic and just viewpoint, and taking into consideration the reality of Palestine, which is a country of two peoples who are equally important for the development and future of this country, we build our programme on the basis that this must be a bi-unitarian State. What does bi-unitarian State mean? It means a single undivided State of both peoples, or two peoples, having equal rights. We do not approach this question from the arithmetic point of view. It is not a question of arithmetics meaning that as we will achieve independence, the vote will show an Arab majority and a Jewish minority. The arithmetic approach must bring as a consequence that the majority will dominate the minority. It means you are back where you were thirty years ago. We want to finish with this question of foreign intervention, in order to finish with the prevailing conditions in Palestine as you have seen them, and as we have seen them for the last thirty years. In order to finish with this trouble, we came to the conclusion that Palestine must not be partitioned. Palestine must be a democratic, single State. Palestine is inhabited by two peoples contributing very much to the present development of the country and to its future, as we hope. And that is why the two peoples not only inhabit Palestine, but they, themselves, should govern Palestine, as peoples with equal rights as regards their cultural development, common economic development, and national development. Equal rights and equal opportunities mean to enable us to raise the standard of life of the Arab masses to that of the Jewish masses in order to march together as equal peoples to a better, a more prosperous future. That is why when we put our programme of a single Palestine governed by two peoples we say with this that our programme reflects the reality in Palestine. It eliminates a possibility of domination of one people over another. It eliminates the possibility of foreign intervention. And we are confident, as I told you before, that the Arab and Jewish people are in any case not worse than other peoples. There were troubles in Yugoslavia and slaughter of peoples because of foreign intervention and because the reactionaries, the social strata of this intervention ruled the country. When all these people were faced with the danger of occupation by Nazi Germany they united and fought to-

gether for their future. So they created the conditions for their common life. In the case of these peoples you hear nothing about differences. Why? Because as there are four or five peoples, autonomous regions in Yugoslavia, the democratic constitution was built on the same lines, providing equality of rights for all peoples, be they big or small, poor or rich, intelligent or unintelligent. It is not a question of size. It is not a question of numbers.

Democratic principles envisage equality of rights for every people. That is why in order to arrive at a solution of independence in Palestine we must not have an arithmetic approach, but an approach which an outgrowth of the realities in this country. And the realities are one country, two equal peoples. It is not a question of numbers.

These two peoples must govern the country together. And I think that liberation, independence and opportunity which will be given to these people to govern themselves will be much stronger than any difference which would arise between Jews and Arabs. I will tell you another secret which is well-known to you. If there are forces in the parliament which will try to continue division between Jews and Arabs, the Jewish and Arab masses will find their way and withdraw these so-called representatives, replacing them with popular democratic representatives who will understand and find the proper and just solutions for any differences in order to preserve the independent and democratic State in Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: Are you thinking of a one party idea?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Of a what?

CHAIRMAN: Are you thinking of a one party system?

Mr. MIKUNIS: No, we are against a one party system. We are for a democratic State which reflects the realities of a country.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran): (Interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, after this explanation I think I understand that what they mean by equal rights is equal power to realize their national aspirations for both peoples in the country, and not equality of rights in participation in government. Thus, if a democratic government is achieved in this country they expect to find collaboration between Jews and Arabs on that basis without arithmetic coming into play at all. I repeat again, what they mean by equal rights apparently is equal power to realize national aspirations, and not equal rights in participation in government.

CHAIRMAN: We are not opposing you. We only want you to develop one particular detail of your proposal. For instance, I am thinking of a possible division in the parliament about a question, whether it be the immigration question or another question. The parliament, I suppose, ought to contain, according to your views, an equal number of representatives for the Jewish and Arab communities. Am I right that this is what you mean?

Mr. MIKUNIS: No, we mean a parliament on the basis of proportional representation, not on a communal basis.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I would just like to have an explanation. If civil and religious rights are safeguarded by the constitution, the government would still have to be run by some persons. How are they to be elected? Are they to be equal in number?

Mr. MIKUNIS: I don't quite understand.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): If the civil and religious rights are to be safeguarded by the constitution which we recommend to the United Nations, still the government will have to come into existence. How are those persons who form that government to be elected? Are they to be elected in equal numbers by both the communities, or are they to be elected by a majority and a minority?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Again you introduce a question of majority and minority. Our plan envisages the guarantee not only of civil and religious rights and freedom, but also the guarantee of equality of national rights for those peoples. The question as to how the Government would be formed is a question of the future — of the near future. The government must not necessarily be built on the basis of parity as between Jews and Arabs. The history of the last years teaches us that parity does not exist in a country which achieves independence. But the guarantee of equality, of religious and civil and national rights is the people. The democratic forces of most people are interested in preserving their independence, but during the last thirty years enormous efforts have been made by the British Government to put obstacles in the way of democratic forces in Palestine. And yet there were possibilities and there were conditions for common Arab-Jewish strikes and different actions, which have been strengthened during the last two years due to the growing consciousness of the Arab and Jewish masses after what they have learned in the last twenty-five years since the First World War. In conditions of independence, in conditions of non-intervention by foreign rule, we are confident that the democratic forces of the Arabs and the Jews will find their best way, in the best interests of the people, for the parliament, and for the creation of a government and for the constituent assembly which must outline the first constitution of the first independent democratic Palestinian State. Everything will be decided according to prevailing conditions in Palestine.

As we have stressed before — and we underline it now — the people of Palestine will never be ready to sacrifice their independence, to sacrifice an historic opportunity of a democratic independent State for any differences which can arise in the course of the first stages of development of an independent Palestine. We are confident, on the basis of history, on the basis of the development in different countries in recent years, we are confident that when you give us a chance of abrogating the Mandate or evacuating troops, both our peoples will show that they

are ripe for such an independent and democratic State, and they will find their own, and the best, way for the solution of all their problems and differences.

CHAIRMAN: It is two o'clock now, and we shall have to continue the questioning tomorrow. I shall be obliged if you will be here then.

The meeting is adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

*The meeting adjourned at 2.05 p.m.*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building,  
Jerusalem, Palestine,  
Monday, 14 July 1947, at 9 a.m.*

### *Present:*

Mr. SANDSTROM, Sweden, (Chairman)  
Mr. HOOD, Australia  
Mr. RAND, Canada  
Mr. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
Sir ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
Mr. ENTEZAM, Iran  
Mr. BLOM, Netherlands  
Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
Mr. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
Mr. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

Mr. HOO, Assistant Secretary-General  
Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES, Secretary

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The agenda for today's meeting contains three items: public hearing of representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine Central Committee, public hearing of representatives of the Ihud (Union) Association, public hearing of representatives of the Council (Waad Hair) of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community. For special reasons, we shall have to change the order in which the hearings are going to take place so that we can hear first the representatives of the Ihud Association.

Can we adopt this agenda with this change in the order?

(No objection).

CHAIRMAN: It is adopted.

### *Hearing of representatives of Ihud*

For Ihud, I understand that Dr. Magnes and Dr. Rainer will speak. Will you come up to the platform, Dr. Magnes and Dr. Rainer?

(Dr. Magnes and Dr. Rainer took their seats at the table).

Mr. MAGNES: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I should like first to present the apologies of Mr. Smilansky who it was expected would appear before you. You have from him a memorandum on land in Palestine. Unfortunately, he is not well.

I also wish to introduce Dr. Rainer who for twenty-five years was one of the chief engineers of the Department of Public Works in Palestine,

and Mr. Gabriel Stern, who is the editor of the Hebrew Monthly, which the Ihud Association publishes.

We had not expected to deliver an opening address. We had expected, on the basis of the material which we handed to you, to spend the greater part of the time allotted to us for questions and answers. Inasmuch as the procedure seems to have been that an address should open the testimony, I have, within the past few days, jotted down what I believe has been distributed to you and what has been called an outline of the remarks I should like to make introducing what we really have to say. I will ask your pardon, therefore, for not having these remarks written out in full for you so that they may be followed with greater ease.

Our contention is that Arab-Jewish co-operation is not only necessary for the peace of this part of the world, but that it is also possible. We contend, upon the basis of the experience of the past twenty-five years, that Arab-Jewish co-operation has never been made the chief objective of major policy, either by the Mandatory Government, by the Jewish Agency, or by those representing the Arabs. We regard this as the great sin of omission which has been committed throughout all these years. Arab-Jewish relationship is the main political problem which one has to face. There may be attempts to evade facing this by placing emphasis on other very important aspects of the problem, but that is the kernel of the problem, and it must be faced courageously and with intelligence, and upon the basis of the experience of these past twenty-five years.

Palestine is a land *sui generis*, and no one can have in Palestine everything that he wants. In all of the history of Palestine, no one has had everything that he wants. Palestine is not just a Jewish land; it is not just an Arab land. Among other things, Palestine is a Holy Land of three great monotheistic religions. The Arabs have great natural rights in Palestine. They have been here for centuries. The graves of their fathers are here. There are remains of Arab culture at every turn. The Mosque of Aksa is the third holy Mosque in Islam. The Mosque of Omar is one of the great architectural monuments in the world of Islam. The Arabs have tilled the soil throughout all these centuries; they have, as we say, great natural rights in Palestine.

The Jews, on the other hand, have great historical rights in Palestine. We have never forgotten this country. "If I forget Thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand wither." That has been upon the lips of our children from generation to generation. The Book of Books was produced here in this city by our ancestors. From that time until the present day, there have been hymns, prayers, voyages, great stirrings among the Jewish people, indicating that this Holy Land has been engraven in their hearts all these centuries.

Moreover, since the return to Zion, during the past generation and more, the Jews have, by

their sacrifice, by their scientific ability, by their love of the soil, by their hopes for its future, built up a national home of which in many respects they may well be proud. This labour also has given them a kind of right which is not to be despised.

We have, therefore, the Arab natural rights, on the one hand, and the Jewish historical rights on the other. The question, therefore, is how can an honourable and reasonable compromise be found. There are those, we know, who reject the very idea of compromise. No answer can be found for this complicated situation, except through compromise that may be reasonable and feasible.

We are in full accord with Recommendation No. 3 of the Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. You will permit me to read part of that: "that Palestine shall be neither a Jewish State nor an Arab State", but "a country in which the legitimate national aspirations of both Jews and Arabs can be reconciled, without either side fearing the ascendancy of the other. In our view, this cannot be done under any form of constitution in which mere numerical majority is decisive." I should like to emphasize that they say that the answer cannot be found under any form of constitution in which a mere numerical majority is decisive "since it is precisely the struggle for a numerical majority which bedevils Arab-Jewish relations. To ensure genuine self-government for both the Arab and the Jewish communities, this struggle"—that is, for majority—"must be made purposeless by the constitution itself."

The Anglo-American Committee did not, unhappily, propose the outlines of such a constitution. We regard this as the main weakness of their Report, with all of the recommendations of which we are in full accord. We are attempting to give the outlines of a constitution for Palestine in which the question of a mere numerical majority is not to be decisive. We propose that Palestine become a bi-national country composed of two equal nationalities, the Jews and the Arabs, a country where each nationality is to have equal political powers, regardless of who is the majority or the minority. We call this "Political Parity".

Majority rule is, to be sure, the accepted working rule in countries which are uni-national as, for example, in the United States, but majority rule is not the universal working rule in multi-national countries such as Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Soviet Russia, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, where the equality of basic national rights of the different nationalities making up the state is protected against majority rule. It will not do, therefore, to try to apply to a country like Palestine the working rule of the majority in some such way as is done in countries of the West. Bi-nationalism based on parity is a comparatively new way. It gives full protection to the various religions of the country, to the national languages, cultures, institutions, and yet, with all of that, there is full allegiance to the political State. Switzerland proves this



possible. That, to be sure, is not so new, it is over one hundred years old. In Switzerland, there are three or four basic nationalities. There is no concurrence of religion, language, nationality in the twenty-two cantons. Some of them are divided up. Nevertheless, we find in Switzerland this great experiment that has been succeeding for more than one hundred years, of three distinct nationalities, each one guarding their own culture jealously, and at the same time, proving faithful citizens of the political state.

We contend that multi-nationalism is a high ideal. It is not just something that is made to order to cover a given situation. The old way of having a major people and a minor people in a state of various nationalities we regard as reactionary. It will not do to have a dominant people and a dominated people. That leads to constant friction, breaks out in revolution, results in war. Parity, we contend, is the one just relationship between the different nationalities of a multi-national State.

It is not always easy to achieve a bi-national or multi-national state. In Palestine great concessions have to be made by all concerned. What are the concessions that the Arabs would have to make? They would have to yield their ambition to set up in Palestine a uni-national independent sovereign State. There are other Arab States which are uni-national, independent, sovereign. Yet in yielding that great ambition of theirs, which is only natural and to be understood, they would enjoy the maximum of national freedom in a bi-national Palestine equally with their Jewish fellow-citizens.

What are the concessions that the Jews would have to make? They would have to give up their dream of a uni-national independent sovereign Jewish State. That is a great concession. This is the only country where such a thing is conceivable. Yet a bi-national Palestine based upon parity between the two nationalities would give the Jews what they have not in any other place. It would make them a constituent nation in this country. They would not be classified as a minority, because in the bi-national state, based upon parity, there is no such thing politically as majority and minority.

We have seen how the minority guarantees of the Treaty of Versailles broke down at every point. Minorities can be protected only through parity, and the Jewish case, the Jewish cause in Palestine, can be protected here upon the basis of bi-nationalism with two equal nationalities, so that they are in Palestine not a minority—to be sure, not a majority, and they, too, can have full national rights equally with their Arab fellow citizens.

There is another concession that the Jews would have to make which is rather serious and which requires grave consideration. If there were a Jewish State, presumably that Jewish State would have its representation in the United Nations. This is a problem which requires very careful consideration. We are of the opinion that the Jews should have representation in the United Nations; exactly in what form re-

mains to be seen, although we have certain views as to how that might be achieved.

Now what are the concessions that the Administering Authority or the Mandatory, or whoever it is that is here, would have to make? This is a concession of very far-reaching importance. We say that Palestine is the Holy Land of three great monotheistic religions. Are there any practical consequences to be drawn from this? Does that merely mean that there will be a few so-called sacred places which will be held intact, to which access will be granted? That is not our conception of it. Our conception of Palestine as the Holy Land covers the whole country. Our historical and religious associations are with the whole of Palestine and not with a few isolated places. The practical consequence to be drawn from that thesis is that Palestine should be made neutral, that perpetual neutrality should be accorded Palestine. Switzerland has neutrality. The Vatican has neutrality. And what we mean by that is that Palestine should not be, should not become, a military base, or a naval base, or an air base for any of the Powers, whether that Power be the Mandatory or the Administering Authority or anyone else.

We have tried to set out in the documents presented to you how self-government based on parity might be introduced and carried through in Palestine. We have envisaged this in three stages:

First, while the Mandate lasts, however long that may be, we ask for the immediate appointment—now, today, tomorrow—of an equal number of Jews and Arabs to the Executive Council of the Government, to the Secretariat, as heads of non-controversial Central Government Departments, as Presidents of Courts, as District Commissioners. There are no Jews or Arabs in such positions in the Central Government. There is a considerable amount of local government, but Jews and Arabs have been excluded from all responsible posts in the Central Government, as I have tried to outline. The Anglo-American Committee stated that "British officials hold all the important positions. They exercise as much authority as in a country where the inhabitants are in a primitive stage of civilization."

Now I am not criticizing the British officials. I regard them as good and able men. There are many hundreds of British officials, aside from the police, in this tiny country. What we do contend is that there are Jews and Arabs—and many of them—who could fill these positions with equal distinction, and we see no reason in the world why in these posts of great authority in the Central Government there should be no Jews and no Arabs. We ask that that be done now, at once.

Secondly, we favour—we have favoured, it is not only just before you that we have favoured—the transfer of Palestine for an agreed transitional period to the Trusteeship system of the United Nations. When and if that stage is reached we think that the first thing that ought

to be done is the appointment of a Commission on Constitution which should be composed, among others, of an equal number of Jews and of Arabs. It will not be easy to work out a draft of a constitution for a bi-national Palestine based on parity. It may take a long time. It will require a great deal of expert help, particularly from such countries as are successfully multi-national today. It may be that there will be more than one report presented to the Constituent Assembly which we envisage. But it is necessary that this basic work be done under the auspices of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. If, at the Constituent Assembly which is to be elected upon the basis of parity between the Jews and the Arabs, there be no agreement on this or that point, we propose that on these moot points the decision be left to the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Now we realize that one of the disadvantages of a bi-national system based upon parity is that there may be a deadlock, a stalemate, and that it may be hard to come to a decision. We think that on social and economic questions, as the Royal Commission expressed it in its Report, some Jews and some Arabs would vote together. On national questions, however, it may be that the Jewish representation and the Arab representation would find no way of coming to a conclusion. We propose, in order to meet this, that a tribunal of arbitration should be in constant existence, appointed by the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. Some of these provisions must be embodied in the organic law of the State. They would have to be removed from all danger of majorization, of being subject to a majority. It has been asked, for example, how could the bi-national state legislate on immigration. We propose that there be a standing Committee on Immigration on which should be represented the Jews, the Arabs and the United Nations. I shall deal with immigration later on, but the decisive voice would be that of the United Nations. We do not believe, in general, that it is possible, within the near future, for Palestine to be without some third party—the United Nations. It may be that in the course of Palestine's development that may be achieved. There certainly is required, I do not say a long period, but a considerable period of transition under the auspices of the trusteeship system of the United Nations.

Why should that be so hard to accept? A bi-national Palestine would be a union, a federation of two peoples. Every union, every federation, lays certain limitations upon its constituent members. Even great powers turn to the United Nations or wish to turn to the International Court of Justice in order that some of these very difficult basic problems may be considered and may be decided by someone other than themselves. Why should a tiny country like Palestine, a Holy Land of three religions, regard it as a disgrace to have to turn to the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations for help to bring them over these difficulties which

history—a long and chequered history—has created?

We then envisage the third stage. After this transitional period of trusteeship, the bi-national Palestine of two equal nationalities is to become an independent State. It is to have the power of deciding whether and upon what terms it is to join a wider federation of neighbouring countries within the framework of the United Nations. We are all for that, we have been for that these many years. We think that a bi-national Palestine based on parity has a great mission to help revive this Semitic world materially and spiritually. The Jews and the Arabs are the only two peoples remaining from Semitic antiquity. We are related. We have lived and worked together. We have fashioned cultural values together throughout our history. We regard it as the mission of the bi-national Palestine to bring about once again, within the Semitic world, this revival of the spirit which has characterized Semitic history from antiquity.

I have dealt thus far with the structure of the bi-national State based upon parity. If you have given attention to the documents which we have submitted, you will have seen that we have given in very great detail certain suggestions as to how this State should be constituted, suggestions which might be turned over to that Committee on Constitution which I mentioned. We talk of the Head of the State. We talk of the Federal Executive, the Federal Legislature. We talk of counties or cantons, however they may be called. We talk of the Executive and of the Advisory Council. We talk also of a consultative body to be constituted even during the time of the Mandate, or the Trusteeship. If you wish If you wish to go into some of these details in your questions, we shall try to do our best to answer. We do not pretend that the scheme we have drawn up cannot be improved. We do say that we have given it considerable thought.

Now, just as the structure of the state is one side of the problem, so is immigration another side. Indeed, the question of Jewish immigration is in many ways the crux of the whole situation. We propose three principles upon which Jewish immigration is to be encouraged. You will note that I say "encouraged".

First, that Jewish immigration be permitted up to parity with the Arabs. We call this numerical parity. What I have been describing before is, I said, what we call political parity. This would enable the Jews to bring in another 500,000 to 600,000 immigrants.

The second principle would be that Jewish immigration be regulated in accordance with the economic absorptive capacity of the country.

Third, that this economic absorptive capacity of the country be enlarged through a Development Plan, which is to be of benefit to all the inhabitants of the country.

May I take up these three principles or stages one by one as briefly as I can: Number one. Why should not the 100,000 Jewish displaced

persons be admitted into Palestine rapidly? President Truman began to speak of it, I think, almost two years ago. Admitting them into Palestine would, of course, mean an enormous enterprise. It will require great sums of money, great capacity for absorption, and great sacrifice on the part of the Jews of Palestine and perhaps of the rest of the world. We wish to express to you our opinion that if it be decided to admit these 100,000 Jews into Palestine as rapidly as possible, you will find that the Jews of all the world will put their shoulders to the wheel—that they will find the manpower, the organizational ability, the money, together with the money which the United States and Great Britain have already said they were ready to put into this enterprise. It will be a great challenge to the Jewish people. No one can say to you at the present time that these 100,000 can be absorbed in Palestine in a year, as was thought. But the Jewish people should be challenged with that. We have wanted these 100,000 of our brothers and sisters so intensely that it seems to us that it ought to be granted, if for no other reason than because the Jewish people have suffered this unspeakable tragedy. Forty per cent of the Jewish people have been annihilated. No other people has suffered anywhere near such losses. This challenge to the Jewish people, putting upon their backs this burden, this task, would in large measure calm them down and keep them from thinking constantly of what has happened to father, mother, brother and sister in those gas chambers. The Jewish people need to be saddled with this enterprise. One should not be particular and say that 1,500 or 4,000 or 5,000 a month, or however many a month, should be admitted. Give these certificates, 100,000 certificates, and tell the Jewish people that they are primarily responsible for the use of them. Those who have rooms to spare in our spacious homes will yield some of them. Those of us who have clothes to spare will turn some of them over. Those of us who have a little extra money, or no extra money, will turn the money over or go into debt. It is a matter of historic mercy. It is a psychological problem, and no so much a political or an economic problem. The Jewish people must be given something—not as a gift—not as charity—but given a task, a burden, an enterprise. One hundred thousand souls! What greater function can all of us see before ourselves than to do what we can to bring these brands from the burning into this new National Home.

The Arabs need not be afraid of these 100,000. In one of our documents you will find that we have made a computation based upon authentic figures which will show that during the war there was very little Jewish immigration. The Arab natural increase is much greater than that of the Jews—almost twice as much. During the war, all these years, the Arab natural increase has brought the Arab population up to figures out of all proportion to what they were before. Last year when we prepared these figures we found that if 100,000 Jews were brought into the country at once the increase in the Jewish

population in relation to the Arab would be only about 30,000, taking into account the lack of immigration during the war and the greater Arab natural increase. These 30,000 would not bring the Jewish State of which the Arabs are so afraid. We are convinced that if these 100,000 had been admitted, without all of this discussion going on for almost two years, the Arabs would have acquiesced. They would have protested, but we know that they are at heart our brothers, and that it would not have been on account of these 100,000 that any revolt would have taken place. We feel the same thing now despite the fact that the situation has been aggravated by these two years of bitter and acrimonious discussion.

The next stage that we envisage is, as I have said, up to parity with the Arabs. From where would these additional immigrants come? There are, in accordance with figures that I have seen lately, about 200,000 displaced Jews in the camps of Europe. That would not make up the 500,000 to 600,000 to bring the Jewish numbers up to parity with the Arabs. These immigrants would probably come, in the first place, from North Africa. There are 300,000 to 400,000 Jews in North Africa, who are very unhappy. Then there are hundreds of thousands of Jews in Hungary and Rumania. And in Jewish history, one can never tell, unfortunately, where the shoe will begin to pinch next. Moreover, there are many Jewish young men and women who want to give their strength to the upbuilding of the National Home, although they are not in need of migrating at all. All of these would make up, so we think, the additional numbers.

Then the third stage is if parity were ever reached with the Arabs, what then? I mentioned to you, in the first place, the greater Arab natural increase. There would always be that much to catch up with. But the chief answer that we give is that if in the course of those years Jews and Arabs find the way of peace and understanding together, they would come to some agreed conclusion as to how much additional Jewish immigration the Jews might be able to have.

As I have said to you, my friend, Mr. Smilansky, had expected to say something to you about legislation for land reform. His point is that all discriminatory restrictions should be removed and that adequate protection for small owners and tenant cultivators, particularly among the Arabs, should be provided for. I mentioned, in passing, the Development Plan. It has been said that the United States Government and the British Government are ready to invest large sums in the economic development of Palestine and the Middle East. We propose that on the Development Board, that Board which is to work out these plans, the Jews and Arabs be equally represented, among others, just as we proposed the same thing for this Immigration Board, which I touched upon in passing.

We have no belief in Partition for many reasons—religious, historical, political, economic. Indeed we regard Partition as not only impractic-

cable, but, should it be carried through, as a great misfortune for both Jews and Arabs. We have not wanted to encumber our documents to you by engaging in polemics with the advocates of Partition, whom we greatly respect. We have wanted to present a positive case for a united bi-national Palestine on its own merits. Should it, however, be desired, we are ready to formulate our arguments against Partition as well.

We are greatly encouraged by the advocacy of the idea of a bi-national Palestine by some of the delegates at the Special Session on Palestine of the United Nations General Assembly. It had been said by the Chief Delegate of the U.S.S.R. that Partition is only to be considered if a bi-national solution should prove to be impossible.

We think it is the task of statesmanship to make this possible. In any event we think consideration of Partition entirely premature until the bi-national Palestine be given a full and fair chance to prove its worth over a number of years.

We regret to say that it has never been given this chance. Neither the British Government nor the Jewish and Arab leaders have ever made any determined and systematic attempt to make Jewish-Arab co-operation a chief objective of their major policy. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry made very important recommendations in this direction, but the leaders all around failed to accept them or to implement them.

Many Jews as well as many Arabs of all classes and sections—some openly and many more privately—anxiously look for a courageous lead from you which will deliver this unhappy country from the evils of political tension and nationalist passion, of mental and physical terror. We call upon you to take up this noble attempt, and not to accept counsels of despair, but to give a fair chance to constructive proposals which in the long run bear hope for real freedom, prosperity and peace for the two peoples of this land.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Magnes. I understand that Dr. Rainer is not going to give an address. Is that right?

MR. MAGNES: No, Dr. Rainer is prepared particularly to give you details in relation to Partition should you so require them, more specially in relation to the analyses of the Woodhead Commission which rejected, in its time, the proposal of the Peel Commission. Dr. Rainer can tell you a great deal about the water resources of the country, erosion, and other things. And should you so desire, he will answer your questions, if they come.

CHAIRMAN: Now we can begin our questions.

MR. MAGNES: You can begin your questions with me, if you please.

CHAIRMAN: Before I do that, I will ask you if you want a recess before we begin?

MR. MAGNES: No, I am ready for a long session with you.

CHAIRMAN: Then we will begin at once. I should first want to ascertain whether your suggestions now are the same as those you made before the Anglo-American Committee?

MR. MAGNES: Substantially the same.

CHAIRMAN: I understand there are very small modifications?

MR. MAGNES: Yes, we have taken into account some of the documents that have appeared during the past year, particularly the Morrison-Grady Report, and the Bevin proposals of February 7, 1947, which are the latest of the British proposals, and we have addressed ourselves in some detail to those. But, essentially what we propose to you is what we proposed to the Anglo-American Committee, and for that reason our document to you is really rather thin. We thought that you would be called upon to read several thousand pages and if you found a thin document you might be tempted to read it.

CHAIRMAN: We appreciate that. Then I should want to ask some questions regarding the way in which your scheme for a bi-national State would operate. I want to know if I am right when I think that it would be partly through regional provinces, territorial provinces, and partly through communities without any territorial basis?

MR. MAGNES: Yes, we provide for the division of Palestine into counties, to use the English term, or cantons, to use the Swiss term. Some of these counties need not be territorially contiguous. Some of them would be mostly Arab or purely Arab. Some of them might be purely Jewish. Some of them would be mixed. They would be scattered throughout the country. That would be on the one hand. On the other hand, in our plan we provide for two National Councils, the Jewish National Council and the Arab National Council, which would have cultural functions, primarily. Then we provide also for the religious courts, both Jewish and Moslem, inasmuch as those are institutions that are rooted in the very ancient tradition of this country.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose that you mean the details of the constitution would be worked out by this Committee which would be set up for working out the constitution. But I should like to have your suggestion as to how the elections for the legislature would take place.

MR. MAGNES: We do not favour what is called "communal lists". By communal lists one means that all the Jews of the country would vote on one list of electors and all the Arabs of the country on another list. We favour the territorial method. We favour election, as I have said, by counties. In the purely Arab counties we presume that there might be two or three, or however many Arab tickets, to be voted for by the elector. The same in the purely Jewish counties. In the mixed counties we even go so far as to think that in some places the Arabs might even favour a Jewish candidate, and the Jews might even favour an Arab candidate. I do not want to become too personal, but I think I could mention a couple of mixed districts where that might very well take place. The

voting would be by counties and be regulated in such a way as in the final analysis to produce in the Constituent Assembly in the first place an equal number of Jews and of Arabs, and in the Legislative Assembly, which we hope might result from the Constituent Assembly, an equal number of Jews and Arabs.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, there will be a provision in the constitution which would have the effect that an equal number would be elected?

Mr. MAGNES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I come now to the big dividing question—the question of immigration. I suppose the question of the 100,000 Jews who would be allowed to immigrate immediately would be a problem which would have to be provided for in the decision of the United Nations. When you came to your further immigration policy you mentioned the principle that the Jews would be allowed to immigrate up to a number which would equalize both groups, and you mentioned also that the principle would be the economic absorptive capacity. Do you mean that these principles could be inscribed in the original decision of the United Nations, or in the constitution? Or how have you envisaged that?

Mr. MAGNES: Yes, I think it is absolutely required that those principles be enunciated from the beginning. Those would be principles that ought to be very clearly laid down because in that way you would be providing for two equal nationalities. That is the basis of our whole conception.

CHAIRMAN: I think your scheme is inspired by a great ideal. If one has hesitation it is, as you yourself pointed out, on the ground of the practical workability of the scheme, and the test for the workability of the scheme, I think you said yourself, would be co-operation. If you cannot bring about the necessary co-operation I think the scheme will fail. Do you agree with me on the importance of co-operation in the working of your scheme?

Mr. MAGNES: Your question is how to bring that co-operation about. There are some who say that the Jews and the Arabs will have to agree in advance to certain abstract principles providing for co-operation between them. We say that co-operation is not produced in that way. We say that discussion, while very essential, can run out into the years and produce nothing practical. That has been the case right along in this country. There have been certain agreements, certain texts of agreements drawn up, certain discussions between Jews and Arabs. Our contention is that co-operation is brought about not through discussion, but through life itself. By life we mean, among other things, government.

Why do we propose that there should be Jews and Arabs in the Executive Council? Why do we propose all of these things that I have gone over? Because that is life. That is something that affects intimately the individual and the communal life of every person and of every community. Immigration affects it. Development affects it. Sitting in the Executive Council of

Government affects it; being members of the Secretariat, being Presidents of Courts, being District Commissioners—a most important position, coming into contact with the people of the country. That is the way co-operation is brought about. Co-operation cannot be brought about, so we have learned, through agreement in advance. Had that been possible, that agreement would have been made long since because, whatever be the views of this one or that, there is hardly anyone who would deny that co-operation is much to be preferred to strife and animosity.

Why has co-operation not taken place up to this time? It is because the Jews and the Arabs have not been given the opportunity of creating together. One of the ways of creating together is through government. That is perhaps the chief way of creating together. And it is for that reason we lay such great stress upon declaring in advance more or less what the form of government is to be.

A man in a municipality—a Jew or an Arab—knows that the paving of a street in front of his house, or the laying of a sewer is an important thing. But we find that there have not been the opportunities for Jew and Arab to sit down together over these matters. There have been opportunities—I should like to correct myself—in relation to the municipality, but I am talking primarily now of central government. That is the way, so we contend, co-operation can be brought about. By creating the conditions in life, people must come together and work together for their common good.

CHAIRMAN: I quite appreciate what you said. When you are striving for an ideal you are perhaps not engrossed in the difficulties, but on the other hand, you have to have the difficulties cleared before your eyes, and I suppose that you are quite aware that the difficulties in the way of co-operation in this case may be greater than in the case of bi-national or federal States, which you have quoted. We have, for instance, this difference of mentality between the two communities, the difference of general outlook on life, the difference in ways of living, the difference of standards of life. I suppose those are difficulties which have not existed to the same degree in the other multi-national or bi-national States of which you have spoken?

Mr. MAGNES: I do not want to go into a description of the other multi-national States, although I think I could show that there are these differences in standards in some of them. But those are facts which you have mentioned. There are these differences in the standard of life between the Jews and Arabs. Those are the facts which we have to face together, the facts that we have to try to overcome together. It will not do, so it seems to us, to try to segregate the Jews from the Arabs, or the Arabs from the Jews, because there happen to be differences in standards. One sees for example, in the United States of America how in one generation—and it takes no longer than that, and sometimes half a generation—these differ-

ences of education and of tradition are completely wiped out, and the ignorant become the learned on an equal level with those who have the tradition of learning for a long time back.

Those are not insuperable problems. It requires merely the will to face them together. They cannot be faced by trying to put the Arabs into one compartment of an insane house, and the Jews into another compartment of an insane house.

In the Government memorandum I was struck by one phrase which, I must say, seemed to me to be very frank because it was in accord with what I had been observing for the past twenty-five years of my residence here. They said there—I do not think I can quote the exact words—that the Mandate did not apply itself to bridge-building. Well, it was always our conception that the Mandate was just for that purpose—to build the bridge between the two peoples. It would appear from this document—and that is not true, for example, of the administration of a High Commissioner like General Sir Arthur Wauchope who was greatly interested in bridge-building and did a great deal of bridge-building between Arabs and Jews—that the Mandate was a sort of referee in a prize-ring where two combatants were fighting one another. These combatants were doing all the work and the umpire was judging them. We do not regard the thing from that point of view at all. We think that the conception of bridge-building is a much higher conception. You build a bridge this way—from both ends—bringing peoples together. Or we have thought of it from the point of view of the teacher: The Mandatory as a teacher trying to teach two peoples not always equal in their standard of education, not always equal in many other respects, but teaching them, leading them. It says there, however, the Mandate does not apply itself to bridge-building.

What we propose is this bridge-building. It can be done. It will take a long time. We do not try to deceive ourselves, and we certainly are not trying to deceive anyone else. It will not be done overnight. It cannot be done from today to tomorrow. For that reason we do not think there can be any sort of finality about any answer that is given to this problem at the present time. This is a situation that has to be permitted to develop and to grow under happy auspices, under the direction of men of goodwill, teachers who understand what it is to have two pupils in one class, one backward and one more forward-looking. That is our whole contention. That is one of the reasons I have been talking about, one of the reasons we oppose partition. It is along those lines we think.

CHAIRMAN: One could certainly develop a good deal on the difficulties, and one of the difficulties is, of course, what you have pointed out, the separateness of the communities and the tendency of the Mandatory rule to widen the rift instead of bridging it. But I shall not

go into that question. I shall only mention one difficulty, which I think might be the greatest and that it is. When you state that the Arab standpoint, the Arab ambition, as you put it, is self-government, that is true; but I wonder whether the Arabs, in self-government, do not also put in a notion of proprietorship to the country and that they feel the Jewish immigration here is an invasion, a penetration, and that they resent this immigration. My question is whether the Arabs, in the scheme you propose, resent the insertion of this immigration as a condition of the co-operation. It is just the opposite of their aim, I think.

MR. MAGNES: You are right in saying that that is the chief objection the Arabs have to the Jews—that the Jews are coming here in too large numbers. And from a certain point of view, when they use the term "invasion" it may be right. People are coming from the outside who were not born here, and that might perhaps conceivably be called an invasion. We have great sympathy with the Arab fear of Jewish domination. That is what it arrives at. We do not believe that the Arabs ought to be dominated by the Jews. We do not think Palestine is a place for that. But we do not think that the Jews ought to be dominated by the Arabs. If we come here as invaders—to use that very harsh term—it is not because we have found a new continent, as the early American settlers who found great riches before them and who wiped out the Indians in order to make a place for themselves in those vast spaces. We have not come into this country for wealth, because it can hardly be called a wealthy country from the material point of view. The wealth that is here we have more or less created by taking advantage of some of the natural resources which heretofore had been supposed not to exist as, for example, water. We have not come here because we happened to find on the map a country in 1917 where there were 800,000 inhabitants and which perhaps might hold 4,000,000; where the inhabitants are weak and we are going to overcome and dispossess them.

Why is it that we do it? Why is it that there are some of these younger men and women among the Jews who have no need whatsoever, materially or even spiritually, of migrating from their homes? It is because this is Palestine. It is because this is Eretz Israel. It is because we have these links with this country. If the Arabs want to deny the substantiality of these spiritual links, that is of course their affair, but we think that these spiritual links are just as substantial as the Kushan which my former landlord had, in the house where I lived, throughout his family for almost six hundred years. Before Columbus went to America his family had that title deed to that land. That is a mighty strong claim that he has. We contend that our claim is at least as strong—to be sure, not so material. This happens to be an instance where the Jewish people, which is accused of being a materialist people, is trying to emphasize spiritual bonds and trying to make these spiritual, historic bonds of equal validity at least with these material



*Kushans*, or deeds, which certain landlords have over the soil.

You have put the problem from the Arab point of view, and you must consider it from that point of view. I have tried to give you an answer from our point of view. There are some who criticize us and say that the Arab natural rights, as we have called them, are not to be considered as of equal validity with Jewish historical rights. Our whole conception is to try to make this something that is equal—equality. There may be a certain amount of artificiality in that. If you weigh the thing, if it were capable of being weighed—these natural rights and these historical rights—heaven knows to which side the scale would tip. But this is a human situation and we think that situation can be met more or less successfully if we say to both of these peoples, both of whom have very good claims to this country: your claims are just; your claims have equal validity; now let us try to see if we cannot build up a common life together from that common background.

CHAIRMAN: You spoke of the somewhat artificial character of this principle of equality. That makes me ask another question. Would not the Arabs resent this artificial character of some of the most important principles of the constitution? Would they not say that they had been conceived with the aim of keeping them down? I mean, I suppose they have the majority now in the country, and they could say that these principles aim at depriving them of this majority situation.

Mr. MAGNES: These principles do deprive the Arabs of what a majority has in uni-national States. If Palestine were an Arab State and the Arabs were in the majority, they would be the rulers of the State; they would be the dominant people, the Jews the dominated people. If this were a Jewish State and the tables were reversed, the Jews would be the dominant people and the Arabs the dominated people. We have tried to avoid that. We have tried to set up the principle of multi-nationalism. It is not a principle which we ourselves have invented. There is a great literature to be studied on that principle. We quoted at least three books in some of our documents, all of them published in 1945: one on *Nationalism and Nationalities*, by Professor Janovsky, of New York; another *Eastern Europe between the Wars, 1918-1941* by Professor H. Seton-Watson; and another by Mr. A. Cobban on *National Self-Determination*. It is not as though the situation in Yugoslavia, for example, which is the newest of the multi-national countries, were the same as in Switzerland, or that the situation in the Soviet Union were the same as in Belgium. The situation in Palestine is different from what it is in any of these, but there is this basic guiding principle of which we are advocates. We contend that this principle is a lofty principle. It is lofty because it tries to do away with domination by a majority over a minority. And it is lofty because it tries to find a practical way of bringing together different types of human be-

ings. It is history that has created that. It is history that has created this congeries of nationalities in the Balkans, for example, and in this country and in other countries. No one of us has created that. The question is, how are we going to try to meet that historical situation?

We contend that you have to have a principle. That principle is the principle of bi-nationalism. Within that principle you will have to find very many ingenious methods of meeting certain practical, day-to-day difficulties. We have tried to outline some of those—by no means all of them—and it is for that reason that we suggest that there be a Commission on constitution, which is to work through and take its time in working through the details of this bi-national or multi-national State.

CHAIRMAN: I look at the question the whole time from the point of view of the practical workability, and from that point of view I ask this question also. Would not this artificial character of the principle of equality of which we have spoken give from the outset an invidious character to the constitution on the Arab side?

Mr. MAGNES: It might well be. There are Arabs who say that. On the other hand, there are Arabs—and I can testify to this from my personal experience—who are altogether in favour of this bi-national idea of two equal peoples in Palestine. If there is another answer that is better than this, then that other answer ought to be applied. We think there is no better answer and we think therefore that the best must be made of this principle of bi-nationalism or of multi-nationalism.

CHAIRMAN: Would it not have been a good thing for the success of your idea—of your scheme—if it had been put to trial at an earlier stage—let us say ten years ago?

Mr. MAGNES: You would not think that I was trying to be amusing if I said it would have been better if it had been tried twenty-five years ago.

CHAIRMAN: What I am aiming at is whether the situation has not deteriorated.

Mr. MAGNES: It has deteriorated almost from year to year.

CHAIRMAN: And also, we may say, from the time when the Anglo-American Committee made its inquiry.

Mr. MAGNES: It has deteriorated in certain respects since then, I think, primarily because of the failure to grant the 100,000 immigration certificates. On the other hand, since the Anglo-American Committee has been here there have been discussions of the problem on the Arab side, not altogether in the spirit of the present Arab Higher Committee. I think you will find from some of the discussions of the Arab League, or from some of the members of the Arab League, a much more moderate attitude towards these proposals of ours than the present intransigent position of the Arab Higher Committee. But you are right; the situation has deteriorated. The situation has deteriorated technically in my view since the Jewish Agency

adopted as its official programme the Jewish State for Palestine.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): I should like to ask a question in this connexion.

CHAIRMAN: I should like to put my question first. Then I shall give the right to other Members to put their questions.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): But it is related to this.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but if it is related, you can also put the question afterwards.

Is it not right to say that the anxiety of the Arabs has been aroused by this claim for a Jewish State?

Mr. MAGNES: There is no question of it.

CHAIRMAN: That the exasperation on both sides has increased?

Mr. MAGNES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That there is a rather nervous state of affairs here?

Mr. MAGNES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But you do not think it is too late to put your idea to a test?

Mr. MAGNES: It is never too late to do a good thing.

CHAIRMAN: You envisage the continuation of the Mandate for a transitional period and then a trusteeship. Would that not, to a certain degree, continue the present situation, with important modifications? I quite see the importance of, for instance, the elements of the population taking more part in the Government and of these attempts to bring about co-operation. But would it not be, in the main, about the same situation for the trustee as it is for the Mandatory?

Mr. MAGNES: If I understand the question, it means this: that whatever situation there is anywhere, a certain continuity is required, except if there be a revolution. If you have a revolution, then the existing situation can be overturned and continuity is destroyed. I do not know that anybody at the present time is planning that. So that it would necessarily follow that the Mandate would continue for a given period until the trusteeship system made the mandated territory a trust territory. In order to do that, the Charter provides that a trusteeship agreement has to be drawn up with the Mandatory itself. That would take a considerable period, I should say. Whatever be the answer, the country cannot just be left to itself, all of a sudden, overnight.

CHAIRMAN: I am thinking more of the trusteeship which would follow and which, in your opinion, would take quite a considerable time.

Mr. MAGNES: Yes, I think that the trusteeship system would take a number of years.

CHAIRMAN: I mean that during that period the same difficulties would be encountered.

Mr. MAGNES: No. You know the trusteeship terms better than I do, but if I have read these terms aright, it would seem to me to be a different situation. For example, the old League of Nations Mandates Commission was not permitted

to visit Palestine. Well, under the trusteeship agreement, the administering authority would have no right to object to your Committee or some other Committee of the United Nations visiting Palestine. There are ever so many differences, it seems to me, between the Mandatory and the trustee.

CHAIRMAN: Then I shall only ask you one more question, and that is with regard to the section of the population which is in favour of your solution. I know that you do not represent a large organization, that it is a comparatively small organization, but I think it has been pointed out already to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry that there is quite a large portion of the population which, in the main, adheres to your ideas.

Mr. MAGNES: There is a very large proportion of the population advocating a bi-national State, and even a much larger proportion of the population that would accept a bi-national State no matter what their present views were. There is a very large proportion of the population definitely committed to the bi-national State, and there is an even larger proportion of the population who would accept the bi-national State once the bi-national State were proposed.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose it is difficult to express in figures the section of the population which would be in favour of such a solution.

Mr. MAGNES: Well, it is difficult, but I think it can be approximated. As you pointed out, our organization is not a political party. It is a small political group, a club—you might call it that—which publishes a monthly, in Hebrew, 1,300 copies a month. We know we have thousands and thousands of readers. We are partners with the Hashomer Hatzair Labour Organization in what is called the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation, which is going to appear before you, so I gather. It is we and they who make up this League, and it is they who advocate a bi-national State. Their votes during the last election here for members of the Vaad Leumi, if I remember rightly, were over 25,000. Then, there are the Communists, who were here before you yesterday. They are for a bi-national State. I would like to say that there are differences, of course, between all of us as to this and that detail. There is, I would like to add further, a large section of the inarticulate population very much in favour of some such accommodation with the Arabs. There is large proportion of the Palestine Jewish population not concentrated in political parties. We get evidences of this constantly. I do, personally.

We published a book in February, a copy of which we submitted to the Members of your Committee, called *Towards Union in Palestine*. We published 2,500 copies of that book. The copies were exhausted almost at once.

I was in New York last summer, and there we published the testimony which our organization gave before the Anglo-American Committee. We published 2,000 copies. Those 2,000 copies were taken up within a few days. We had to publish another 2,000 copies, and they were ex-

hausted presently. In other words, we do get indications all around that a large part of the inarticulate Jewish population would be happy, would rejoice, if some way of accommodation between the Jews and Arabs along these lines, more or less, could be found. Just how many and what the proportion is, I do not know. But I have no doubt and I am ready to admit that the majority of the Jewish population is in favour of a Jewish State.

CHAIRMAN: A uni-national Jewish State?

MR. MAGNES: In favour of a Jewish State of one sort or another. I think it is correct to say that.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Magnes, for your answers to my questions.

I give you the right, Mr. Granados, to put your questions.

MR. GRANADOS (Guatemala): I thank you very much for the great favour you are granting to me. It seems that nowadays dictatorship is a bit contagious.

I should like to put to Dr. Magnes some questions relating to his plan, but not to the ultimate end of his plan. I should like to know just why this plan which, in a great part, was adopted by the Anglo-American Committee, was not carried out. For instance, the Anglo-American Committee asked for 100,000 immigrants to come in. The Anglo-American Committee accepted the idea of a bi-national State. More than a year has passed, and nothing has been done. Is there not something lacking at the base of the plan? What do you think, Dr. Magnes?

MR. MAGNES: I do not think that is the reason. I think there are other reasons, if I understand the situation. The Anglo-American Committee put forward this general idea: no Jewish State, no Arab State—and we call that a bi-national State. But they did not propose any constitution for that State.

It has been said, therefore, that the British Government held up the issuing of the 100,000 immigration certificates in order to try to bring together the two main aspects of the problem: immigration being one aspect and the form of the State—self-government—being the other. The Anglo-American Committee went into great detail concerning the one aspect, namely, immigration. The British Government therefore, if I read the situation aright—and I have no information except that which one gets from the press—proposed to the American Government that two committees of experts—they were called delegations—were to meet in London in order to try and work out the second aspect of the problem, namely, the political. The result of those meetings was what is known as the Morrison-Grady Report. It is a great pity that the Morrison-Grady Report has not been published in full. I suppose you gentlemen have seen it in full; I think others have also seen it in full. You find there a considerable discussion as to how this recommendation, recommendation No. 3 of the Anglo-American Committee which I read to you, could be implemented. The purpose of the Morrison-Grady experts was to

try to find a way of giving practical form to that.

Well, I think only a torso of the plan was produced by Mr. Morrison in the House of Commons at the time. It provided for two provinces, a Jewish province and an Arab province, as you know, with no participation of the Jews or the Arabs in central government whatsoever, and with many other drawbacks. At once, both sides—both the Jews and the Arabs—rejected the Morrison-Grady plan. The British Government therefore was not satisfied that the two aspects of the problem had been worked out together; the immigration aspect and the political, self-government aspect.

What they did was to produce other plans. On 5 February 1947, they tried to call a conference, and all the rest of it. I need not go into those details. At any rate, I think there are two reasons why the bi-national plan was not advocated. The one that I have just given, that there was no political aspect to the immigration side of the problem; and the second, that there was a tremendous propaganda for partition, particularly in England, throughout the whole of the past year. The Secretary of State for the Colonies was said to be in favour of partition. The *London Times* was in favour of partition. And a large number of other prominent individuals and publications were in favour of partition. I think it was for those two reasons, because of the lack of a clear-cut political solution, and because of the propaganda for partition, that the bi-national plan was put into the background.

MR. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Do you think there is a real chance of your plan or any other plan being carried out under a mandatory, or do you think that it would have more chance under an independent State?

MR. MAGNES: I think that in order to get an independent State you have to have a transitional period.

MR. GRANADOS (Guatemala): For how long?

MR. MAGNES: It is difficult, I must confess, for me to say. In these British proposals of 5 February 1947, Mr. Bevin proposes five years. I think that is too short a time. I think that is too short a time for two reasons. In the first place, you have to give the Jews a longer time within which to immigrate. In the second place, you have to give both the Jews and the Arabs a somewhat longer time to settle down together, to work out this constitution that I speak of. I would say that the interim period, the transitional period of trusteeship, should be measured by the time within which this constitution could be worked out.

MR. GRANADOS (Guatemala): When you speak of trusteeship, do you envisage any particular country as a trustee?

MR. MAGNES: Yes. I do not know just what the result is going to be, but I assume that Britain is going to continue as a trustee. And why? Because Britain, whatever is said, has interests in this part of the world. Your trusteeship agreement will have to be made with Great

Britain, if it is to be made at all. And I should imagine that Great Britain would say: Well, we can remain as trustee. Moreover, Britain has had this tremendous experience here of twenty-five years, which is not just to be put aside. There are some of us, if I may make a confession to you, who have great admiration for the liberalism of Great Britain, for the traditional liberalism of Great Britain; and particularly now, if I may speak for myself; for the way in which Great Britain is trying to change her Empire, change her Imperialism, which has brought a great deal of unhappiness, into a Commonwealth; the way she has tried to do it in India, the way she has tried to do it in Burma, the way she is trying to do it in Egypt, whether with complete success or not. That is one of the great political movements of history. That is another reason—if you ask me the question—why I say Great Britain would probably be the trustee over this period.

I would like to add one more thing. We assume also that the Trusteeship Council is going to exercise control. We also assume that the Trusteeship Council is in a position different from that of the Council of the League of Nations in relation to that unhappy Mandates Commission. Moreover, I hope that you have not overlooked what I said about neutrality in this country. I hope that some consideration may be given to that. I hope that Palestine or this part of the world might be very unattractive, and I hope it may be made very unattractive, to Great Britain or to any other power, if Palestine were to be forbidden as the base for armies, navies and air forces. Now I do not know if, in a neutralized Palestine, Great Britain would want to be the trustee and would insist on being the trustee when she makes the trusteeship agreements with you or with the United Nations. But I have tried to give an answer to your question as fully as I could.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): You have lived in the country for the last twenty-five years. You have seen the results of the Mandate. Do you think that your people, the Jews, and your friends, the Arabs, would be happy under that trusteeship?

Mr. MAGNES: Whether they be happy or not, I do not know. I think I can say this for the Jews, if you will permit me to. I cannot speak for the Arabs. I think that if, once these problems can be met in some such spirit of co-operation as we have tried to indicate, the Jews would be happy to have Great Britain as the trustee during this interim period. You may think that is strange, but I think I know my own people somewhat, and I think you can find expressions of that, even in the most extreme quarters. Moreover, who is to be here in place of Great Britain? If we knew that, we might perhaps be able to give you a better answer as to whether we would prefer that particular country to Great Britain.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): Well, that is exactly what I meant when I said that on the basis of your reasoning there was something lacking. Thank you very much.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): I wish to ask Dr. Magnes to explain something. You have stated that in a bi-national State with political parity the numerical relation between Arabs and Jews would have no importance whatever. And yet, you propose immigration until numerical parity is attained. I find an apparent contradiction between those two propositions. Will you make clear your proposal, please?

Mr. MAGNES: Well, I admit to that contradiction. If, on the one hand, one says that a bi-national State with two equal nationalities, no matter who is the majority or the minority, is to be established, and in the same breath, one says that the Jews are not to be enabled to go beyond parity, there is undoubtedly a contradiction there.

The Hashomer Hatzair Party, for example, who, with us, advocate a bi-national State, overcome that contradiction in a way that we have not been able to. They say, inasmuch as majority-minority is not to play a decisive role, let the Jews then become the majority, if they can, if there be need for that in the exigencies of Jewish life. Now, we have put this, you might say, political level on the increase of the Jewish population up to parity because of political considerations.

I have had the experience that in talking with Arabs there was understanding of parity in population but no understanding whatsoever of the idea that inasmuch as majority-minority was not to play the decisive role, let the Jews become the majority. It is there for the sake of trying to work out some acceptable formula to both sides. Your logical contradiction, nevertheless, remains.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I would like to ask Dr. Magnes this: Dr. Magnes visualizes a transitional period. We do not know exactly—and he does not either—what the duration of this period will be. But Dr. Magnes gave the indication that five years, in his opinion, is too short. I think that was the way he put it. What I would like to know is this: What will be, during this transitional period in the Jewish proposals, the authority and the position of the Jewish Agency? On the one hand, it is proposed that Jews will be appointed in central government jobs immediately, as well as Arabs. Now, what will then be the relation of the Jewish Agency to the central government, to Jewry all over the world? Perhaps Dr. Magnes will explain what he has in mind in this respect.

Mr. MAGNES: You will pardon me if I cannot give a very brief answer to that question. We look upon the Jewish Agency as the representative of all the Jews in the world in relation to Palestine. We tried, in our memorandum to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, to equate the Arab League with the Jewish Agency and to make the Arab League the representative of all the Arabs and Moslems of the world in relation to Palestine. We then said that the Mandatory or the Administering Authority would probably be the representative of all the Christians of the world in relation to Palestine.

Palestine is not a country that has only local interests. As has been pointed out over and over again, as I tried to say this morning, this is a place that engages the affections and the interest of millions and millions of persons throughout the world, Jews, Arabs and Christians. We feel, therefore, that there should be in this whole set-up what we termed more or less a regional trusteeship council. I have not emphasized that, because that may be going into too great detail, but that regional trusteeship council would contain representatives in equal numbers of the Jews, of the Arabs and of the Administering Authority. For what purpose? For the purpose of working out this problem of immigration, the numbers of immigrants, of working out the question of the economic absorptive capacity, of working out the Development Scheme. Those are three basic ideas, plans, schemes which one assumes would have to be taken into account whatever was done.

Now who should be the representatives of the Jews, of the Arabs, of the Moslems and of the Christians on this regional trusteeship council? We think the Jewish Agency for the Jews; the Arab League for the Arabs; and the Administering Authority or the United Nations or some representative there for the rest of the world. The Jewish Agency, moreover, collects large sums of money from the Jews of the world. That cannot be done by government officials, whether they be Jews or whoever they be. The Jewish Agency also carries on certain work of settlement, the work of the buying of land, of education, which the Government has not done for the Jews. So that we find that the Jewish Agency would for some time to come have a great role to play as long as the situation here was fluid, until the Jews and the Arabs themselves, in this independent bi-national Palestine based on parity, proved that they could be the trustees, as we hope they might, for their brethren throughout the world.

Our objective is that in this independent Palestine the Jews of Palestine—not necessarily the Jewish Agency any more—could be the trustee of all the Jews and the Arabs of Palestine the trustee of all the Arabs and Moslems of the world, but for a considerable period—how long one does not know—the Jewish Agency, we consider, would be a necessary link in this chain. I should like to go on and continue a bit what I said before as to finality, because some of the questions that are put would seem to indicate that in the minds of some there could be finality given to this question. One of the arguments for partition, for example, is finality. One of the arguments for the Arab State is finality. There is no finality in this problem. This is the kind of problem that is going to tax the spirit of mankind for years and years to come; whether there be a Jewish partitioned State or a Jewish State in all of Palestine, or an Arab State in all of Palestine, there is no finality to this. This is a developing problem. If this is a Holy Land, it is not a Holy Land merely because it is a museum of antiquities, but a Holy Land in the spirit of living men today and

tomorrow, developing their spiritual values, their intellectual values for today and for tomorrow.

We do not look upon Palestine as a place where once and for all you can put the stamp of finality. Moreover, if you have in a Jewish partitioned State a tremendous Arab minority—and you can have no Jewish partitioned State without a tremendous Arab minority, almost as large as the Jewish majority itself—you would there have the same bi-national problem. Why not then, in all of Palestine. Why use the term “finality” in all of this? Why try to say that a problem as complex as this, an historical problem that has been developing for hundreds, perhaps, one might say for thousands of years, is to be met by some formula that will overnight, from today to tomorrow pronounce: “The problem is settled now once and for all”? We do not contend that our solution is a settlement of this problem once and for all. We merely contend that it gives the framework for the development of common interests between the Jews and the Arabs, who are both going to remain here unless the Arabs drive the Jews into the sea, as they say they once drove the Crusaders into the sea, or the Jews drive the Arabs into the desert, as some think perhaps they should be driven. We do not believe in that. We believe that the one practical, hopeful solution—and we do not call it a solution either—the one hopeful, practical approach is that which we have tried to outline, so that it does not make so much difference, in our view, whether that interim period is one year shorter or one year longer. That would have to be determined when the time came by the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I have two more points. One is this: Dr. Magnes has very eloquently expressed to us his belief, and that of the members of his Association, in the co-operation that will come about in life, in the daily necessity of dealing with practical problems of administration. What I would like to know is what, in Dr. Magnes' opinion, will be the influence from outside on this will to co-operate? I can quite see that the daily necessity of deciding practical points will bring about a lot of co-operation, but will or will not this co-operation be endangered by influences from outside countries, surrounding or not surrounding?

Mr. MAGNES: So far as the neighbouring countries are concerned, we believe that the bi-national Palestine based upon parity should become a member in due course of a larger federation, a larger union, whether it be the Arab federation or a union of countries of the Middle East. From that point of view, the neighbouring countries would undoubtedly exercise a great deal of influence upon what is going on in Palestine, and Palestine, perhaps—so we hope—would exercise a beneficent influence upon them. One of the ways in which this influence could be felt would be this: that if in Palestine these problems of majority-minority were put into the background, it is perfectly conceivable that some of the other countries of this federation would say, as some have said in days gone by: “We also

would like to have some Jewish immigrants in order to help us build our land". That would not mean, of course, that the Jewish National Home would be extended into those countries. But Jewish scientific ability, Jewish organizing power, perhaps finance, perhaps the experience of the West, which many of the countries of this part of the world have need of, might be placed at their disposal for the good of this whole region. In this way reciprocal influence might be felt. To be sure, if I gathered the purport of your question, people from the outside can always interfere, can always harm. It is not Palestine alone that will have to face that problem.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I do not know whether this question is very easy to answer, but Dr. Magnes' associate might perhaps do so. If, just for the sake of argument, we exclude now any psychological and political arguments against partition, I would like to know whether in your opinion, from an entirely technical, economic, financial and agricultural point of view, there is a possibility of drawing up a partition scheme that is, from this point of view, feasible.

CHAIRMAN: That is a question for Dr. Rainer. I might ask, perhaps, if there is anyone who wants to put some more questions to Dr. Magnes. I think we might do that and then we might continue with Dr. Rainer later.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I have one question of a constitutional nature for Dr. Magnes, relating to the general framework of the principle which he outlined this morning. I would like to ask Dr. Magnes whether the assumption on which the plan is to some extent based, namely, that the primary division of Palestine into counties or cantons or local divisions of one kind or another, is an essential assumption for the primary constitution of the bi-national State. Whether, in other words, a bi-national State, in his opinion, must necessarily be a federal State, or whether the division of Palestine into counties and local administrative areas is a proposal which arises from other motives. I hope I have made myself clear.

Mr. MAGNES: The other alternative would be to have the two communities constitute the two parts of the State without any territorial divisions whatsoever. Instead of having these counties as we propose, the alternative would be that there be a register of the Jews and a register of the Arabs, and that these two communities carry on their elections in the way that they choose to do, sending to the Constituent Assembly, and later to the Legislative Assembly, an equal number of their citizens. That is, as far as I can make out, the only alternative to the plan which we propose. Drawing boundary lines for provinces, such as the Morrison-Grady plan did, we regard as dangerous, as almost impossible, because just as we think that it is dangerous and almost impossible to draw many boundary lines for the partition of Palestine, so we think it is almost impossible to draw administrative boundary lines if they are to mean two provinces, one Jewish and the other Arab.

We think, therefore, that the only two practical possibilities are—let me repeat—either these counties or these communal lists. We have effected in a certain way a synthesis of those two in what we call the National Councils. There is at the present time a Jewish National Council, the Vaad Leumi. In our proposals we give that Council and a corresponding Arab Council a definite function—cultural. Those two Councils would be responsible for the schools of those communities, but basically, if I understood your question aright, I have given you the answer as to these two alternatives.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I am rather interested in the potential capacity for co-operation between these two groups. You spoke of them as the remaining representatives of the Semitic group of peoples. Would you say that from the standpoint of their fundamental attitudes and instinctive tendencies there would be more, or less, likelihood of an easy transition to co-operation than in the case, say, of the Central European multi-national countries?

Mr. MAGNES: It is impossible for me to give a direct yes or no in answer to that. I think in some ways it would be more difficult, in other ways easier. It would be more difficult than, for example, in Yugoslavia, if I may be so bold as to mention that country in the presence of its representative here. There, although the alphabet of the Croat language is different from the alphabet of the other languages, nevertheless the basic roots and the basic forms are the same. So that from the point of view of language, it would be easier, despite these difficulties, in Yugoslavia for the various peoples to come together and form this tri- or quadri-national State.

Here the basic languages are Hebrew and Arabic. They are sister languages, very closely related. I have here the prospectus of an Arabic-Hebrew dictionary, which the Hebrew University is about to publish in a week's time, almost 500 pages and anyone who can go through that, who can read the alphabets, will find out how closely related the Hebrew and Arabic languages are. Nevertheless, it by no means follows that one who speaks Hebrew can speak Arabic, or the reverse, so that the language question here is more difficult than it would be, say, in Yugoslavia. On the other hand, it has to be looked at from the point of view, so we think, of historical perspective. Why do we call the Jews and the Arabs Semitic peoples? It is because they have presumably more or less a common ancestry. There is no racial problem, therefore, between them. An Arab cannot say to a Jew, "You have a big nose", because a lot of Arabs have bigger noses, and a Jew cannot say to an Arab "You are too clever a merchant", because we have very clever merchants among ourselves. There is no racial animosity. Moreover, as far as religion is concerned, there are many points of affinity between Judaism and Islam. I do not want to go into that, because that would take one very far afield. But some think there are even greater points of affinity than between Judaism and Christianity, in some respects. To



be sure, it is easily possible to arouse the religious fanaticism of many of the Moslems, I am sorry to say. That was done here. I do not think it can be done so easily again by the same people who did it then. There is a great deal of affinity in the religious sense, and if I can use the term "spiritual and intellectual", in the spiritual and intellectual sense there is very much affinity between Jews and Arabs, if you take their history. The Jews and the Arabs, for example, were the intermediaries, the *colporteurs* of Greek civilization to Europe. It was the Arabs and the Jews who translated into Arabic and into Hebrew, and it was these two peoples, particularly the Jews, who brought this translated Greek philosophy to the Catholic monasteries of Europe, where they put them into Latin and disseminated them throughout the European world at the time.

Mr. RAND (Canada): What would you say about the development of what is called the concept of nationality among both groups? I ask that because essentially it is the impingement upon that sensibility in all governmental arrangements that produces, I would think, most of the antagonisms.

Mr. MAGNES: If you knew a way of wiping that problem out—

Mr. RAND (Canada): I was wondering how sensitive it is in this country.

Mr. MAGNES: It is very sensitive. Both the Jews and the Arabs are novices in relation to the feelings of nationality. The Jews always have held together by an invisible national bond, but by a more visible religious bond, so that when one talks of the bond of nationality among the Jews, one talks of a comparatively modern phenomenon. It is even more modern among the Arabs. The Arab awakening from the point of view of nationality, is a comparatively recent development.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Would you think it became more or less sensitive as it developed and became more mature?

Mr. MAGNES: That has been the case, I think, with every developing sense of nationality.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Would you say that was so in Central Europe?

Mr. MAGNES: I would say it was so in Central Europe, so much so that—but what do you mean by Central Europe?

Mr. RAND (Canada): I have in mind the old Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Mr. MAGNES: They have had their fill. For them, national sensibility was no new thing. It was something that had grown stale in their mouths, something that had brought them nothing but pain and suffering, and for that reason the sensibility as to nationality in Austria-Hungary, for example, was, so I believe, a declining thing. This sensibility as to nationality among the Jews and among the Arabs is still on the rise. There are Jews who have passed beyond that sensibility. More of them, I think, many more of them, than among the Arabs, because the Jews have had experience of

the disadvantages of this national sensibility; they have experienced it in their own lives, trying to work through their own problems of Jewish nationality, and they have come to the conclusion that that is not perhaps the final answer to things anyway. Nationality is something that undoubtedly still requires a great deal of clarification, but to answer your question as to this situation here: there is undoubtedly that sensibility as to feeling of nationality which makes the problem here much more difficult.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions to Dr. Magnes?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you not think that Jews who have been living in this country for a long time feel more akin to the Arabs than the Jews who have come from Europe and other places?

Mr. MAGNES: That is only natural, because they get to know one another's mode of life, they get to know one another's language, they get to fear one another less, they appear less strange to one another.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you not think that the Jews who have been living here consider the Jews who have come from other places to be almost a different nation?

Mr. MAGNES: No, I should advise you not to believe anybody who told you that.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Then according to you religion and nationality are one and the same thing, so far as Jews are concerned?

Mr. MAGNES: I do not know that I quite catch the purport of your question.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Whether you would identify the Jewish nationality with those who believe in the Jewish faith?

Mr. MAGNES: No, there are those who have abandoned the Jewish faith, so they say, and who are yet Jews, pertaining to and belonging to the Jewish nationality. There are many such cases.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): And the *vice-versa* of the statement you made just now?

Mr. MAGNES: That is, those who are Jews by religion are not Jews by nationality? Well, I hardly think so. There may be certain Jews who have been converted to Judaism, who are not born Jews. They may contend that they are not members of the Jewish nationality, because Jewish nationality presupposes, in general, birth into the Jewish nation.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): One more question. How would you fit in the idea of Jewish representation in a bi-national State? You suggested a bi-national State. How would you fit in the idea of Jewish representation in the United Nations?

Mr. MAGNES: I must confess it is a problem that I have not seen discussed as thoroughly as it should be and as it probably will be. But I would have the bi-national State appoint two representatives to the United Nations, a Jew and an Arab. They would receive instructions from the bi-national State as to their attitude

in relation to this and that. The Jewish representative, however, would be granted the privilege by the bi-national State of representing the Jews. Now here comes the difficult part for me. I have not worked out in my own mind just those specific things in which he would be the representative of the Jews. I would go further and I would say that it is not only the Jews of Palestine who are interested in problems affecting Jews coming up before the United Nations, but it is the Jews of the world. And I would have the Jews of the world, through some of their representative organizations, meet with the Jews of Palestine in order to discuss the problem as to how, together, they could all be represented before the United Nations.

One of the things that impressed me in reading the Charter of the United Nations originally was its flexibility. The Charter, for example, would be ready to let certain organizations appear before certain constituent bodies of the United Nations. The United Nations, I am sure, would find itself flexible enough to provide for a reasonable and just representation of the Jewish people before it. It will hardly do for the Jewish people, who still number, despite all of these massacres, many millions, to be left without direct access to the United Nations. As I have said to you, I have not worked it out for myself, and I have not seen that anybody else has. But I think that one of our functions ought to be to try to do that and come with a prepared plan in relation to it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Dr. Magnes, can you suggest any other solution for parity than what you have suggested? Can it not be secured, for instance, by constitutional safeguarding of the rights of the various parties without affecting the numerical parity between the two sections of the community living there?

Mr. MAGNES: Does your question mean to imply that there would be no further Jewish immigration?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): No, it does not imply that.

Mr. MAGNES: Then I do not understand the question.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Taking the situation as a whole today, the question whether there is going to be future immigration or not may be left to be determined by the State which will come into being later on. But to settle the question today, is it not possible to achieve the same objective by safeguarding the civil, political and religious rights and liberties by constitution, and by providing that no change in the constitution should be effected unless something like seven-eighths or four-fifths of the majority vote for the change?

Mr. MAGNES: What you say has a great deal to it. On the other hand, I would like to ask you when that would begin? What would happen to Jewish immigration meanwhile? If I understand you aright, you would leave the determination of the problem of immigration to that bi-national State based on parity when it came into being. Now, I ask when will it come into being? What

will happen to the Jews in these intervening years? If that State could come into being at once, then I would say that what you have proposed has a great deal to it. But there is no guarantee that that will happen.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): But suppose it is suggested that independence be granted to Palestine and the Mandatory Power and the Trusteeship disappear altogether. I am just putting the idea before you to consider whether or not it is practical—we will go into details later on. Supposing independence is recognized for Palestine as such and a bi-national State is brought into being, and that that State is given the safeguards against political, religious and other liberties, will power be given to that constitution which comes into being in pursuance of that recommendation, if it is adopted by the Assembly, to settle the question itself?

Mr. MAGNES: Is that a bi-national State based on parity?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is what I am saying.

Mr. MAGNES: Is it based on parity?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): That is what I am asking you. That is the very question. Can we, without resorting to numerical parity, safeguard against the minority who are numerically less?

Mr. MAGNES: I don't think so. I think the history of the past generation has taught us that the safeguarding of minority rights is just nothing but words. The safeguarding of minority rights in the various countries where Jews were minorities, and where their rights were to be safeguarded, failed. That is the basis of our contention. We contend that there is one just, equitable, practicable way of meeting a minority-majority problem, and that is by wiping it out and making both the majority and the minority equal constituent partners.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Although numerically they may not be so?

Mr. MAGNES: Although numerically they may not be so. A numerical majority, we contend, is all right for this place and for that place, but—it has not been decreed from Heaven for other places. And if one starts on the assumption that a numerical majority is going to be bound by a constitutional provision to protect the minority, history teaches us that the majority sooner or later becomes arrogant, becomes dominant, and subjects the minority to its will. It then has the civil service in its hands. It has the military in its power. It has diplomatic representation in its power. It has economic key positions in its power. It can wipe the minority out, if it wants to. And if there is any virtue in any constitution, it must be just that—that there be no minority and that here be no majority. There is, to be sure, the logical contradiction that was pointed out by the gentleman on the other side of the table, but we have faced that logical contradiction and we think that our formula of parity is a formula that can be accepted by both the Jews and the Arabs. And, we know Arabs who do accept it.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I would just like to ask a question arising out of the last statement. You say that you can secure parity by constitutional provision but you cannot secure minority right by the same kind of provision?

Mr. MAGNES: I said if there is any virtue in a constitution at all—I do not know.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I was just wondering. I was suggesting that a majority that in fact would repudiate a provision to secure the minority would scarcely hesitate at repudiating a parity provision.

Mr. MAGNES: But may I suggest to you that there is this difference: That if there be in the constitution that provision, minority-majority, all on the same level, there is now something there never was before—a United Nations. And it is the United Nations that would have to guarantee that Constitution. Now, if one is sceptical as to what the United Nations can do, well then the fat is in the fire whichever way you put it. But if one is hopeful as to what the United Nations can become, and I must say I am one of the hopeful ones, then the situation becomes such that it is not love's labour lost to put it into the constitution, because despite what that majority would want to do there would be this greater power behind it.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I quite sympathize with that view. What occasions my question is that I live under a constitution that has such minority provisions, and it would be rather shocking to me to have to feel that the majority would take the course, in contingencies that are conceivable, of making such a repudiation.

Mr. MAGNES: You live under a constitution that has a rather long tradition.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, they all have to begin, I suppose.

Mr. MAGNES: Yes, but your people have been trained in the exercises of self-government for a long time and you have not the nationalities' problem before you, and I think there are many other differences that might be pointed out. I should say that you are very fortunate in not having to live under the fear of that majority. I beg your pardon, I thought you were from Australia. I see you are from Canada. Then, I should have given you a different answer, of course. I am not quite as ignorant as that! Do you want me to go over it all again?

Mr. RAND (Canada): No, it is not necessary.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): Dr. Magnes, you said that the Jewish nationality presupposed birth in the Jewish nation, if I have properly understood you. Are you sure that during the centuries there have been no conversions and that all existing Jews have been born into the Jewish nation?

Mr. MAGNES: By no means. There have been many conversions to Judaism, and they are all Jews, and their children are Jews. Their children are, I should say, members of the Jewish nation. Whether they are or not, I am ready to include them also in the Jewish nation, although nationality to me conveys in some way or other also the conception of birth. But, there have been conversions by the tens of thousands.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN: Well, then, I take it we have finished questioning Dr. Magnes. Before we question Dr. Rainer we shall have to take a recess. If you, Dr. Magnes, want to leave, I want to thank you once more. We appreciate very much that you under the circumstances have taken pains to come here and give your very interesting views. I thank you.

Dr. MAGNES: Let me thank you also for your great courtesy. And I want to thank you for all of those, and there are many in this country, who are looking forward to peace and co-operation and who are not taking the defeatist view that Jews and Arabs cannot live together. They live together, and they can live together. Let me thank you.

(The meeting adjourned for a brief recess.)

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order. We shall go on with the questioning of the Ihud. Dr. Rainer, will you please come up to the platform, and Dr. Magnes, if he is here.

(Dr. Rainer and Dr. Magnes took seats at the table.)

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): I should like to have the views of the representative of the Ihud with regard to the technical possibility of drawing up a partition plan, not including all the political and psychological aspects of partition.

Dr. RAINER: I have of course to assume a certain partition plan. I am assuming that partition will be along the lines in the Peel Report. That partition plan of the Peel Report consists, you will remember, of two areas: a larger area to the north and a smaller area to the south, both divided by a corridor from Jerusalem to Jaffa. Now there has been added to this suggestion a proposal to include the Negeb. The Negeb of course would also be separated from the other two parts by an area which would belong to the Arab State. It has not been claimed that the area should also be included in the Jewish State. There would therefore be three separate areas and there would have to be corridors connecting these areas, and also cross-corridors crossing these corridors, because the corridor from the southern part of the Jewish State to the Negeb would pass through the Arab State and would be divided into an eastern and a western part, and there would have to be corridors crossing that corridor.

We think that partition, if carried out, would be disastrous but we do not think it will be carried out for the following reason. We think, even if you recommend it to the United Nations General Assembly, they would have to appoint a technical committee to work out the details of this partition scheme with regard to boundaries—all sorts of technical details—and we foresee that the result would be the same as with the partition plan of the Peel Commission, which brought with it the Woodhead Commission to fix the details. That Commission reported that the scheme was impracticable, but while we think that this partition scheme will not come through, we still think it is a very dangerous proposal because, when the

technical commission reported that the scheme was impracticable, probably more than a year would have elapsed and conditions would have deteriorated. Therefore we want to make it clear that in accordance with what we think, there are very serious technical objections to any such partition scheme. Such objections the technical commission would without doubt find. I will deal with them under the following headings: (i) population; (ii) land; (iii) communications; (iv) customs; (v) development, (vi) water economy.

First, population. If we assume the area which I mentioned in the beginning, the population at present would be as follows: in the Jewish State 490,000 Jews; in the Arab State 430,000 Arabs; a total of 920,000 not counting the small number of others who are not Jews and not Arabs. This is a very rough estimate. I have taken the figures of the Woodhead Report and have added the increase of population through natural increase and immigration. But that is enough for your purpose. In percentages that would be 53 per cent Jews and 47 per cent Arabs. At the time of the Woodhead Commission, in 1938, these percentages were 51 per cent Jews and 49 per cent Arabs. With the increase in immigration and the natural increase, the figures would now be 58 per cent Jews and 42 per cent Arabs, but I have included the Negeb, and the Negeb holds about 75,000 Arabs and that makes the percentage to the disadvantage of the Jews. The inclusion of the Negeb makes this of course a disadvantage to the Jews. Of course this would give such a large minority of Arabs that from the beginning it could only be considered as a Jewish State in name. Actually the 47 per cent of Arabs would consider themselves as belonging to an Arab nation, and the 53 per cent of Jews to a Jewish nation, and there would be a citizenship of the Jewish State which might be considered as a Jewish citizenship. I shall not go into these details because they are political and I am asked to deal only with technical questions, but that is the situation.

Secondly, immigration. Numbers have been given for a maximum number of immigrants, and if we assume that this Jewish State can absorb an increase of 100,000 yearly, the situation after seven years—I am taking seven years because that brings the total population to 1,600,000, which is fairly large for the Jewish State—with the natural increase of Arabs and Jews, would be about 69 per cent Jews and 31 per cent Arabs; and that, after an increase of the Jewish population by 700,000. The density would then be, in the original Jewish State as foreseen by the Peel Commission, the same as the density of Belgium which is, I think, the most densely populated country in Europe. In the Negeb it would bring the density in the plains which could be settled, to the density of Switzerland, and with the Bedouins living now in the Negeb it is assumed that the rest of the Negeb would be developed to such an extent that the present Bedouin population could live on the rest of the Negeb.

To sum up: at present we would have 53 per cent Jews and 47 per cent Arabs. After the population increased to 1,600,000 we would have 69 per cent Jews and 31 per cent Arabs. What we want to point out is that even then the Government of the country would have to be practically bi-national, and even if it were to be called a Jewish State it would actually be bi-national. Therefore, partition is not a solution for overcoming the difficulty of bi-nationality. This is with regard to population.

With regard to land, the situation is even worse. In a Jewish State land would be 23 per cent Jewish and 77 per cent Arab. That was the situation in 1939 when the Woodhead Report was made. The situation is different now because since then Jews have acquired land in these areas, but still it has not reversed the relation. That means the Arabs hold more land than the Jews.

The Woodhead Commission realized these difficulties, and therefore, in an attempt to find a State which would be Jewish to such an extent that the population would at present be a majority of Jews, they cut down the original Peel scheme, which they called Scheme A, and worked out Scheme B and Scheme C, gradually decreasing the area until Scheme A would be such a small area that it would not permit increased immigration—in any case not such immigration as is desired by us. So, while the largest desired area would only be in name a Jewish State, the smallest area which could be a Jewish State would not be desirable because it would defeat the purpose of immigration.

I come now to communications. There are certain difficulties with regard to railways and roads, but they can be overcome. They are minor technical difficulties. For example, the workshops of the railways of the country are concentrated in Haifa; so workshops would have to be put up in the Arab State and some of the railway lines would have to be diverted. For instance, the line from Egypt to Haifa passes through Tul-Karm—Tul-Karm would certainly be in the Arab State, and so the railway would pass through the Jewish State to Tul-Karm, and again to the Jewish State, and that would have to be changed. But these are minor difficulties and they only find expression in expenditure. As a whole, the railways will be less efficient and more costly, and the same will apply to the roads. Personal freedom of movement between the States will, of course, have to be very much restricted, and there will be special difficulty with regard to the Jews in Tel-Aviv. I am always assuming the Peel scheme, where Jerusalem is not in the Jewish State. There are a large number of Jews living in Jerusalem but working in Tel-Aviv, and even commuting at weekends. That, of course, will have its difficulty.

Then there will be the difficulty of the corridors, as I have mentioned before. It is difficult to imagine how the traffic through the corridors will be organized, for example, especially that long corridor between the southern part of the Jewish State and the Negeb. That corridor would

be about 80 kilometres long and it would mean transport in closed vehicles to prevent smuggling, and perhaps under guard. It is of course assumed that the Jewish and Arab States will have different customs tariffs because that is one of the main purposes of putting up a different State—to have an industrial customs policy in order to develop Jewish industry. These traffic problems are really very great, and you know of course that the traffic through the Danzig Corridor was by means of locked and guarded vehicles, and the question is whether it is contemplated that the traffic would be through these corridors. Of course one will remember that the Danzig Corridor was one of the points where the last war started.

The next is customs. What different customs tariffs would mean in both States, what difficulties this would bring, is perhaps nowhere better shown than in the description of the boundary between Jaffa and Tel-Aviv as contemplated by the Woodhead Commission. Permit me to read this description because it is fantastic and gives an idea of the difficulties which will be encountered generally. The Woodhead Report said:

"In our opinion one would have a road as a boundary between the two towns; down the middle of it a high iron railing must be constructed which would form the actual boundary and be the joint property of the two States. At intervals where the boundary would cut important roads there would be gates to allow of the passage of traffic between the two towns. Such railing would enable the police of each State to patrol the boundary and would provide a reasonably effective barrier between two possibly hostile towns. This arrangement is not perfect. In the event of disturbances no one could prevent shots from being fired. The substitution of a wall would prevent shots from being fired from streets, but would not prevent the throwing of bombs. It would doubtless also be possible for small articles to be smuggled through the railing, but again, provision of a wall instead of a railing would not wholly prevent the smuggling of such articles."

While the Woodhead Commission foresaw that such 'railing' or wall would be necessary between Tel-Aviv and Jaffa, customs barriers, to be ensured, would actually be necessary nearly the whole length of the boundary. During the disturbances about ten years ago the Palestine Government had to erect a barbed wire fence along the whole of the northern boundary. There is therefore a precedent for this, but that barbed wire fence proved entirely ineffective. It was easily breached and crossed, and therefore if an actual customs barrier is to be erected it would have to be a concrete wall along nearly the whole length. Such wall would cost at least £2,000,000 and even the upkeep would be nearly £20,000 to 25,000, and the effect would be very doubtful.

In connection with this, while I do not want to deal with defence, I may mention that the military authorities informed the Woodhead Com-

mission that no boundary can be found west of the Jordan which affords a satisfactory strategic line. Therefore, all such boundaries would be entirely artificial and would have to be secured as natural barriers do not exist, by some wall. While there are formidable objections, these are all minor things in comparison with any development scheme and water economy, because all proposals for increased immigration and for a large Jewish immigration must be based, not on the present economic condition of the country, but on a development scheme which will manifoldly increase the absorptive capacity. You have heard of such schemes, gentlemen, and I understand that you will get details of such schemes.

If you will examine them, then you will see there are many such schemes, but all have certain things in common. They have four features in common which are absolutely necessary for such a development scheme. The first is the utilization of the Jordan waters. The Jordan enters the northern boundary of Palestine and comes from Syria. Not the actual waters of the Jordan but the Jordan Valley. The storm waters coming down from the Lebanon pass through there, come to Palestine from Syria. Now, every development scheme assumes the utilization of these storm waters which now run to waste. This storm water now runs into the Dead Sea. There it evaporates. If it could be put on to land which can be developed for agriculture, it would be very useful. At present it serves no useful purpose at all.

But I agree—there is not a partition scheme which does not foresee that the lower part of the Jordan and the Dead Sea will be in Arab territory. Then, in accordance with usual international practice, only such water as is at present taken off the Jordan up to the northern boundary of that future Arab State belongs to the northern part. All the rest must enter the Arab State, as at present, even if the Arabs do not use that water from the Dead Sea but let it evaporate. They may legally object, and they will probably be given the right to do as they like with that water. For instance, they may say that while they do not use it at present they may perhaps use it at some future date. Therefore, the surplus water of the Jordan cannot be diverted into the Jewish State—only such a small part of it as is at present used in the northern part of Palestine, which will belong to the Jewish State. That is the first difficulty.

The second is this: that Palestine is divided by a ridge of hills and has a catchment area to the east going down to the Jordan and to the west into the Mediterranean Sea.

There is a tremendous amount of rain water. I do not want to bother you with the figures. But there is a tremendous amount of rain water falling down on the western catchment area. This flows out into the Dead Sea and is not used. All development schemes foresee that there should be an intercepting channel, a channel going from north to south along the foot of the hills and intercepting these waters in the valleys, as they

are called, so that it will not flow to waste into to the sea. It will be intercepted and used for irrigation of the plains.

Now, the plains will belong to the Jewish State, but the hills will belong to the Arab State. The Arab State will have no interest in putting up works in the hills, which would not be of immediate service to them but would serve the Jewish State and the plains. Also, according to all schemes, the intercepting channel will be just to the east of the boundary of the Jewish State. It will actually be in the Arab State. But even if you extend the boundary so that this intercepting channel should be in the Jewish State, it would be just at the boundary and could easily be sabotaged. It would be nearly impossible to prevent sabotage. Its maintenance would be extremely difficult. Therefore, that intercepting channel would hardly be possible.

The third source of water is the development scheme for forcing surface water, which cannot be stored in reservoirs and put into the intercepting channel, underground to enrich the ground water. This would have to be done also in the hills by wells and by small dams and by draining the water. In the hills, the water would have to be forced down underground, and it would enrich the ground water in the plains where it could be pumped and put into an irrigation net. But the work would also have to be done in the hills and the plains. That means the work will have to be done in the Arab States, but the gain will be in the Jewish State.

Of course, this is only to give you a rough idea. But it could be supported by detailed calculations. If you examine the schemes, you will find that these development schemes can only be carried out for the common interest of the whole country. It can only be a development of the whole country. Then, if the Arabs profit by it, they will be interested in it. Such Arabs as would draw from the intercepting channel water for the irrigation of their lands would have an interest in watching for the upkeep and maintenance and watching that it is not being disturbed and sabotaged.

Also, all the details of this scheme would have to be worked out so that part of it could be of immediate interest for one or the other community. If it is of ultimate interest, say, for the Jews, it should be of immediate interest for Arabs. If it is of ultimate interest for Arabs, it should be of immediate interest for the Jews. One such thing is erosion. For instance, erosion is a very great problem in this country. Its danger is two-fold. First, it lets the water run off without being utilized, and secondly, it takes the soil from the hills down into the plains. Now, the Arabs would be against erosion because their soil is taken away. The Jews would not be interested directly in what is happening to the soil of the hills but they would not want the water to run to waste but would want to use it in the plains. So, all this work could only be installed for the common interest of both communities.

I think this is enough. It does not go into

details. I am prepared to answer questions of detail.

CHAIRMAN: What you have said is laid down in a memorandum?

Mr. MAGNES: We are going to present a memorandum on this.

CHAIRMAN: We will have copies of it?

Mr. MAGNES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions, Mr. Blom?

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): No. If we get the memorandum, then I think the views on the situation will be clear.

CHAIRMAN: You have spoken of a special partition scheme.

Mr. RAINER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, there are many possibilities with regard to partition.

Mr. RAINER: Yes, I have taken the maximum and I have stated what its disadvantages are. I have said that one of the disadvantages of the maximum area with regard to Arab and Jewish population is so and so. There is also a very large minority, while by reduction of the area this disadvantage could be overcome. On the other hand, the area would be so small that it would not permit future or very little future Jewish immigration. So one is between the devil and the deep sea.

CHAIRMAN: Does anybody else wish to ask any questions?

Mr. RAND (Canada): You think it would be impossible to segregate these essential features which you have mentioned under a joint control bearing an analogy to your bi-national administration?

Mr. RAINER: Yes, in a bi-national administration.

Mr. RAND (Canada): No, I mean assuming a physical partition of the land and general administrative control over those features where the necessity for legislative and executive powers, which would be nullified by a straight partition, could be met.

Mr. RAINER: The would be possible with regard to the last-mentioned feature, development and water economy. It would, of course, not do away with the proportion of Jews and Arabs in the Jewish State, nor do away with the difficulties of communications and customs.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Why couldn't the customs be brought—

Mr. RAINER: One could also have a customs union.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Not a customs union. Well, that would be the effect of it, but could you not have a central administrative power with limited jurisdiction, and all other powers of a State residing in the partitioned sectors?

Mr. RAINER: Yes. That would make the partition really a partition into two sovereign states but into a sort of federation of two areas.

Mr. RAND (Canada): That is really a question of names, is it not? Is not the essence of it the question of distribution of power?



Mr. RAINER: Well, I will leave that to Dr. Magnes, since that is a political question.

Mr. MAGNES: It would appear from everything that one gathers in conversation and in reading that when partition is proposed there is in the background the idea that on certain basic features there would be a kind of joint control or joint administration. One of these features is water. Not only would the Jewish State and the Arab State have to come to some understanding on that, but that would include also the State of Transjordan, which is on the other side of the Jordan River.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Yes, necessarily.

Mr. MAGNES: Because they are also concerned with the uses of the water from the Jordan.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Yes, but that could be by agreement with any central authority.

Mr. MAGNES: That could be by agreement with the joint authority or with each State separately. The question is just this: whether in setting up two partitioned States the joint authority or joint authorities are also to be included. If they are to be included, it would make the setting up of these partitioned States that much more reasonable. In view, however, of the opposition, which is very strong, both among the Arabs and among the Jews, to this division, the question remains whether these joint controls are going to be agreed to. It may be that the force of life in the course of years would compel that. In any event, the establishment of joint controls, particularly if there be many of them, would be a point in favor of the idea of partition. Without these joint controls, some of these consequences that have been outlined by Dr. Rainer would undoubtedly ensue. Very great care would therefore have to be taken as to how these partitioned states were going to be set up.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Of course, it raises the question of whether or not what you might call a physical local habitation is a more or less essential element of the conception of nationality. You say no. I mean an exclusive area where you can stand upon it, or kneel upon it, or kiss it, as you like. It becomes a sort of sacred national soil. You exclude that feature. And I was wondering whether you do not consider or whether you do consider that as one of the fundamental components of the feeling, the spirit, the totality of what we call the national conception.

Mr. MAGNES: May I just speak for myself for a moment. I have the feeling that every point in this country, every square foot of it is something that I am in touch with, through my history, through my tradition. I cannot exclude Jenin which was at one time in the Bible called Ein Ganin and which is going to be, under all calculations, in the Arab State.

Mr. RAND (Canada): But would it be a necessary result of an arrangement in which there would be a central administering body that you would be excluded from Jenin.

Mr. MAGNES: If you are going to have a central administering body, then you have almost a federation. If you have a central administering

body, you have the Jewish State here and the Arab State there. It does not matter much what you call them, province or State, or whatever else, and the central administering body is then to be the important thing.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, necessarily? I am dealing purely hypothetically now. Suppose the fundamental administrative departments were land and immigration. Suppose those were committed to the States.

Mr. MAGNES: You mean that each State could deal with its own immigration and each State could deal with its own land?

Mr. RAND (Canada): Yes.

Mr. MAGNES: What would then be the part of the central administering authority?

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, those features that have been mentioned, the customs, foreign trade, inter-communications of all sorts, works that affect both States.

Mr. MAGNES: Well, that is practically what the Morrison-Grady Plan proposed. The Morrison-Grady Plan said that in the Jewish province we will be in control of immigration; we will be in control of land. In the Arab province, the Arabs will be in control of immigration and of land. It may be that you have in mind some modification of the Morrison-Grady Plan.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, I am suggesting a modification of the field of central power, a lessening of it, a minimum. What is the fundamental objection to that?

Mr. MAGNES: Well, the fundamental objection, to my mind, is that it segregates Arabs and Jews.

Mr. RAND (Canada): In a federal State, of course, the whole of the land is yours. I am a Canadian living in one of the provinces, but my Canadianism extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. MAGNES: There you have a strong central government, have you not?

Mr. RAND (Canada): In that instance, yes. But the interest, the spread of the individual's conception over the total commonwealth, you might call it, is not affected by the fact that you have two States in which the residue of power may be committed to the State rather than to the central government.

Mr. MAGNES: Well, if I understand your point, it is this: That you would set up a joint commonwealth, an Arab or Jewish commonwealth with a central—

Mr. RAND (Canada): I am suggesting that as a possibility.

Mr. MAGNES: I understand. I would like to try to understand it and to meet it. You are setting up a joint commonwealth, Arab-Jewish, and you are giving to the Arab State or province certain functions and powers and the same practically to the Jewish. That is one way of doing it. There is no question about that. That is the essence of the Morrison-Grady Plan, except that you would whittle down the central powers that are so obtrusive in the Morrison-Grady Plan, all of them remaining in the hands of the British

there. You would make the central powers limited in extent and confine them probably to water and to other matters of common interest. The objection I have to that is this: You nevertheless set up boundaries. And, as I tried to indicate this morning, boundaries are not only difficult to draw up but they are dangerous to maintain. You set up boundaries on either side of which the Jewish youth and the Arab youth are going to be trained in chauvinism and you make the creation of irredentism on either side of these boundaries a very simple thing. In one of the Hebrew papers yesterday I saw an abstract of a speech that was delivered by one of the foremost advocates of partition, in which he said, trying to persuade his audience that partition was all right, boundaries are not eternal things. One example of Piedmont and Sardinia has been cited by some of our people. We know that in the unification of Italy that took place at the end of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties, it was Piedmont and Sardinia, far-separated Italian provinces, that were used as the springboards, as the jumping-off places for the unification of all of Italy. That history is most fascinating and illuminating when one reads it in the light of our present problem here.

The main objection that I have to what I gather to be your tentative suggestion is these boundaries. These boundaries that keep me here and keep him there, and these boundaries over which we are going to fight. What I would like to see is that there be a united Palestine without these boundaries. Set up the central administration, as you propose it, for the control of these waters. Why must you have the boundaries?

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, even you suggested boundaries of counties.

Mr. MAGNES: Yes, but those are purely local administrative boundaries.

Mr. RAND (Canada): What do you think these suggested boundaries would do in the way of impediments or obstacles to each group?

Mr. MAGNES: The local administrative boundaries?

Mr. RAND (Canada): Yes.

Mr. MAGNES: There would be absolutely no need of a passport from one county to another.

Mr. RAND (Canada): There would not be in the case I suggested. You would be citizens, in effect, of the commonwealth.

Mr. MAGNES: Well, that is an entirely different conception from what I understand partition to be.

Mr. RAND (Canada): I quite agree.

Mr. MAGNES: I see. So we have been arguing at cross purposes, really.

Mr. RAND (Canada): No.

Mr. MAGNES: If you want to set up a commonwealth, call it bi-national. Why not?

Mr. RAND (Canada): Well, I think it is a question of names, so far as that goes.

Mr. MAGNES: Yes, all right, do or do not call it bi-national. If you want to set up this common-

wealth, give freedom of access to all citizens, to all parts of this commonwealth, and freedom for land purchase in all parts of that commonwealth.

Mr. RAND (Canada): You might have to qualify that. I was speaking of the right of any individual in the commonwealth to go where he pleased. Now that is a fundamental privilege. On the other hand, as each State would have control over its land and immigration, in fact, the geographical boundary would operate as the control of the numerical population.

Mr. MAGNES: That is one of the things I would object to, that each State should have control over its lands. I would like to see a condition under which I could have land anywhere in this country, and an Arab could have land anywhere in this country.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Of course, I agree that that might be desirable, but I am not losing sight of the fact that no matter what is suggested, there will be objections to it. I was wondering whether we could not make progress towards that which might be least objectionable.

Mr. MAGNES: You might find it less objectionable to the Arabs; but you will find it very objectionable, in the eyes of the Jews, to be excluded from lands here, there, and everywhere.

Mr. RAND (Canada): So far they would be willing to accept, they would accept land restriction in a commonwealth?

Mr. MAGNES: That is one of the reasons why I would not want them to accept partition.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Might it not depend upon the underlying setting in which you would look upon a commonwealth, and is your analogy to Piedmont and Sardinia quite apt? Here, as you properly stressed, you have a Holy Land in which millions all through the world are interested. That sets it apart somewhat, does it not, from the rest of the earth?

Mr. MAGNES: Yes, and would that conception play any part in the picture which you may have of administrative areas? I just do not quite gather the purport of your question.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Loyalties must cluster around ideas, or feelings, at least sentiments. Here, it seems to me that we are lacking in the framework of a conception in which loyalty in a Palestinian sense can arise. I think it was the Peel Commission that said it was nonsense to think that either the Jews or the Arabs in the present condition of things took any pride in Palestine, or even contemplated his relation to it as that of a citizen of one State. Now could you modify that by a change in setting?

Mr. MAGNES: Might I read you the last paragraph in our statement to the Anglo-American Committee? It is headed "A Palestine Solution":

"What a boon to mankind it would be if the Jews and the Arabs of Palestine were to strive together to make their Holy Land into a thriving, peaceful Switzerland, situated at the heart of this ancient highway between East and West. A 'Palestine Solution' is required for the Palestine problem. This would have an incalculable political

and spiritual influence in all the Middle East and far beyond. A bi-national Palestine could become a beacon of peace in the world."

What I may say is that one of our problems is the creation of just those loyalties that you so rightly emphasize. A loyalty for a Palestine State and not just for a Jewish State or for an Arab State. If that be our ideal, the question is how is it to be brought about, and it seems to me that the fewer barriers set up between the Arabs and the Jews—territorial or political or economic—the better chance you have of creating common loyalties for this Palestine State.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Yes, the only question would be whether the one or the other practically is realizable. Which would be the more likely to attract that new conception of loyalty which is a necessary condition, but which seems today to be absent?

Mr. MAGNES: Undoubtedly if you have a Jewish State or if you have an Arab State, a uni-national State creates national loyalties much more quickly than a bi-national State could. On the other hand, as you know and as you have said about Canada, your loyalty extends to all parts of it, from east to west, and to all sections, whatever language be spoken there. Now it has not been so easy in Canada, because I read only a year ago, I should say in the American "Foreign Affairs" an article by someone from Canada who talked about fundamental difficulties that are still to come, because of the basic differences in language and in customs and in European connexions, and so forth. But the fact that it has not been entirely simple in Canada does not mean that it has not been possible. It has not been simple in South Africa—more difficult there than it has been in Canada. On the other hand, you have there a kind of bi-national State where very deep loyalties have been engendered in the hearts of many Englishmen and many Afrikaans towards a South African unified State. The Premier of South Africa at the present time is not an Englishman, the Vice-Premier is not an Englishman. You have these loyalties on the part of the dominant political parties, and on the other hand you have the Nationalist Party in South Africa, which is by no means satisfied for South Africa to remain as it is under this present-day bi-national conception.

The question is what is one going to strive for? What is the higher ideal and what is the more likely ideal to be carried out? That is the question you ask. Now I would like to answer that. It may be that any answer that is given will have more or less to be imposed by the United Nations. The question is what can be imposed with least difficulty? That is the way I should like to formulate it. I think partition can not be imposed. It is going to create war. The great majority of the Arabs are against it. Large numbers of Jews, both extremists and moderates, and among the religious groups of the Jews, are against it. It is going to create these irredenta and these outbursts. The bi-national State, however, is here. We are a bi-national

State. We do not have to draw any new boundaries. We do not have to persuade anybody that that part of the country is land for the Arabs and this part of the country is land for the Jews. It would hardly have to be imposed. It will come into being. If you begin with the appointment, for example, of a Jew and an Arab—take the most modest of all requirements—as members of the Executive Council, sitting with the High Commissioner of this country during the period of the Mandate, that is nothing that you will have to go to war for, or all these other things that I tried to outline in the government of the country. Those things arise almost naturally. They are organic. You do not have to segregate people in any sense of the term, physically or spiritually, so that I have not the slightest doubt myself that if anything is to be imposed, the one thing that can be imposed is the bi-national State, because using the word imposed about that is a very strong term. We are here already a bi-national State, and any attempt to make these divisions is going to be something that will stir up animosity that does not at the present time exist.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. RAND (Canada): I was thinking of the more or less universal objective or dream or, you might say, spiritual aim of the Jewish people to have some part of this earth's surface which it might say was its own exclusively.

Mr. MAGNES: Well, if it were all left to me and we had a free hand, I would create a Jewish State. I am not among those who have objections in principle to a Jewish State. There are many Jews throughout the world in America and elsewhere who object to a Jewish State in principle. I am not one of those. I would like to see the Jewish people burdened with the task of conducting a State. They might, perhaps, add to the spiritual treasures of mankind if they were given that burden. But it has not been left to me. There is no tabula rasa. We are here in this country with two peoples. One of the ways of trying to evade that has been to try to find some other territory. The British Government at one time offered the Jews a settlement in Uganda. The Jewish people refused that settlement. Why? Because it was not Palestine. There may be other countries in the world which would offer space for Jewish homeless people. The Jewish people are not interested in that. I must say I am surprised some of the great countries of the world have not opened their gates to some of the Jewish displaced persons, but all constantly concentrated only and exclusively on Palestine for the reception of these unhappy languishing victims of this terrible holocaust. But the Jewish people would turn it all down. When I say Jewish people, I mean Jewish history, I mean the Jewish future, would turn it down as it has turned it down thus far. So that we find ourselves in this peculiar position, a peculiar people, that is what we are called in our Bible—and we are a peculiar people, sometimes in the good sense and sometimes, perhaps, not in so good a sense—and this is a peculiar land, with, as we have agreed, millions of people interested in it,

and it is here we want to set up our National Home for good and true purposes and where we are setting up our National Home.

Now if you think that by this division, this partition, you are answering the century-long yearning of the Jewish people for a niche in the world, for a home, for their own State, I think myself that is a mistaken conception. This does not answer the Jewish need for that. It is too small. It has too large a minority of Arabs in that particular State, too many administrative, economic, social and educational difficulties. If you could give to the Jewish people Palestine, all of Palestine, as many of our Jews want—we have our parties who say that all of this talk, all our talk and the partition talk and the rest of it is all rot; what the Jewish people require is Palestine on both sides of the Jordan River—and some go as far as the Euphrates River, because in our Bible the boundaries of Palestine have been set at times from the River of Egypt to the Euphrates River—(which you could not do, of course)—that, perhaps, might meet this great historical need of the Jewish people for some kind of a State that would make this the equivalent in statehood of some of the other peoples of the world. But to take this tiny country—you have seen how small it is.

Mr. RAND (Canada): It necessarily has to be symbolic, by its geographical limits, but what you say is that that yearning must remain forever unsatisfied.

Mr. MAGNES: I say this, that as long as Palestine is inhabited by two peoples and as long as we have not had one or two generations of experience and of experiment, of hit-and-miss, of working things out together,—I say that the Jewish people will have to do without that as it has done without that for many hundreds of years. I am convinced in my own heart that the Jewish people here can be creative: that is what we are after, most of all. In addition, by increasing immigration up to parity in this bi-national State, even though we do not achieve our legitimate ambition to have one State in the world that we may call our own, I am sure the solution will be more easily found. I do not think the task could be accomplished otherwise.

CHAIRMAN: Are there are more questions?

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to put a question to Mr. Rainer. I see you are very well acquainted with all schemes and plans for irrigation of Palestine as a whole. I have understood the biggest source for exploitation of water is the Jordan River water. Is that so?

Mr. RAINER: Not the biggest, but one of the biggest.

CHAIRMAN: Then I think we had better make this the end of the interrogation, since no one else has any questions. I repeat my thanks to you both.

The next item on the agenda should have been the hearing of representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine. We have had to postpone that hearing till tomorrow.

The next item on the agenda will be the hearing of representatives of the Council of the

Ashkenasic Jewish Community. Are they here? I understand that His Eminence, the Chief Rabbi of Orthodox Jewry of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, Rabbi J. H. Duschinsky and Rabbi Selig Reuben Bengis, President, Religious Law Courts, were going to appear before this body.

Rabbi BENGIS: The Rabbi who was supposed to answer did not feel well and decided to go home. I have to ask the Chairman when he should appear again.

CHAIRMAN: We shall see when we can fit it in. It becomes very difficult now to fit in something new in the programme, but we shall see if it is possible. We will have to review the situation, and I do not think we can say anything now about the possibilities of the Ashkenasic Community being heard or the time when it can be done.

Rabbi BENGIS: It is not possible to do it tomorrow after the Communist Party have spoken?

CHAIRMAN: We have fixed other hearings for tomorrow, but we shall consider the question and ask you to be ready to come here at short notice.

The public hearing is adjourned till tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

*(The meeting adjourned at 1.50 p.m.)*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SECOND MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building  
Jerusalem, Palestine  
Tuesday, 15 July 1947, at 11.25 a.m.*

### *Present:*

Mr. SANDSTROM, Sweden, (*Chairman*)  
Mr. HOOD, Australia  
Mr. RAND, Canada  
Mr. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
Sir ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
Mr. ENTEZAM, Iran  
Mr. BLOM, Netherlands  
Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
Mr. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
Mr. SIMAC, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

Mr. HOOD, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The Agenda for this Public Meeting contains three items:

1. Public Hearing of Representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine, Central Committee.

2. Public Hearing of Representatives of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement.

3. Public Hearing of Representatives of the Council (Waad Hair) of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community.

Can we adopt this Agenda?

*(No objection voiced)*

## Hearing of Representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine, Central Committee

CHAIRMAN: The Agenda is adopted. The first item on the Agenda relates to the questions to be put to the representatives of the Communist Party.

Mr. Mikunis, Dr. Ehrlich, and Mr. Vilner, will you please come up on the platform.

*(Mr. Mikunis, Dr. Ehrlich, and Mr. Vilner took their seats at the table)*

CHAIRMAN: Do any of the Members of the Committee wish to put some questions.

Mr. SIMAC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Mikunis, you have, in replying to the questions of the gentlemen of the Committee, mentioned my country several times. You did so precisely when referring to that part of the programme of your Party which has aroused the greatest interest, that is, to the question of the equality of rights of peoples. This might give me right, and possibly even make it my duty, to make some reference to the fact that you have, in your replies, in order to substantiate the correctness of your views, pointed to the solution of the national question which has been achieved during and after this war in my country.

I shall not do so, however, for reasons which are easy to understand. But, in connexion with this example you have given, I should like you to answer a question, in order to make sure that I have understood you correctly.

My question is: Have I understood you correctly if I take your programme for the solution of the problem which has arisen historically in Palestine to mean that, according to your conceptions, your demand for the abolition of the Mandate, the withdrawal of British forces and the immediate proclamation of Palestine's independence is a result of your conviction, that in such an event the actual conditions (and relationships) in Palestine will undergo such a change that they will constitute new conditions and a completely new objective reality, in which the Arab and Jewish peoples, and their progressive democratic forces, free of all influences from without, will be able to find an answer to all fundamental questions of life in common in a common country? Is it so, or not?

Mr. MIKUNIS: Exactly. Our conviction is that when the United Nations Organization will proclaim the independence of Palestine, after the abolition of the Mandate and the evacuation of troops in Palestine, there will occur, I would say, revolutionary changes. The peasantry, the working class, and the intellectuals will be free to express their opinion. They will be free to mobilize the masses of the people for the protection of the independence and the democratic State. This is our conviction. This is based on the composition of the social forces in Palestine among the Jews and Arabs. This is based on history, even of the recent years, on examples taken from different peoples. This is the general rule of freedom of all oppressed peoples. We do not think that Palestine and the Jewish and

Arab peoples are an exception in this respect. That is why we gave the example of Yugoslavia. Although our conditions are different, we think that the lines for the future development of our country are similar.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): Thank you. Now, this is my second question: You have stressed in your speeches and statements, that the fundamental freedoms, such as the freedom of the press and meeting and assembly, of the public expression of thought and conviction, and so on, are not guaranteed in Palestine. I should like you to give us a more detailed account of your experience in this respect? I should also like to know whether such measures are applied equally to all organizations, political parties and individuals?

Mr. MIKUNIS: We have a rich experience in this respect in Palestine. For instance, the Communist Party of Palestine was illegal until 1942 and was very severely persecuted. We had no legal paper. Hundreds of Communists had been deported from the country, and hundreds imprisoned on the basis of Emergency Regulations, without any court. Even on the 7th of July 1941 the Secretary of the Party was arrested along with several other members, although nothing could have been shown against them except that they are Communists. On the basis of the Defence Regulations we were sentenced to be imprisoned—to be detained until the end of the war. The racing forces of democracy were stronger than these Defence Regulations, and the Government, under the pressure of public opinion here and abroad, was compelled to release us after several months of detention. Our legal paper, Kol-Haam, was stopped for one month on account of a caricature on local matters. The paper of the Arab Trade Unions, the Al-Ittihad, was also stopped last year for one month. Our daily paper, Kol-Haam, until now has no telephone. We have to use private telephones because the Government does not allow us to have a telephone after four or five months of existence of our daily paper. You have the striking example of yesterday. Yesterday the Government revealed anew its real position by applying martial measures in Nathanya and its surroundings. I think I am just in protesting here against this collective punishment. I ask whether such measures would be applied against Manchester and Liverpool if two soldiers were kidnapped there. We are deprived of the elementary civil liberties of this country. Inhabitants of Palestine are deported to other countries. They are detained by hundreds and thousands without any reasons. The King David Hotel was exploded in Jerusalem, but after eight days the Government decided to punish Tel-Aviv—to impose a curfew and martial measures on Tel-Aviv for four days, causing sufferings to two hundred thousand inhabitants, in the biggest city in Palestine. The censorship is very severe, and especially regarding our daily paper. We gave in our memorandum and in our speeches a long list of discriminations and of the deprivations of the elementary civil liberties, both to Arabs and Jews, for the last thirty years. What I wanted to stress, and to underline it in

our reports, is that the main persecutions of the Communists and other progressive circles in Palestine were on account of our fight for Arab-Jewish co-operation and rapprochement because we estimate, and experience has shown, that the strongest weapons of imperialism in Palestine are not the tanks and the bombers, nor the police, but the strongest weapon is the Arab-Jewish antagonism. In every case where Arabs and Jews unite and fight together they always succeed. This is our experience for the last twenty-five years.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): You have stated categorically, among other things, that Palestine has been made into a British military base in the Middle East. Can you give us any further evidence substantiating such an assertion and such an appraisal of the matter?

Mr. MIKUNIS: In my address I indicated that the British troops in Palestine are too numerous, not only to suppress the liberation movement in Palestine, and the liberation movement in the Middle East, but that the number of troops shows that Britain's intention to fortify, to strengthen and to widen its military bases here as a preparation for a Third World War. The argument is that these troops have to protect the Jews against the Arabs, and the Arabs from the Jews. It is very strange that these troops are neither stationed among the Arabs nor among the Jews. They are stationed in the Southern part of Palestine near the Egyptian Frontier. They are stationed in the South in huge permanent camps. There are many permanent camps in Palestine. Tens of thousands of workers are still engaged in these military camps, in the construction of new buildings, and in workshops. There are several military aerodromes which are still maintained, where buildings are still added, and where workshops are erected. All these facts, which are not complete, prove that Great Britain, together with the aid and consent of American imperialism, erects here in Palestine a military base. I think that you will be able, I hope so, to obtain further details on this military base from the War Ministry of Great Britain.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I may, to clear up one point arising from the paper read by Mr. Vilner. As I understand the proposal made in general terms by the spokesman who is present with us, there would be two stages: There would first be the stage of proclamation of the principle of independence, and secondly the stage of the actual establishment of an independent administration in Palestine. Might I ask whether any of these gentlemen could give us a statement on the time he would think would be necessary before the second stage was started — let us say the interval between the first and the second stage.

Mr. VILNER: In our proposals there are no stages. We think, we are sure, that the peoples of Palestine are ripe for independence. The question is not a question of stages. The question is how to obtain — how to carry out in practice, now, in the nearest possible future, the inde-

pendence of Palestine. Our proposal stressed, and it was also obvious from the questioning last Sunday, one side of the matter. It means the pre-conditions for the independence of Palestine. We have stressed in our statement, in our memorandum, and in our oral statement, that the independence of Palestine can be achieved if some pre-conditions were carried out by the United Nations Organization in participation and co-operation with the peoples of Palestine. What are these pre-conditions? First of all, we propose that in the September Session of the Assembly of the United Nations Organization, the United Nations Organization according to our proposals should decide: 1. That the British Mandate of the League of Nations be abolished. 2. That in the nearest future, in the shortest possible time, that the British Army of Occupation and the British Police should leave Palestine. On these two, let me say, negative proposals, at least we have the full support not only of the Communist Party but of the whole Jewish Community and Arab Community in Palestine. Let me in this connexion . . .

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I asked a reasonably simple question.

Mr. VILNER: I will come to that.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): All I want to know is whether you contemplate an interval, and if so how long?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, we need not go into the support you had for your claims. The question was only the time it would take between the two stages.

Mr. VILNER: Yes, I know, but the time is dependent on the situation in Palestine and on the attitude of both peoples, not on abstract calculations of the Communists or other parties. That is our opinion, at least.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I do not think it is necessary to read the statement.

Mr. VILNER: No, not a statement, only two or three lines. It is not a statement.

CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is necessary. Will you answer the question without any reference as to what other communities might think?

Mr. VILNER: Our proposition on stages or against stages depends on this: In our opinion the whole question is what is the attitude of both peoples of Palestine. The stages are not a question to act out in a room alongside a table with a pen in hand. The question of stages and of the possibility to carry out our program for immediate independence or nearest possible independence of Palestine is dependent on this.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, you said it would be immediately. You have said there would be no stages, that it would follow immediately.

Mr. VILNER: No, it is not so simple. I wanted to explain our attitude. I only want to say in one sentence, not to quote, that all the newspapers, right-wing and left-wing in the Jewish Community have supported our demands against British imperialism, though they have objections to some of our other proposals. Now, how to carry out the independence. After the decision



of the United Nations in September about the abolition of the Mandate and the evacuation of British troops our proposal has said that the Security Council of the United Nations should appoint a United Nations Commission. This Commission appointed by the Security Council should come to Palestine to organize and carry out elections between Jews and Arabs to a constituent Assembly. This body of Jews and Arabs will be the body which will create the constitution of the future regime of Palestine. According to our proposals, as we have announced, this constitution will be in accordance with the realities of Palestine, taking into account the existence of two peoples — equal rights.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): How long do you think that will take; a matter of months, a year, or what?

Mr. VILNER: I think that if the United Nations Organization would give our peoples a real opportunity and make impossible the interference of the police, of the British Military Forces, and of the British Military and Civil Administration, then we are sure that the people will arrange it in months. But, on one condition: No foreign interference in the matters of Palestine.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Who will carry on the Government? Who will carry on the administration in that period?

Mr. VILNER: I said it very clearly. This question in our proposal cannot exist. Why? Because immediately after the United Nations Organization's decision, the commission will come to Palestine.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Do you mean the commission will administer the country?

Mr. VILNER: Well, the commission, or a provisional institution which will come out of the first elections after the United Nations Commission comes to Palestine. I think this will elect the committee, and I am not interested in details. This is up to the representatives of the Jews and Arabs. They will arrange in the best way they know how to work out the first constitution of the independence of Palestine. These are details which cannot change the proposal. It may be organized in this or that way; it does not matter at all.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Why do you suggest that the Security Council appoint a commission?

Mr. VILNER: Because we are sure, as my comrade has explained a few minutes ago, that the situation in Palestine (and this we should like to stress before you) is very grave. It must come to an end. The quicker the better.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): You have just told us that as soon as the Mandatory Power goes there will be no difficulties, the people will settle down. You understand that the Security Council is empowered to act in situations which may endanger international peace or security. But would that be a situation to endanger peace and security? I thought you said there would be no danger; there would be only reconciliation?

Mr. VILNER: I think that the situation in Palestine, as in other countries, created by American and British imperialism, is endangering the

peace. I am not a lawyer, but as a simple man I understand that the term "endangering the peace" in the United Nations Charter does not mean endangering the peace today, this afternoon, or tomorrow morning; it means a situation which endangers the peace. It may in a week, or it may in a year or more. But, the whole political-military situation in Palestine is endangering the peace in the Middle East.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): What is your reason for wanting the Security Council to act in this matter rather than the Trusteeship Council?

Mr. VILNER: Because of two reasons: First of all because the situation in Palestine is so grave and we have martial law every day, murders and so on. Further, the race to build military camps in Palestine is so intense that the situation is such, and the problem is such, that it must be transferred to this body of the United Nations.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): But you have just said that this body would not be appointed until the Mandatory had gone; is that right?

Mr. VILNER: This body means the Security Council, the situation in Palestine, in our opinion, endangers the peoples. But now the second half of the question was—oh, I am sorry, but I do not remember the second half of your question.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): The question was why do you prefer action by the Security Council rather than action by the Trusteeship Council?

Mr. VILNER: I am not sure if there exists now a full Trusteeship Council in the United Nations, at all.

CHAIRMAN: It does.

Mr. VILNER: I know, but according to the United Nations Charter, which I have here with me, the Trusteeship Council is a body for transition periods. I think that in our former answer I gave also the answer why we have not proposed the Trusteeship Council, but the Security Council, because we think that for Palestine the question now is independence and not trusteeship. It means that this is also my answer to the question "Why not the Trusteeship Council?"

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): The speakers here have referred more than once to equal rights for the Arabs and the Jews in this country. I am not sure of what they mean by that. Do they think of parity? Or what is meant by equal rights?

CHAIRMAN: We debated that at very great length at our previous meeting. If you read the record of the previous meetings, I think you will get the answer to what you ask.

Mr. MIKUNIS: Let me add some words.

CHAIRMAN: It is unnecessary because we debated that at great length at our previous meetings.

Mr. MIKUNIS: I wish to say only a few words to clarify the matter.

CHAIRMAN: I am not sure it can be clarified by explaining it once more.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): On Page 20 of Mr. Mikunis' statement, I read: "The United Nations should provide every facility to displaced Jews desirous to return to their countries of origin

where democratic regimes have been established". As you know, we have considerable evidence that by far the most of the Jews in D.P. Camps want to emigrate into Palestine and not to return to their countries of origin. What I want to know is: Has Mr. Mikunis any indication that people in the camps who are desirous of returning to their countries of origin are being prevented from doing so now?

Mr. MIKUNIS: In order to answer you properly, I will read two more lines of my statement. "The United Nations should provide every facility to displaced Jews desirous to return to the countries of origin where democratic regimes have been established, as well as to those interested in emigration to other countries, including Palestine, taking into consideration the desire to join relatives. This is the way to solve this urgent problem, how to eliminate the "Divide and Rule" speculations of imperialism.

In answer to the first question, we have facts. Many facts have been published in the press in Palestine and in Europe that the authorities of the camps of displaced Jews have not only prevented some of these Jews desiring to return to Poland or Yugoslavia or Hungary, but they have led a propaganda attack against it, describing the new democratic countries as police countries, as police States, endangering the security and the material wealth of the people.

Second, we know that the overwhelming majority of the Jews in these displaced persons camps desire to emigrate because of bitter memories and of the horrors they have survived in the countries of extermination. They do not want to return because of this. They want to join relatives, their families in different countries. That is why we say it is the duty of the United Nations Organization to assist them in this and to give them every opportunity in order to enable them to emigrate to those countries, including Palestine, and to liquidate all these camps in Western Germany, in Austria, Italy and Cyprus, in order to put an end to this shameful story of keeping the remnants, the victims of Fascism, the remnants of such a slaughter—keeping them two years after the war in such camps under protection of Nazis or former Nazis and allowing such Nazis to make pogroms and provocations against these victims of Fascism.

I stressed this point in my address. I stressed this point, that this is a sin of Cain on those people who speak so much about Western culture and who find a way—and I came from England only three weeks ago and I was there during the last weeks I was there thousands of former Fascists and collaborators with the Nazi armies, Ukrainians and Latvians, entered England freely. They have all accommodations and work, whenever they like. But the gates of England are closed for the Jewish victims of Fascism. Canada is open for the bandits of the Nazi armies, but Canada is closed for the Jewish victims of Fascism. Palestine is closed for these victims—

CHAIRMAN: I want you to choose your words carefully.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Dr. Magnes, in

his statement yesterday, suggested a bi-national state with parity between Jews and Arabs in spite of their differences in numbers. Just answer my question; I do not want your discourse. Do you, as Communists, support that idea?

Mr. MAKUNIS: Support what idea?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Dr. Magnes, in his statement yesterday, suggested a bi-national State with parity between Jews and Arabs in spite of their differences in numbers. I do not want a discourse; I only want your reply. Do you, as Communists, support that suggestion of Dr. Magnes?

CHAIRMAN: Yes or no.

Mr. MIKUNIS: No; it is not a question of yes or no.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I only want yes or no.

Mr. MIKUNIS: You speak about parity. I do not know what you mean by parity. There may be parity of the government and Parliament.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): You were present here when Dr. Magnes made his statement.

Mr. MIKUNIS: Yes.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am referring to that statement. I am only asking you: do you support the statement and the suggestion made by Dr. Magnes, as Communists, or do you not?

Mr. MIKUNIS: You ask me a question on which I cannot answer because Dr. Magnes gave a complete conception on the question of parity. If you want to know my conception of parity, I will tell you in a few words, but do not ask me if I signed the statement of Dr. Magnes. Of course, I did not sign it. I object to this conception of Dr. Magnes, although I appreciate his attitude on Arab-Jewish co-operation and his work for it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): On what points do you object? Tell me that.

Mr. MIKUNIS: We object to the continuation of British rule in Palestine under the name of trusteeship.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but that was not the question. The question was if you subscribe to the thesis of parity.

Mr. MIKUNIS: What kind of parity? There are different kinds of parity. I want to tell you what we understand it is, under two peoples with equal rights, constitutionally, simply. We understand two Houses. The first is the House of Representatives elected democratically on the basis of proportionate representation. Then we suggest the second House, the House of Peoples, also elected democratically on a regional basis, which is composed of fifty per cent Jewish and fifty per cent Arab representatives. This is the second House of Peoples. It must be based on this principle, in order—in addition to the constitution—to create an additional guarantee for the real equality of rights between the two peoples, Arabs and Jews. This is how we understand constitutionally the question of equal rights for both peoples.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): What would be

the respective functions of these two Houses, according to you?

Mr. MIKUNIS: The respective functions of these two Houses—first of all, they have the same rights. And secondly—

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): The functions. That is what I asked you.

Mr. MIKUNIS: If there are questions which, for instance, the first House is in conflict and these questions are passed to the second House, in every country where you have two Houses. It is very well known what such two Houses are doing, as for instance in the Soviet and Yugoslavia, and in different other countries. It is a well known thing.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is there any difference in principle between the Arab and the Jewish Communists in Palestine in regard to the form of the government in Palestine?

Mr. MIKUNIS: I speak, first of all, for the Communist Party of Palestine—

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am only asking you if there is a difference or not.

Mr. MIKUNIS: Then, we do not discuss questions of details. We are not entering now into details. We have confidence in the people, and we can assure you that after the granting or the proclamation of independence and evacuation of troops, the people will solve all fundamental, as well as the detailed questions for their future constitution and their future free government.

CHAIRMAN: Any more questions?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am not satisfied but I will put no other questions.

CHAIRMAN: Well then, we have ended the hearing of the representatives of the Communist Party. I thank you, gentlemen.

### Hearing of Representatives of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation

We go on with the next item on the agenda: Hearing of the representatives of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation. I understand that Dr. Simon and Mr. Cohen are going to speak.

*(Dr. Simon and Mr. Cohen took a seat at the table.)*

Dr. SIMON (Representative of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation): Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, we appreciate very deeply the privilege you have granted us of appearing before the Special Committee which was sent here by the United Nations, an organization which strives for the unity of the entire human race. Our aim is to achieve one union of two nations in this country. Such an effort, we believe, can be our greatest contribution to the welfare and unity of the world, especially since we dwell on one of its danger spots.

The League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation is not a political party. It is composed of a number of organizations and per-

sonalities in the Jewish community. The League does not speak in the name of the Yishuv or the Zionist movement. It wishes to offer you the opinion of a group which has devoted a great deal of thought and a considerable measure of action for the solution of the Jewish-Arab problem. While a party is built upon an all-inclusive programme relating to most problems of life, a league like ours unites its members through one central aim. We all see in the matter of Jewish-Arab relations the crux of the political situation in this country. We believe that failing the solution of this problem, no satisfactory solution is conceivable for the aims of Zionism or for the development and progress of the inhabitants of this country and its newcomers.

All the members of the League are united in their belief that the solution to the political situation in this country must be based upon the principle of bi-nationalism, namely: full equality of rights for both nations. It is not sufficient to grant equality to the individual Jew or the individual Arab. This equality must be possessed by the Jewish people as a whole, returning to its homeland by right and not by sufferance, and by the Arab people dwelling here in its homeland also by right and not by sufferance. This equality for which we strive must guarantee each nation what it needs most:—to the Jews—the right of immigration and settlement; to the Arabs—economic and social development; and to both—the prospect for peace and joint independence.

This common belief unites all the members of the League. While there may be amongst us differences of emphasis why such political agreement between the two nations has not been reached in the past, all of us agree that all the three political factors involved in Palestine are in one way or another to be blamed for the impasse. We do not indulge merely in casting accusations against others. We are constantly struggling for our ideas within the Jewish community and we do not deter from open criticism on the proper occasion. At this moment when we stand before an international forum, we wish to touch upon the international aspects of this problem, and we believe that our criticism within our community gives us the moral right to assess the responsibility of outside forces.

We do not wish to create the impression that we are anti-British. We know how to appraise the fine traits of the English people, its heroic efforts during the last war, especially when it stood alone against the enemy of mankind. But we are concerned here with the Jewish-Arab problem and in this matter we cannot exonerate the various British Governments from perilous negligence and at times even from harmful actions.

One more word about the activity of the League within the Jewish community. As we stated in our memorandum, the League was founded in 1939 in the midst of the riots, when it seemed that there was almost no hope for better relations between the two nations. The founding of the League crystallized in an organized way certain trends and activities which

existed already for many years. One of the greatest dangers which lurks for the Jew in the Diaspora as well as in his homeland is the danger of despair. The cause for this despair may be very well understood. When a human being loses a third of his blood, then he becomes mortally ill. Certainly, the Jewish people which has lost a third of its sons and its daughters has cause to be gravely ill—the illness of despair. The first symptoms of this illness were apparent in the very year when the League was founded. They increased in intensity during the terrible slaughters of the war in Europe, during the era of the White Paper in Palestine.

The members of the League still believe in man, in the brotherhood of nations, in the progress of mankind and in the eventual triumph of the progressive forces within it. They feel that they are part of one world front fighting for the victory of certain ideals without which there will be no hope for the liberation of the Jewish people either. Our efforts are devoted to heal the woes of our people by showing the way to a brighter future. We feel that it is not sufficient to preach the brotherhood of nations and international unity abroad without making the first steps here. Charity begins at home.

We began our work at home. It is not an easy task. We are swimming against the current of all the three political forces involved. We may assume that the testimony of the economic experts have proven beyond doubt that Jewish immigration to Palestine has been benefiting the Arabs economically. However, we know that a nation does not sell its national birthright for a pot of lentils of economic development, just as we, the Jewish community of Palestine, are not ready to give up our right to take in our brothers from overseas for equality within an Arab State promised to us by Arab leaders.

We, as Jews of national consciousness, understand and honour the Arab national movement in Palestine as well as in the neighbouring countries. We believe that there is reciprocal relationship between the two national movements. Any progress made by Zionism strengthens automatically Arab nationalism. The problem is how to direct this additional strength not against the aspirations of the Jewish people, not in destructive warfare, but rather how to direct it into positive channels so that the Arabs become active partners in the constructive upbuilding of the country.

The solution to this problem lies in the setting of a common political goal. As long as the economic benefits which the Jews are bringing to the Arabs are counterweighted by political demands, the situation is almost hopeless. However, if we set as our goal bi-nationalism—the creation of bi-national facts leading to a bi-national regime, then the economic benefits brought by Jewish immigration will assume their full positive value. The Arabs will cease seeing in them political danger.

Meanwhile, Jewish immigration must continue on a large scale. We cannot, gentlemen, you cannot, punish the Jews who are knocking at the

gates of this country—those remnants, victims of Fascism, who two years after the close of the war are still rotting in their camps and find the doors of Palestine shut in their faces. It is unforgivable that they should be punished and continue their suffering because of the political entanglement in this country. Their right as human beings to reach a haven in the land of their desires precedes any political settlement. However, we believe that if bi-nationalism were set as the political aim, it would minimize to no small extent the opposition of our neighbours, the Arabs, especially to Jewish immigration. Of all the solutions offered to you, gentlemen, we think that this solution holds the greatest promise of peace, especially if bi-national self-government is granted as soon as possible to the Jews and Arabs of Palestine, who deserve it as much as any other nation in the East as well as in the West.

Professor Weizmann spoke about the normalization which Zionism seeks to bring in the life of a sick and wandering people. This normalization has three aspects:

*First*, it refers to the attitude of the Jewish nation to itself, to its own cultural heritage. There is no contradiction whatsoever between satisfactory neighbourly relations among peoples in one country and the fostering of their respective languages, cultures and educational systems. Certainly the example of Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Canada, and Soviet Russia proves this fact.

*Secondly*, normalization in relationship between the Jewish people and their land.

*Thirdly*, normalization in the relationship of the Jewish people to the outside world—a nation among nations. The League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation seeks to promote those aims. The return of the Jewish people to its homeland and its entrenchment within it, should be accompanied by the re-establishment of the proper, healthy relations between the Jewish nation and other nations; above all, with the neighbouring Arab nation to whom it is closest related, racially, territorially, and also in the respective aspirations of the two nations for their national and social liberation and freedom.

Jewish-Arab co-operation is not only desirable but is of the utmost necessity for the welfare of both peoples. Governments and political regimes may come and go, but these two nations, who are bound forever to this land, will always live side by side. Their true freedom and prosperity depend upon their mutual co-operation. Since this is necessary, it must be made possible. It is the noble task of all statesmen who sincerely seek to contribute a lasting solution to the fate of this country and to the peace of the world to help these two nations to find their mutual way.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Simon.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Dr. Simon. Will Mr. Cohen please go on? As we have the address you are going to give in writing before us, you can perhaps shorten it here and there.

(Mr. Cohen's remarks were interpreted from Hebrew by his own interpreter)

Mr. COHEN: The League regrets it was not in the position to present the material addressed the day before to the Committee, since it was originally notified that it was going to testify Wednesday and not today. We understand that the Members of the Committee are tired and we do not wish to tax their patience unnecessarily. I, therefore, wish to devote my words mainly to factual material, and I hope it will help you to receive a more correct picture.

CHAIRMAN: How long is it going to be?

Mr. COHEN: About an hour.

CHAIRMAN: Then it has to be translated?

Mr. COHEN: No, it will be read directly in English.

CHAIRMAN: But it is not to be read out of the statement we have here?

Mr. COHEN: These are the facts which I am presenting.

CHAIRMAN: Then please make it as short as possible. Is it to be the same as laid down here?

Mr. COHEN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: But is it necessary to read it? Could we not read it by ourselves? We can take it into our records as read, and then I suggest that you come tomorrow morning and we can put questions to you on what we have read. It will be put in the record as it is.

Mr. COHEN: This is factual material, and I feel it must be read here. We will be glad, of course, to answer any questions tomorrow or any other time.

CHAIRMAN: Can you take out the most important points?

Mr. COHEN: It is all factual material, and therefore I feel that it has to be read here completely.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I cannot understand why it must be read here. It is understood that we shall read it for ourselves, and tomorrow will be time reserved for our questions.

Mr. COHEN: I feel that according to the procedure which was followed before, it should be read, since it is all factual material and the same procedure was followed before, therefore I urge that it be heard. It will not be any longer than anything that was delivered here.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (Spoke in French, of which the following is a translation): Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Cohen will be satisfied if we decide that his statement will be put on the record. This would meet his wishes, since the fact would be made public. We shall study the document tonight and shall be in a position to ask him our questions tomorrow. I think it is useless to read the document, since it will appear on the record. I might add that it has 29 pages.

Mr. SIMON: I think the situation is this: there are many friends of the idea of bi-nationalism; they think it is a very good idea, but it is unworkable. We bring very much material to prove that it works, even against the political stream, and I think after you have heard from the great auditorium the cause of partition, it will not be said that bi-nationalism does not work. We shall

find it is not given equal standing when we are deprived of the opportunity to bring these facts before, not only the honourable members of the Committee, but before this public meeting. We choose to make our statement in the public meeting.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but it is a question of giving us the facts. We are the investigation Committee, and it is not for the public that this is made.

Mr. SIMON: For both of them—the public meetings are for the public too.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but does that mean we are here to give the public a lecture on these things? We will read them at leisure and have the opportunity to put questions tomorrow. It is for our edification that you bring before us the facts, is it not?

Mr. SIMON: Yes, but not for you only.

CHAIRMAN: We can only take this fact into consideration.

Mr. RAND (Canada): Dr. Magnes did the same thing yesterday. He did not read his statement.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) (Interpretation from Spanish): I think that we should give full liberty to everyone who comes here to speak. We should not limit them in the time, and I think that they should have liberty to speak also. Therefore, I move that we should allow Mr. Cohen to speak.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): It is a long book of 29 pages.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): It is not the first long book.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Let me make a statement. It may not be in accordance with yours, and it is not possible to digest all the facts therein in so short a time. It would be better for all concerned from the point of view of the speaker himself, and therefore the Members of the Committee, if we will be able to give some time to studying it and then come prepared to put questions.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia): I propose the suspension of the meeting in order to enable us to discuss this point of procedure among ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: We will lose more time that way.

I suspend the meeting for ten minutes.

*(The meeting was suspended for ten minutes.)*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

Mr. Cohen, you will have an hour at your disposal for your address, and what is going to be cut out will be recorded in our verbatim record.

Mr. COHEN: I consent to that.

Mr. AHARON COHEN (Secretary of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, in the concise memorandum which we presented to the Committee, there was expressed the opinion that in spite of everything which happened in the past, there exists today the definite prospect that the situation can change finally and basically for the better if there should be established in this country a regime which sees as one of its main tasks the rapprochement of the two nations. We feel it our duty to explain where, according to our

opinion, lay the source of the evil in the past and hence the better prospect for the future.

The memorandum presented by the Palestinian Government to your Committee referred to the matter of Jewish-Arab relations, accusing both Jews and Arabs as having frustrated all its attempts to bring about understanding and co-operation between the two nations. This argument is repeated several times. Also Mr. Bevin expressed it in his declaration on Palestine in Nov. 13, 1945 when he said:—"The British Government made every effort in order to bring about an arrangement which would make it possible for Arabs and Jews to live together in peace and co-operation for the benefit of the entire country." However, the good wishes, H. M. Government were frustrated by the parties affected—namely the Jews and the Arabs themselves.

In the Statement of the League which was attached as Appendix No. III to the Memorandum presented to your Committee, we declared that Mr. Bevin's statement will not find support on the part of either of the two peoples whose destiny is bound up with this country. Among both peoples is current the common opinion that the British policy, both by its acts and by its omissions, bears a good part of the responsibility for the aggravation of the national conflict in this country. Mr. Bevin also said in his declaration that "if Arabs and Jews would approach the problem in the proper spirit . . . it would be possible to find a solution which would be just to both sides". It is a fact, however, that in the light of the real policy of the British Government in Palestine, every announcement of the above nature, such as Mr. Bevin's, was not received by both peoples, as a real invitation to understanding and co-operation between them.

We wish to express frankly our opinion that the political conflict in Palestine is first and foremost a result of the bankrupt policy of entanglement followed during the last 25-30 years. This basic fact of lack of a constructive policy towards Jewish-Arab relationship is not impaired by the matter that it was helped to a greater or smaller extent, consciously or unconsciously, by the official leadership of Jews and Arabs. In our opinion, the main and decisive burden of responsibility falls upon the shoulder of the Mandatory Government. We categorically deny the argument that there exists an unbridgeable gulf between the two obligations undertaken by the Mandatory Government—the obligation to the Arab Community of the country and the obligation to the Jewish people which is rebuilding its national home. The present situation in the country is rather a result of the fact that the Mandatory Government did not see in the common interests of the Jews and Arabs a starting point for its policy.

It is an instructive fact that not in one of its many declarations on its Palestine policy did the British Government find it necessary to state simply and clearly that it would look with favour on the effort of the two nations to reach an understanding between themselves on the only pos-

sible basis for a fair agreement—political and national equality, and satisfaction of the real vital needs and just national aspirations of both peoples. If in the memorandum presented by the Government to this Committee, it mentioned something about the "honest recognition of Jews and Arabs of the status, needs, and rights of the other community",—it immediately hastened to add when speaking about the principle of equality between the two nations that "this was anyhow an artificial principle that cannot serve as a healthy basis for representative government". On the other hand, there are instances where the British Government more than once interfered with attempts of Jewish-Arab negotiations and caused their abrogation. The most striking example is the one of Jewish-Arab negotiations of 1922.

In the beginning of 1922 the Jews and Arabs were faced with a negative balance sheet. The Jews had just experienced the bloody riots of 1920-21; they saw the slow development of their national home. The Arabs had just witnessed the collapse of Feisal's rule in Syria and the postponement of Arab unity for an indefinite future. Under such circumstances there ripened the consciousness on the part of both parties, that common action might facilitate the realization of their goals. With this as the political background, there took place in March-April 1922 a number of meetings in Cairo between the representatives of the Zionist Organization, among them the late Dr. David Eder, head of the Political Department of the Palestine Zionist Executive and representatives of the Congress of Parties of the Confederation of the Arab Countries; among them its President, Sheikh Rashid Rida and Riad Bey es-Sulh, a well-known Arab national leader, at present Prime Minister of the Lebanese Republic. Emil Khuri, Christian Arab, who was then the foreign editor of "Al-Ahram" served as secretary of the Arab delegation.

In the minutes of the first meeting which took place in March 18, 1922, we read that the aim of this conference is "to reach an understanding which will enable both parties to work together . . . on the basis of equal rights and interests. In the convening of this conference, the two parties are imbued with the mutual desire to inaugurate a new era of peace and tranquility and to terminate the quarrels and misunderstandings which divide them; because if they continue they are liable to deteriorate our public and private interests and to retard the realization of the legitimate aspirations of both parties".

"The Arab delegation declares that the Arab countries, after the centuries of corrupt Turkish administration, find it impossible to carry through their reconstruction, in order to take their rightful place in the world again, without the collaboration with representatives of the more advanced Western civilization. Such representatives can be either:—1. a well-established European nation, which means a Colonial power which represents a great danger to the independence and unity of the Arab countries; or 2. the Jewish people whose origin is in the East but who are now dispersed all over the world, and



who possess ideal forces upon which modern civilization and progress is based. Because the Arab delegates are aware of the antiquity of the Jewish people which is undoubtedly historically related to the Arabs, and of the fact that Jewish colonization does not represent the entering wedge of a foreign political power; but rather by settling in Palestine, the Jews become attached to it and make it their homeland, therefore they declare that in order to hasten the process of progressive civilization in their countries, they give first preference to the Jews and they will be happy to work together with them so that the Jews become the most effective carriers of that civilization which the Arabs need most."

"In reply to this declaration, the Jewish delegates expressed their appreciation of the confidence shown to them, and after having likewise emphasized the ancient racial relationship between the two peoples, they proclaimed that they welcomed the suggestion of the Arab delegates to work together and to open an era of collaboration and peace, for the progress of the above mentioned countries. On the other hand, they drew attention of the Arab delegates to the specific legal interests and aspirations which the Jews possess in Palestine as their historical and national homeland".

"While recognizing these aspirations, the Arab delegates pointed out that in their view the discussion should not proceed on the bases of any previous political agreements or documents, either the Balfour Declaration or the accord between Britain and King Hussein. Arabs and Jews must discuss today as nation to nation. They must make mutual concessions and must recognize one another's rights". At this point the discussions were interrupted. The representatives of the British Government asked Dr. Weizmann to postpone the negotiations until after the ratification of the Mandate.

In September of that year, after the ratification of the Mandate, the negotiations were resumed in Geneva. The Jewish representation was Mr. A. Saphir who had previously participated in the above mentioned Cairo meetings. On behalf of the Arabs there participated the Emir Habib Lutfallah as the personal representative of King Hussein, and the Emir Shakib Arslan, and Ihsan Sabri of the Syro-Palestinian Delegation in Geneva. The discussions were again conducted in a very friendly atmosphere. In the minutes entitled "Preliminary Propositions of an Understanding between Arabs and Jews" was included paragraph 4 which reads:—

"The Arabs and Jews will decide upon the modus of declaration to be issued concerning the special attachment of the Jews to Palestine. This declaration will be so formulated as to state clearly the connexion of the Jews with Palestine as well as the rights of the Arab inhabitants of the country. It is understood that the basis for this declaration will be complete equality of all the inhabitants without any distinction of race and religion."

The minutes go on to say:—"In order to facilitate the realization of such an agreement, both

parties concerned intend to take immediately the following steps:—1. Cessation of anti-Jewish agitation in Palestine should be immediately proclaimed and an end put to political antagonism between Arabs and Jews in the neighbouring countries. 2. A Joint Committee should be immediately constituted composed on the one hand of representatives of the Syro-Palestinian delegation and the Palestinian Arabs (Moslems and Christians), and on the other hand of representatives of the Zionist Organization, which if it will deem it necessary, will be entitled to co-opt influential personalities in the Jewish world. This Joint Committee should work out the details of a Draft Agreement on the principles suggested above to form the basis of further action".

As rendered by the testimony of Mr. Saphir before the Palestine Royal Commission of 1937, the negotiations were abrogated before they reached the stage of practical details. They were abrogated after Dr. Weizmann, who was then staying in Rome, had rendered a full report of the negotiations to the British Ambassador.

The testimony of Mr. Saphir, including the protocols of the sessions and facsimilies of the protocols written in French in the handwriting of Emil Khuri, the secretary of the Arab Delegation, were presented to the Palestine Royal Commission of 1937.

However, it is not always possible to attribute such direct acts of interference. Sometimes it was sufficient to hint to one of the parties that in negotiations with them (the British), it would obtain greater concessions than in negotiations with the representatives of the neighbouring people. Thus, during the last war there began to crystallize a serious change of mind in the Arab community of Palestine. The extremist anti-Jewish leaders were not in the country. Some of them were detained in Rhodesia and others were in the lands of the Fascist Axis. Among the Palestinian Arabs there were signs of sobering up from the tragic results of the riots of 1936-39 which cost them tremendous losses in life, economic ruin, and bitter internecine strife. Also, politically they were facing a broken manger. On the other hand, it was becoming clear that after the war, Palestine would become part of the general problem of the Near East and the solution of this problem would be sought in a wider framework. The late President of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation, Mr. Kalvarisky and myself visited Syria and Lebanon in the end of 1942 and met with important Arab statesmen, some of them at present leading members of the governments of these respective countries. We then received great encouragement from these Arab leaders for the activities of the League.

In the summer of 1943 an attempt was made on the part of important Arab circles to come in contact with Jews concerning an agreement, as similar attempts had been previously made by the Jews to reach an agreement with the Arabs. As a basis for the negotiations the Arab suggestions included agreement to Jewish immigration of over half a million during the coming few

years (up to numerical parity between the two peoples); the transformation of Palestine into a bi-national State, based upon parity, which would join the federation of the neighboring countries; leaving the question of the future of Jewish immigration (once numerical parity was reached between the two peoples) to be decided. But this time it was the official Jewish leadership which hesitated from entering into negotiations with the Arabs on the basis of their suggestion, because it appeared insufficient in the light of the high promises made at that time by the captain of British policy and by the two large political parties of the U.S.A. The Jewish leaders were encouraged by hints and promises until they were enticed to believe that the Jews had no reason to seek an understanding with the Arabs. These same misleading promises were responsible to no small extent for the formulation of the Zionist demands at the end of the war as it was expressed by the "Biltmore Programme". There was current at that time a rumour among the Jewish public that Mr. Churchill, personally, had promised one of the Jewish leaders that after the war he himself would pull out for the Jews 'the plum from the pudding'.

Somewhat later the tables were reversed. Just as advances had been previously made to the Jewish leaders, so now the Arab leadership was encouraged to disregard completely the necessity to come to an understanding with the Jews. The repressions against the Jewish community in Palestine, the attempts to disarm it of its self defence, the mass arrests, the deportations to Cyprus of the victims of Nazi-Fascism who managed to reach the shores of this country, etc. — all these acts have been encouraging the extremists and the uncompromising among the Arabs. It practically hinted to the Arabs that they need not seek an agreement with the Jews because they could obtain all their desires from the British behind the backs and against the vital interests and just national aspirations of the Jews.

Very soon, the Arabs too will probably discover that they were deceived and that they lost precious time. But come what may, the game continues, and the Jews and Arabs exchange roles in the play written by British policy.

The focal point of British policy in Palestine was to use Arab arguments as a pretext for slowing up the development of the Jewish national Home, and Jewish arguments as a pretext against the national demands of the Arabs.

The Government claims in its Memorandum to this Committee that it made efforts to bring about an understanding between the Jews and the Arabs but it did not succeed. The Government would have undoubtedly made a much better point if instead of speaking in general terms about efforts which were frustrated, it had brought into its Memorandum at least five cases of such attempts during its mandatory rule of 25 years. It did not do so. It did not mention even five cases for the sake of example.

Ever since its inception, there was a trend in the Mandatory Government of Palestine to en-

courage the Arabs to oppose the establishment of the National Home promised the Jews in the Balfour Declaration and in the Mandate. After the first riots in Palestine in 1920, high Government officials were accused of being guilty concerning their outbreak — as testified in the Protocols of the Shaw Commission in 1930.

Also during late years, the Government maintained epic calmness and complete indifference to religious and national incitement which culminated in bloody outbreaks. When outbreaks did occur they were allowed to develop; many victims were killed; and the relations between the two nations were thus poisoned. However, when in 1933, the Arabs directed their demonstrations against the Government and consciously refrained from touching Jews, these demonstrations were immediately suppressed with an iron fist.

The culminating and most typical instance of this policy was exemplified by the appointment of Haj Amin Al-Husseini as the Mufti of Jerusalem in April 1921 and as the President of the Supreme Moslem Council in 1922. The anti-Jewish sentiments of Haj Amin were then very well known — only a year previously he had been sentenced to ten years of imprisonment for incitement to riots against Jews which did take place at that time, but he was afterwards reprieved. In the elections for the office of Mufti, Haj Amin received 9 votes as against 12, 17, and 18 votes for the other candidates who were older and more learned than he. In spite of the rules enacted by the Government itself by which the Supreme Moslem Council was to be elected every four years, no such elections took place ever since. The Mufti was removed from office only after the murder of the British District Commissioner, Andrews, in 1937.

In his Dairy, the late Colonel Kisch, who served as head of the Political Department and Chairman of the Zionist Executive in Palestine from Jan. 1923–August 1931, one can find many sustaining examples proving this point. We shall quote here some of them. It is to be noted that the late Brigadier Kisch can hardly be suspected of having lacked confidence in the British. When Riad es-Sulh — now Prime Minister of the Lebanon — tells him on the basis of his observations that "The Government are not sincere about the elections (to the Legislative Council) — (which were boycotted by the Mufti and his followers, but were supported by a large section of Arab public opinion) and that the Government do not wish to see a rapprochement between Jews and Arabs", Colonel Kisch notes in his Diary (3.4.23):—"I cannot believe this to be the case, but undoubtedly the Government have acted, and are acting, as if it were true." According to Ragheb Bey Nashashibi, (Kisch Diary — 21.9.23) "in all matters concerning Arab participation — in the Legislative Council — the High Commissioner is following the advice of Richmond who is opposed to all co-operation with the Jews".

Concerning the same Mr. Ernest T. Richmond, Col. Kisch writes in his Diary (21.9.23) that "the Jews and the moderate Arabs see in

Richmond a man who identifies himself fully with the policies of the Mufti". And this is the man who served as the Assistant Secretary, head of the Political Department and adviser to the High Commissioner of Palestine during the years 1920-24.

It was the British Administration, in co-operation with certain interested Arab circles, which was responsible for the removal of Saleh Hassan Shukri, the then mayor of Haifa, who enjoyed the respect and esteem of both Jews and Arabs. Hassan Shukri was punished for having sent a message of greetings to the High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, who had arrived in the country. At the first municipal elections which took place after this incident in 1927, Hassan Shukri was re-elected with the overwhelming majority of both Jews and Arabs and he served as Mayor in Haifa till his death.

During all these years, the Government revealed an encouraging leniency towards various Arab extremists who incited not only against Jews, but who also threatened and terrorized all Arabs who strove for an understanding between the two nations. The Palestine Royal Commission of 1937 testifies to this effect in its report:—

"If one thing stands out clear from the record of the Mandatory Administration, it is the leniency with which Arab political agitation was treated, even when carried to the point of violence and murder." (Chs. 5-55, p.140).

The Government not only encouraged the extremists, trouble makers and inciters; there are sufficient examples to prove that it refrained from, and at times actually interfered with attempts to bring about an understanding between the two nations. Thus, when there was formed in 1930 the "Workers' Brotherhood", an organization of Jewish and Arab workers which called upon workers of both nations to co-operate and to fight together the poison of national hatred, it was shut down by the Government. The excuse given was that "It suspected the members of the organization of destructive acts" and because the aims of the organization "were not in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Ottoman Law of Associations . . ."

Among the numerous laws enacted by the Mandatory Government in this country, most of them limiting the freedom and rights of the inhabitants and immigrants to this country, one cannot find even one law which prohibits national incitement of any nature. There is a very large measure of freedom in this country for national incitement and sowing of hatred of one nation against the other. Newspapers or organizations which aim to widen the gulf between the two nations were hardly ever forbidden. In a land of two nations the Government and the censorship reveal unrestrained leniency towards insulting and inciting articles written in the papers of one nation against the other. On the other hand, the censorship is very severe not only with criticism aimed at the Government, but also at times makes it even impossible to refute the chauvinistic incitement and reveal the true nature of reactionary intrigues.

The best example of the typical policy of the Government we can find in the developments in the Arab community during the last year. The anti-Jewish extremists among the Arabs were encouraged by the boycott propaganda, by the return of Jamal Hussein to Palestine, by the return of the Mufti to the Middle East, and by the permission for the founding of aggressive military organizations such as "Najada" and "Futuwa". When these organizations did not develop according to plan, the Mufti sent here an Egyptian reserve officer to act as a commander; and this foreign officer was not detained from entering the country and from acting as the chief commander of the above mentioned military force. A month before the Arab boycott was pronounced by the Arab League, Ahmed Hussein, the leader of the Egyptian Fascist "Green Shirts" Movement—a man who was under arrest during the war because of his pro-Axis activities—was allowed to tour Palestine and make inciting speeches, preparing the ground for the boycott. The fanatical "Moslem Brotherhood" of Egypt was likewise allowed to open branches in Palestine and was even given time on the Government-owned Palestine Broadcasting Station in Jerusalem.

In the light of the incitement to riots which began with the return of Jamal Hussein, an Arab newspaper, "Al-Mihmaz", (12.5.46), wrote: "Those people who speak about a revolt forget that 1946 is not 1936; that there exists at present a United Nations Organization; and that all matters of Palestine should be directed to it". This was also the stand of the "Arab Front", which included all opposition forces in the Arab Community who were opposed to the Hussein policy. Contrary to the demands of the Opposition, Jamal Hussein refused at the time to transfer the Palestine problem to the United Nations. He poured his wrath against this united Opposition front because some of its constituent groups openly advocated the principle of Arab-Jewish understanding. It is noteworthy that just at the time when this Arab opposition front was in formation, the High Commissioner saw fit to receive Jamal Hussein as the leader of the Arab Community at the time when even formally he was no longer the sole representative of the entire Arab community. The Arab Opposition front was rapidly disbanded under the pressure of the Mufti's return to the Middle East, perhaps managed for this very aim. The decision to disband the Opposition front and the appointment of the present Arab Higher Committee under the leadership of the Mufti, took place at the notorious secret session of the Arab League Council in Bludan in June of last year in the presence of Brigadier Clayton, one of the Chief British Officers in the Middle East. It is rather obvious then with whose aid the Hussein clan returned to power in the Arab Community in Palestine. As an example of the Hussein rule we may cite the boycott against UNSCOP, which is accompanied by the passive attitude of Government. The same authorities who found ways to influence the Arabs to testify before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry and to parti-

cipate afterwards in the London Conference on Palestine — those authorities did not find it necessary this time to appeal to the wide Arab public to co-operate with your Committee. All the Arab newspapers except "Al-Wahda", the organ of the Mufti, urged co-operation with the United Nations Committee. In your tour through the Arab areas of the country you hardly witnessed any special attempts on behalf of Government authorities to counteract that boycott. The aims of the Husseini-sponsored boycott against your Committee may be summed up as follows:

First; to undermine the prestige of the United Nations;

Secondly; to prevent direct and free contact between the Committee and the Arab masses;

Thirdly; to prevent testimony of opposition forces, especially those who stand for Arab-Jewish understanding; who are ready to compromise in order to reach such an understanding; and who are increasing lately the criticism of the undemocratic character of the present Arab Higher Committee;

Fourthly; to prevent the repetition of the vulgar anti-Jewish appearance made by a spokesman of the Arab Higher Committee at the United Nations Special Session on Palestine—an appearance which aroused a great deal of indignation among wide Arab circles.

The Arab community is quite aware that the Government practically supports the Husseini Party. There are quite a number of examples which prove that the Government does not look favourably upon Arab-Jewish friendship. There were a number of instances when individuals, especially Arabs, working for co-operation between the two nations, were molested by the police. One must draw his own conclusions. Strange as it may seem, though it is a fact, you can speak openly in Palestine about warfare between the two nations and prepare for it, but joint Arab-Jewish activities aiming at understanding and co-operation have to be conducted many a time secretly, "underground", so to speak.

We must state frankly that in our opinion the Government's indifference to political murder is equivalent to tacit consent to the wiping out of all opposition in the Arab community. The same must be said for the Government's indifference to the anti-Jewish boycott which, although from a purely economic point of view, may be not too successful, and is resented and circumvented by many Arabs, nevertheless poisons the day-by-day relations between the two peoples. It is unimaginable that the perpetrators of such activities cannot be discovered—at a time when the Government spends 40% of its budget for police and security, and only 11% for education, health and social services combined. If the Government really does not know the culprits, we may ask, what kind of Government is it anyhow? If it does know and keeps silent, what name shall we give such an administration? It is noteworthy that the only trial which took place so far involving political murder was the case against the avengers of the

Emir Zeinati of Beisan who had been murdered for the "crime" of maintaining friendship with the Jews. Well, the blood avengers were brought to court, but the murderers of Emir Zeinati himself have not been revealed to this day.

On the basis of numerous facts such as those mentioned above we allow ourselves to assert that the Mandatory Government, by its deeds as well as by its omissions, bears a considerable share of responsibility for the aggravation of the national conflict in Palestine.

Nevertheless, in spite of the severe consequences brought about by the complicated and ruinous policy of the last 25-30 years we are convinced that there is still no place for despair and that the situation can still be saved.

On what do we base our belief?

One of the most important facts which the Committee should note is that the Palestinian reality is not made of one metal. It is composed of various factors and processes, some positive and other negative; and further development may be in either direction. The main question which faces Palestinian policy is—which one of these processes will be encouraged and given a lifting hand.

The Committee had the opportunity to hear on a number of occasions that the direct day-by-day relations between the two peoples in this country are not at all bad. There were mentioned quite a number of cases of co-operation between orange growers, in the municipality of Haifa, joint strikes of workers, etc. But it was claimed that daily relations were one matter and politics was another matter. In our opinion this distinction is artificial and erroneous for at least two basic reasons:—

First; the instances of Jewish-Arab co-operation even under the existing political circumstances testify to the vitality of such common interests.

Secondly; such co-operation upholds possibilities which, if supported by the proper programme and encouraged by the right policy, would definitely influence the political situation. It is understood that an improper and inept policy interferes with such development and directs it into undesirable channels.

In the confusing political atmosphere of our country even political matters of such insignificance assume political importance. Under such circumstances, instances of co-operation have to contend many a time with visible or secret stumbling blocks. If in spite of all this, orange growers, workers, government officials and members of other classes overcame all these obstacles and succeeded in carrying through common activities, it is a sign that there exists not only common vital interests, but also mutual confidence and readiness to go together. It is noteworthy that such instances of co-operation are usually conducted, most naturally, on a basis of parity, regardless of the numerical strength of the two parties and without reaching that "deadlock" with which one is threatened when proposing it as a principle for the political regime of the country.

Indeed, Palestinian reality has two faces:—the official reality as made in declarations, and the reality which is teeming underground, secretly, but with tremendous force and vitality.

On more than one occasion you have heard here of instances where Jews revealed good will, support, and readiness to co-operate with the Arabs. We have no intention of repeating or adding additional cases. It is quite possible that, were you to hear today the leaders of the Arab community, you would not have been presented with these facts which you are entitled to hear so that you get a full picture of what is going on here. We shall attempt to do it.

Immediately after the Government spokesman had "proved" to the Anglo-American Committee last year the alleged existence of the "unbridgeable gulf" between the Arabs and the Jews, there broke out the mighty and extensive strike of 85 thousand workers in the Government services which included Arabs and Jews. Thanks to their solidarity, they won important concessions. Thousands of Jewish and Arab workers and officials marched together through the streets of Jerusalem and Haifa, carrying slogans proclaiming:—"In our unity lies our strength".

At a time when Arab leaders threaten with "war" if another Jew was allowed to enter the country, it was reported in Haifa that, on the day masses of Jews disregarded the curfew and clashed with Government forces which attempted to deport Jewish immigrants from the shores of the land—on that day there were many instances of Jews retreating to Arab houses and being welcomed with understanding and sympathy.

At a time when Arab leaders pour fire and brimstone against every new Jewish settlement which reclaims the wilderness and fructifies another corner of the land, Arab fellaheen receive their new neighbours with open arms. On the occasion of the settlement of the ex-soldiers' kibbutz called Ma'ayan Baruh, Arabs from the neighbouring village welcomed them with coffee, and in the afternoon, at a meal according to oriental traditions, there participated tens of Arabs and Jews. Numerous Arabs from the neighbourhood visited the new Kibbutz "Yakum" which had recently settled near Wadi-Falek. At the open air festival arranged by the kibbutz as a get-together with the Arab neighbours, a solid foundation was laid for friendly relations between the new Jewish settlement and its Arab neighbours. Only two weeks ago we witnessed a similar case of a hearty gathering between Arabs and members of the Kibbutz "Eyal" who settled on the eastern shore of the Huleh near the Syrian border.

In spite of the anti-Jewish propaganda, friendly relations are being formed between the new Jewish settlements in the Negeb and the Arab neighbours. The average Arab, even if he is under the influence of the current anti-Jewish slogan, "Defend the South against Jewish invasion", welcomes Jewish settlement in his vicinity because he hopes that it will bring him

water, bus transport, medical aid, and modern methods in many other fields. During the spring, when a number of Jewish settlements were cut off from all contacts with the outside world by torrents of rain, neighbouring sheiks came to their aid and brought them sacks of flour, rice, eggs, and offered the services of their camels gratuitously, absolutely refusing any remuneration for the services they rendered their younger neighbours in a time of tribulation.

In the Nathanya area, Jewish settlers and Arab fellaheen, under the direction of the Government Department of Agriculture, carried through an extensive joint campaign of locust extermination which threatened their crops, on an area of thousands of dunums, regardless of national barrier.

In spite of absence of diplomatic relations between the official leaders of both communities, good neighbour relations are daily phenomena. Arab neighbours participated in the opening ceremonies of the school at Kfar Atta. A deep impression was left by the fine, fiery speech of one of the Arab guests who called for peaceful and brotherly relations and ended with the words:—"If some Arabs come to visit you and do not behave as they should, do not hold it against the entire Arab Community." It is noteworthy that all the Arabs who came to this function requested that their names should not be mentioned and that they should not be photographed—either out of fear of vengeance from Arab extremists, or for lack of desire to be exploited for Jewish propaganda aims. Many such gatherings between Jews and Arabs take place under cover. An Arab who receives an Arabic newspaper which calls for Arab-Jewish co-operation sometimes is liable to get in troubled waters. Jewish and Arab workers recently again revealed their trade union solidarity when 1500 workers struck against the Iraq Petroleum Company in Haifa. There is complete co-operation between the Arab and Jewish Councils in the Haifa Oil Refineries. At the mass meeting of Arab and Jewish workers, the speeches were translated into both languages, Arabic and Hebrew, and one of the Arab workers illustrated the importance of solidarity by pointing to a bundle of reeds and exclaiming:—"Everyone singly can easily be broken; together—never."

It was interesting to note the reaction of the Arabs to the Government repressions against the Jews last summer. It is true that this reaction was not the same at every place but there were typical traits throughout. In numerous conversations with all kinds of people—intellectuals, shopkeepers, workers, and peasants, one could hear the same refrain: "Yesterday it was our turn, today it is yours; and so it goes on . . ."

During those days, many Arabs called on the Jewish neighbours to comfort them. There were instances when Arab village elders came to beg pardon for acts of vandalism committed by inhabitants of the villages against Jewish vineyards during the Arab searches, and they even revealed the culprits. In some places, even officers and soldiers of the "Arab Legion", who

usually are not trained in an atmosphere of exaggerated friendliness to Jews, revealed a fine spirit towards the Jewish settlers during those days of hardship, and warned them beforehand of searches; transferred messages to confined relatives etc. During the siege against Jewish settlements in the Negeb, Arab neighbours watched over the fields and agricultural machinery left out in the open, and even sent food and other gifts to the besieged settlers. In several cases, Arabs expressed their anxiety and deep human interest by bringing candy and also money for the women and children of Jews confined in detention camps. When fire broke out at that time in the water station of Kibbutz Eylon, in Western Galilee, the neighbouring Arabs put it out even before the members of the Kibbutz arrived. Right now the members of Kibbutz Mizra are conducting a course in fire-fighting for their Arab fellaheen neighbours whose threshing-barn recently caught fire and was extinguished by the members of the Kibbutz in the middle of the night in spite of the prevailing road curfew.

It is interesting to note the reaction of the Arab public to the martial law which was declared against certain Jewish areas—Tel-Aviv and sections of Jerusalem—during March of this year. These areas were cut off completely for several weeks from other parts of the country, and the Army took over. Postal, telephone, and telegraph services were stopped; all motor communication was prohibited, extensive daily curfews and constant searches took place; all import or export of raw materials etc., was prohibited. While the Arab press which reflects the opinion of the ruling circles mostly published expressions of joy, the wide Arab public was dissatisfied and ill at ease. It was again revealed how closely connected are the two national sectors in the country. In Tel-Aviv one felt during the siege how vital the connection with the Arab wholesalers of Jaffa is, and in Jaffa the rise in prices of all linens, clothes and textile and other vital necessities revealed how important the Tel-Aviv sources of supply are for the Jaffa inhabitants, in spite of the boycott. Arab craftsmen in Jaffa eagerly awaited the lifting of the siege of Tel-Aviv so that they would be able to obtain the necessary raw materials for their work; Arab villagers were compelled to sell their produce which they otherwise market in Tel-Aviv at half price at considerable distances. The Arab newspaper "Falestin" published—contrary to its general line of policy—a leading article which said: "The means employed by the Government harm the innocent and lead to the economic disaster of the country without affecting the terrorists in any way. Terror cannot be fought by barbed wire, fortresses and martial law. One is concerned here with political terror and it must be fought by political means." The leftist Arab weekly "Al-Itihad" wrote that the Government sanctions harmed the entire country. They caused the termination of constructive activities, the flourishing of the black market, the impoverishment of the population, the strangling of public opinion, the "suppression of freedom of the press,

freedom of movement, and all other civil liberties".

We witnessed numerous instances of simple human relations between Jews and Arabs in their daily life. Even a chauvinistic Jewish sheet, which usually does not distinguish itself by special sympathy for the Arabs, wrote during those days of siege: "Many Jews of Tel-Aviv can tell stories of fine acts of sympathy shown by Arabs. Many a time Arabs endangered their life and 'smuggled' Jews out of Tel-Aviv to Jaffa and back refusing any remuneration."

This too is part of the reality of Palestine—pictures which reveal the other side of Palestine life.

Six weeks ago, 40,000 workers in Army public works, two-thirds Arabs and one-third Jews, went out on a warning strike, demonstrating their solidarity against illegal dismissals and poor working conditions. This strike was the largest in scope and in number in the history of the trade-union struggle in Palestine. It encompassed all workers, daily, weekly, or monthly, in all the army enterprises, workshops, Army offices, airways and Navy. The strike was carried through in complete co-operation between the Histadruth—The General Federation of Jewish Labour—and the Arab labour organizations. The workers' demands were formulated by representatives of workers of both nations. At the strikers' meetings the importance of Jewish-Arab co-operation was greatly emphasized. The weekly "Al-Itihad", which speaks for one of the two Arab labour organizations, wrote the following about the significance of the strike:—

"The imperialist British and American press is greatly disturbed by the calling of a strike in the Army camps by Arab workers in co-operation with Jewish workers. This press misleads the world public opinion by arguing that Arabs and Jews cannot live together peacefully and that the only solution for Palestine is partition . . . . Besides economic significance, this strike bears great political significance."

One can also tell of attempts to bring about political co-operation during the recent period. The most striking example is the agreement drawn up between our League and the Falestin el-Jadide Society, the text of which is enclosed as Appendix IV in the Memorandum we presented to the Committee. The founder and living spirit of this Arab Society was Fawzi Darwish el-Husseini, who was murdered by "anonymous assassins" several days before the club-rooms of the Society were to be officially opened in Jerusalem.

The deceased, who was forty-eight years old, was a member of the well-known Housseini family and for many years participated actively in the Arab national movement. At the time of the disturbances of 1936-39, he was detained in a concentration camp. However, in recent years, he arrived at the conviction that the only path to the fulfilment of Arab national aspirations lay in agreement between the Arabs and the Jews, the solution of the Palestine problem on the basis of political equality between the



two peoples—and the realization of the just, national aspirations of each.

At a meeting in Haifa, exactly a year ago, Fawzi el-Housseini explained the basic conception of his circle:—

“There is a road to understanding and agreement between the two peoples, although there are many stumbling blocks on the road. Agreement is absolutely necessary for the development of the land and the emancipation of the peoples. The conditions for agreement are:—the principle of non-domination of one people over the other; the establishment of a bi-national State on the basis of political equality; and full economic, social, and cultural co-operation between the two peoples. Immigration is a political problem. Within the framework of an over-all agreement, it will not be difficult to solve the question of Jewish immigration on the basis of the economic absorptive capacity of the land. The agreement between the two peoples must receive the endorsement of the United Nations. It must also assure the Arabs that the independent, bi-national Palestine will join in a union with the neighbouring Arab countries.”

On another occasion, at a large meeting of Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem, at the house of Mr. Kalvarisky, the late president of our League, at the end of August, 1946, Fawzi el-Husseini said:

“The political conditions have deteriorated. The political consciousness of the Arab public has greatly increased; at the same time, however, the extremist influence has gained in dominance. Great strength has accrued to the Palestinian Arab Party (of Jamal Husseini and the Mufti) not so much in the moral sense as in the material sense; and it has the support of the Government. Those sections of the Arab people who do not want to follow unreservedly this Party have nowhere to turn for help. Experience has taught us that the official policies of both parties concerned—Arabs as well as Jews—have caused injury and suffering to both. It is true that for many years I was a follower of Jamal Husseini, my cousin. My companions and I made him our leader and we participated with him in various political activities. I took part in the disturbances of 1929. However, as the years progressed I came to the conclusion that activity in this direction is worthless. Imperialist politics toy with both of us, both Jews and Arabs. There is no other way except to unite and to work side by side for the good of both of us.”

No one can imagine that the Palestine Police knows less about this murder than the man in the street. Yet it is a glaring fact that the investigation of this dastardly murder did not exceed the usual procedure of dealing with ordinary crimes, while issuing strict warnings not to intrude upon the political field. The murderers of Fawzi el-Husseini and those who sent them have not been discovered till today. The widespread Egyptian newspaper “Ahbar el-Yom” published an interview with Jamal Husseini, the deputy chairman of the Higher Arab Committee,

commenting on this murder: “My cousin stumbled and he received his just punishment.”

The Government's attitude to this murder and to similar political murders can have only one meaning: The blood of Arabs who seek an understanding with Jews can be spilled with impunity. Jamal Husseini proclaimed brazenly that he is responsible for what he calls “acts against traitors”, and he is recognized by the Government as the legitimate representative of the Palestine Arabs. The Government watches how the ruling clique of the Arab community suppresses every spark of liberty and desire for agreement with the Jews—watches and keeps silent. This indifference of the Government encourages the extremists and naturally discourages the compromising sectors.

The above-mentioned phenomena are also part of the Palestinian reality—this wild reality which has developed without any positive guidance. Had the Government desired to use the keys which were placed in its hands, it could have unlocked tremendous possibilities for *rapprochement* between the two peoples. It could have undertaken large irrigation projects which serve the interests of both Jews and Arabs and convert desolate areas into sectors of intensive cultivation. This was not done. Even when the Government did establish an irrigation project in a mixed area, it established it for one nationality only.

It could have made special grants to those economic enterprises operated jointly by Jews and Arabs, and thus encouraged the establishment of such enterprises in various fields. It could have introduced the study of Hebrew in the Government—Arab schools and aided the extension of the study of Arabic in the Jewish schools. It could have trained teachers in both languages; promoted contact between educators of both nations. None of this was attempted. In some of the Government Arab schools there exists an attitude of non-fraternization with Jewish schools.

There was a wide scope of activity for *rapprochement* in the field of administration. However, except for the Government Law Classes, no attempt was made to train officials of both nations for common activity in the Government administration.

We know that there cannot be education towards independence without granting the opportunity to carry responsibilities. However, in this country the most important positions in the administration have been closed to both Arabs and Jews. Not only have the salaries and pensions of the British officials swallowed the greater part of the sums set aside for local administration, but, as the members of the Committee may recall the answer of the Government witness to a question put by one of the members was: Only two of the thirty-nine Assistant District Commissioners in the country are Palestinians. Not one Arab or Jew is a District Commissioner or a member of the Government Council. The Chief Secretary stated that it was impossible to appoint a Jew in an Arab District

or an Arab in a Jewish District; and in mixed Districts it was impossible to appoint either of them; so the only solution was to appoint British. Apparently, it never occurred to the Government to appoint an Arab in an Arab District and a Jew in a Jewish District. There are officials in this country, Arabs as well as Jews, who enjoy the full confidence of the wide public regardless of nationality. According to the announcement of Mr. Stubbs, Public Information Officer of the Palestine Government, there were appointed from the beginning of 1946 to March of 1947 the following new officials: 105 Englishmen, 26 Arabs and 15 Jews.

One may rightly ask, in the light of this reality of two national movements facing each other, and opposing each other's demands—wherein lies the solution; how can the knot be unravelled?

We believe that the situation is not as desperate as it may appear on the surface. One of the interesting facts in the Palestinian reality is that there exists a gap between the feelings of the wide masses of both peoples and the official proclamation made by their respective leaders. The policy of extremism which was nurtured during the recent years became popular under the misleading assumption that extremism pays. However, wide circles are coming to realize that it is not so; that extremism leads to destruction. If it were demonstrated that co-operation holds greater promise, that the attempt to bridge temporary conflicting interests presents greater hopes, then the mood of the two nations would definitely change. From this point of view, the right decision on the part of the United Nations and its effective realization may have decisive influence.

In our view there is no conflict between the real interests and just aspirations of the two peoples. The Jews want freedom to develop unhindered their national home through immigration, settlement, and political independence. The Arabs seek progress, political independence, a rise in their standard of life, freedom from want and ignorance, freedom from economic backwardness and feudal domination. We believe that the Jews can attain their goal in complete co-operation with the Arabs if Palestine is constituted as quickly as possible as the bi-national State in which they will live as two nations enjoying equal national status in Government regardless of their relative numbers. We believe that the Arabs can attain their goal in complete co-operation with the Jews in the framework of a bi-national State as outlined above.

A political regime based upon these premises, taking into consideration the special needs of the country and the needs of the two nations involved, can stimulate the progressive and compromising forces in the two nations, and make them co-operate for the benefit of all the inhabitants. Such a regime can open the gates of Palestine to the Jews waiting to enter; it can raise the standard of living of the Arabs to that of the Jews through joint development

schemes, so that both of them may progress shoulder to shoulder. Such a regime can advance both nations quickly to independence in their common homeland.

A bi-national solution, with international constitutional guarantees, can remove the fear of domination of one nation over the other. The status of each nation and its basic interests will be safeguarded and preserved. A new leaf can be opened in the stormy history of this country and its progress can become a torch for the entire Middle East.

More and more Jews and Arabs are becoming aware that a way must be found for the two nations to come to an understanding along the lines of progress, peace and co-operation for which the best forces in human society are struggling today. However, after what took place in this country during the last 25–30 years, one must work with wisdom, decisiveness and courage in order to untangle the painful knot and find a just and workable solution. Such aid should and must come from all the peace-loving and progressive forces of the entire world.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you. I also thank you for having observed the time limit. Now, we might put some questions. I want to ask some questions about the constitution of the League. You represent which bodies here?

Mr. SIMON: In the League are represented co-operatively the Workers' Party of the Hashomer Hatzair, the Ihud, and besides both these organizations we have individual members of different circuits of the Yishuv.

CHAIRMAN: Yesterday, we heard about the constitution of the Ihud. How many members has this Workers' Party of which you spoke?

Mr. SIMON: I am not a member, myself, but I think about 10,000. The voters were up to 25,000 at the last election, if I am right.

CHAIRMAN: And these individual members of the League, how many can they be?

Mr. SIMON: Not many. I think some hundreds.

CHAIRMAN: Are your political aims the same as the Ihud?

Mr. SIMON: Not quite the same.

CHAIRMAN: What is the difference?

Mr. SIMON: The difference is that the Ihud based itself upon the principle of numerical parity. The League does not do that. In the League is incorporated the party of the Hashomer Hatzair, which does not commit itself to numerical parity but only to political parity. The Ihud members of the League are free to hold their own opinion in this specific point.

CHAIRMAN: What does political parity mean?

Mr. SIMON: Political parity means that the Jews and Arabs in Palestine will have the same rights regardless of who is in the majority and who is in the minority at a given moment.

CHAIRMAN: But I have understood that that was the programme of the Ihud?

Mr. SIMON: Yes, but in addition to this political parity the Ihud thinks that Jewish immigration must be continued up to numerical

parity, and then its continuation may be dependent on the common institutions of the binational State. To this policy the League does not commit itself.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (Spoke in French, of which the following is a translation): Nobody favours more than I do the idea of rapprochement and collaboration by the Arabs and Jews. But I must admit I do not fully understand the programme of the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement.

Yesterday we heard Dr. Magnes and the representatives of the Communist Party. In my opinion their programme gave a better answer to the question of rapprochement.

The second statement we heard today can be divided into three parts.

The first is a critique aimed at the Government, in which it is said that the Government of Palestine has done nothing towards a rapprochement between Jews and Arabs. I will not go into this question.

The third part aims at proving that all the statements or actions of the Arab leaders are not supported by the Arab masses.

We personally know of an example which contradicts this statement; I mean the boycott. In spite of all our efforts we have not achieved any success, which proves that the Arab Higher Committee is not as divided as is alleged. But I will not go now into these details.

We are told that the Arab masses do not follow their leaders. I would like to ask: can the same thing be said about the Jews? Can one state that the Jewish masses do not agree with the extremist ideas of some of their leaders?

The examples you have given us deal more with collaboration on the part of the Arabs. Of course, you say that the Jews are willing to collaborate, but if the word "*rapprochement*" has the same meaning in English as it has in French—and I notice your Organization is called "League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement"—this means that both sides must take a step forward.

You have mentioned all the claims of the Jews, and you say: "an understanding can easily be reached; the Arabs have only one claim, and that is the raising of their standard of living, we can guarantee to them that this will be achieved". But as far as we know the Arabs have other claims.

I would like to know if, in your desire for a *rapprochement*, you have attempted to understand the viewpoint of the Arab masses or the Arab leaders, so as to achieve a collaboration which could truly be a *rapprochement* and an operation to ascertain and to understand the real claims of the Arab side.

Mr. COHEN (Interpretation from Hebrew): Concerning the question of the programme of the League, it was presented to you in the memorandum which was given before the hearing. This programme was crystallized after direct contact with certain Arab groups. These negotiations which have taken place between certain groups

of Arabs and Jews have proved more than once that this programme has considerable chance of success, if it were supported by the United Nations, because it does take into consideration the vital needs and just aspirations of both peoples.

I am sorry the honourable Member of the Committee has understood my remarks and those of Dr. Simon as meaning that we considered only the economic needs of the Arabs. This is not the case. We have always emphasized that there are national interests which exist here, and just and vital claims on the part of both peoples. Any solution which does not take into consideration the just national claims of both peoples and their aspirations will not be a fair solution and not a solution which will be practicable.

I also wish to add, to the honourable Member who has asked this question, that the boycott which is being practised by the masses of Arabs against the Committee cannot necessarily be proved to be the sentiment of the wide masses of the Arabs, when one takes into consideration the force and the threats which have been used by the leading cliques of the Arab groups to suppress it. But there is another factor which must be taken into consideration, and that is that there exists a great deal of disappointment on the part of the Arab public concerning the many commissions who have visited this country. It should be recalled that of the Anglo-American Committee, which visited here and which came to a unanimous conclusion, that in spite of the fact that promises were made that if its conclusions were unanimous they would be carried out, the conclusions were annulled a day after they were announced. We do not say the Jews did everything in their power in order to realize the programme. Furthermore, I wish to add, about the influence of the League on the wide public: one cannot judge the influence of this League merely by its membership or by its numbers, since it is not organized as a political party. We believe that it represents a considerable section of opinion in this country. Furthermore, as it will be recalled, it is not such a long time ago that the official Zionist movement as a whole believed and pronounced the principles of equality and non-domination.

It is, of course, the great tragedy which has overtaken the Jewish people, the despair which has also followed the result of the White Paper policy, which has changed the official attitude of the Zionist movement. We understand this despair, but we do not accept it, and we call upon the Jewish leadership not to fall into despair, to continue the constructive policies of immigration, of settlement, but at the same time to call in the Arabs for co-operation and to call to the international forces for aid for such a programme.

Furthermore, not only the Jewish public follows closely our testimony here, but wide groups among the Arab public are following keenly what we have to say and also what we have to say before your Committee here. There were a number of Arabs who desired to present to you a memorandum. We did not encourage them for

the simple reason that we did not wish they should meet the same fate that befell Fawzi Darwish El-Husseini because we need such friends for further work and co-operation.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): If there are any other questions, I myself would like to ask one, but in view of the hour I would refrain.

CHAIRMAN: Are there many Members wishing to put questions?

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): I have only one question.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): I have one question.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I have one, but I do not know how long the reply might be.

CHAIRMAN: We might try to get it through.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): To appreciate the development of your movement, I should like to know what is the percentage of Jews and Arabs in your Organization.

Mr. COHEN: Our League has never tried to organize Jews and Arabs within its framework. We are working primarily within the Jewish community and we are trying to encourage the rise of similar groups within the Arab community, so that we both can be co-operating together. In the light of the events which have taken place lately, you can very well appreciate what might happen if a different policy were followed.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): I assume, then, that your Organization represents the opinion of a group of Jews, but is not entitled to speak in the name of any Arabs?

CHAIRMAN: Can you answer, Dr. Simon?

Mr. SIMON: I know the language better, but he knows the facts better. I think on this question I may give a short answer. We can speak not in the name but in the spirit of this Arab group who signed with us this agreement, but we appear here for ourselves as a Jewish organization.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru): Have you tried to form among the Arabs a similar organization to yours?

Mr. COHEN: As I stated before, this League does not see its task to be to organize among the Arabs, but rather to help and encourage the rise of similar groups among the Arabs. I believe that the best proof of co-operation is the example of the agreement which was signed between our League and this Falesein el-Jadide Society as shown in the memorandum which was rendered to this Committee, and especially as pointed out in Appendix IV in that document. I advise the Members of this Committee to examine carefully this document, which undoubtedly has also answered the question of the honourable Member who asked before about the possibility of agreement between Jews and Arabs, not only from an economic but also from a political basis. We believe that this agreement, signed between us and the Arabs, entertains a wide programme which, if adopted, would give both nations the fulfilment of their just aspirations and rights.

Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to know what are your views on partition.

Mr. COHEN (Interpretation from Hebrew): Our League believes in the programme that the relationship between Jews and Arabs and their problem has to be solved in a non-partitioned Palestine.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I merely want to ask whether Mr. Cohen would agree with the statements we have heard in other evidence to the effect that the relations between Arabs and Jews in all the Arab countries in the Middle East are bad and are getting worse, and if so, if he agrees, broadly, with that. Does he think it has any bearing on the prospect of a rapprochement in this country?

Mr. COHEN (Interpretation from Hebrew): I believe the question was not put correctly. In order to understand the relations between Jews and Arabs in the entire Near East, one should investigate the situation of Jews and Arabs in Palestine, rather than investigate the relations in the Near East and say that must influence the situation here. It is right that the Jewish situation in a number of countries in the Near East is bad and has deteriorated, but the Jewish situation is bad in many other countries of the world, and we believe that is the main task of the Zionist Movement—to solve this problem basically and normalize the relationships of the Jewish people and the other peoples of the world. This will affect the relations of the Jews in the Near East as well as the relations in other parts.

I have travelled extensively throughout the Near East and the neighbouring countries and I am convinced that if the problem of Jewish and Arab relations were solved here it would help and change for the better the relations between Jews and Arabs in the neighbouring countries.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else wish to ask any questions? (No such wish indicated.) Then we have heard the representatives of the League of Rapprochement and I thank you for the evidence you have given.

The last item on the agenda, the hearing of the representatives of the Ashkenazi Jewish Community, is postponed until tomorrow. The hearing is adjourned until tomorrow at nine o'clock.

*(The meeting adjourned at 2.25 p.m.)*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building  
Jerusalem, Palestine.*

*Wednesday, 16 July, 1947, at 9 a.m.*

### *Present:*

Mr. SANDSTROM, Sweden, (*Chairman*)  
Mr. HOOD, Australia  
Mr. RAND, Canada  
Mr. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
Sir ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
Mr. ENTEZAM, Iran  
Mr. BLOM, Netherlands  
Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru

Mr. FABREGAT, Uruguay

Mr. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

*Secretariat:*

Mr. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*

Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The agenda for today's hearing contains three points: hearing of representatives of the Council (Waad Hair) of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community, hearing of representatives of the General Federation of Jewish Labour, and hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Can we adopt this agenda?

(No objection)

CHAIRMAN: It is adopted.

### Hearing of Representatives of the Council (Waad Hair) of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community

I understand that for the Ashkenazi Jewish Community two persons are going to speak—His Eminence the Chief Rabbi, J. H. Duschinsky, and the President of the Religious Law Courts, Rabbi Selig Reuben Bengis.

I recognize his Eminence the Chief Rabbi Duschinsky.

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY (Chief Rabbi of Orthodox Jewry of Jerusalem and the Holy Land): (spoke in Hebrew) Honourable Chairman, Gentlemen, in the name of the Rabbinate and the Religious Law Courts of orthodox Jewry of the Holy City and of the Holy Land, and in the name of thousands of orthodox Jews who are organized tradition of the people of Israel as the nation of God and His teachings, and in the name of thousands of orthodox Jews who are organized in the Council of Ashkenazic Jewish Community of Jerusalem, I have the honour to welcome you upon your arrival in the Holy Land on your exalted mission with which you have been entrusted by the nations of the world, to inquire into the various problems and to find a suitable and just solution in order to restore peace in the Holy Land.

It is our belief and hope that the Creator of the world, our Father in Heaven, will bring about eternal redemption to the people of Israel. Yet we also believe that the hearts of Kings and Governments are in the hand of God. You Gentlemen have the providential privilege of being charged with that lofty task and this is why we kindly request you to do justice to those deprived of justice.

The massacre of millions of our brethren in the Diaspora has already been pointed out to you by various speakers. I cannot, however, but plead for the remainder of our people, especially the survivors of those thousands of ruthlessly murdered victims whom I have known personally, and I implore you to render help and assistance by opening the gates of the Holy Land, the Land of our Forefathers, in accordance with its absorptive capacity, for there can be no reason

for opposing this appeal on behalf of the rescue of those survivors.

We pray that the blessings of Providence be with you and with all your activities so that rescue and life may flow from your decisions and quietude and peace for the dispersed sons of Israel and all citizens of the Holy Land.

As loyal delegates of the highest forum of humanity, the legal successor of the defunct League of Nations, we appeal to you to inquire also into the following infringements of their rights and the discriminatory treatment from which orthodox Jewry suffer:

(a) During the period of the Mandate the rights of orthodox Jewry in the Diaspora, who had for centuries immigrated into the Holy Land, have suffered by the fact that their immigration quota was reduced by granting immigration schedules through the Jewish Agency. This infringement resulted in the serious deterioration of religion in the Holy Land which had been on a satisfactory level until then.

(b) The Government of Palestine has officially recognized the Community Councils known as "Knesseth Israel", who do not recognize the authority of the Holy Law, and orthodox Jews may therefore not belong to such communities in accordance with the tradition of our forefathers. Although that is the reason for the Government having granted the right of opting out of the "Knesseth Israel", it did not, on the other hand, wish to recognize officially the separate community Councils in which orthodox Jewry is organized and also refused to grant legal sanction for the authority of their Religious Law Courts and Rabbinate.

I therefore request you to consider most carefully the detailed statement submitted to you and, simultaneously with your endeavours for a just solution of the general problems of the Holy Land, I exhort you to bring about the fulfilment of our special and just demands.

May the command of the Almighty—the line of justice and truth—serve and guide you so that your names may forever shine on the annals of the Holy Land, the sanctity of which is eternal. And let the beauty of the Lord be upon you and upon the work of your hands.

Rabbi SELIG REUBEN BENGIS (President Religious Law Courts),

(Rabbi Bengis spoke in Hebrew and the following is the translation of his speech):

His Eminence the Chief Rabbi of orthodox Jewry in the Holy City and of the Holy Land spoke to you briefly and in general terms and I have the honour to address you on the following vital points.

Let me begin with a few general remarks which are of interest to us on account of their religious aspects.

I shall first deal with immigration. Settlement in the Holy Land being one of the commandments of the Lord, has not lost its validity during any period in history. In addition the fulfilment of many other commandments of the Holy Law depend on the soil of the Holy Land. This is

why orthodox Jews throughout the ages have endeavoured to settle in the Holy Land as explained in Part I, paragraph 2 of the statement submitted to you by our Council.

However, in our days the importance of this problem of immigration increases mightily on account of its potential life saving aspect. Our brethren the survivors of an unprecedented mass slaughter, who are now behind barbed wire in many a camp, are losing their will to live as days go by and it is imperative that they be rescued from the abyss of psychological decadence. This is why we appeal to you gentlemen, to help them in their present demoralizing state of restricted existence.

It is clear that in addition to any other place of refuge that might possibly be discovered for them, this Holy Land must be and is ready to be their principal haven of security and happiness.

From the bottom of our heart do we address you on this international stage:—"Have we not all one Common Father? Has not one God created us all? Fulfil then your brotherly duty and love towards these downcast brethren.

In connexion with the question of immigration I kindly request you to note the following details:—

(a) Past experience proves that orthodox Jewry who have always observed and upheld the religious ties and historical connexions between the People of Israel and the Land of Israel and who for centuries immigrated into this Holy Land uninterruptedly, have been discriminated against within the framework of general Jewish immigration, by the authorities in charge of such immigration for a very considerable time during the period of the Mandate. And even upon the intervention of the Government, only a very small number of immigration certificates were made available through the medium of the Jewish Agency, channels which are against our conscience, as explained in part I, paragraph 6 of our statement.

(b) The catastrophe that befell European Jewry during the Second World War was a disaster for the entire Jewish people and especially for orthodox Jewry in the Diaspora which has suffered to such an enormous extent.

Justice requires, therefore, that at a time when the nations of the world wish to compensate the Jewish people for its untold sufferings, that this just retribution come from your hands and not through channels which may suppress religious conscience. That is why we ask that the United Nations Organization decide that Jewish immigration in future be the direct responsibility of the Government of this country and all those who are in need of immigration shall be free to benefit directly by such arrangements.

The serious limitations of the land laws as at present in force in the Holy Land discriminate between Jews and non-Jew and they are in open conflict with the United Nations Charter. While Jews are free to acquire land in any independent country, here in the Holy Land, where one of

the Commandments of the Holy Law specifically requires Jews to settle, we are barred from buying land even if such Jewish prospective buyers are Palestinian born and loyal citizens.

Permit me to add a few words regarding Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, the Holy City, whose sanctity ranks higher than that of any other town in the Holy Land, has been chosen by orthodox Jewry for permanent settlement in any period. This city has always occupied a unique position in as much that even at the time of Jewish Kingdoms, when the whole of the country was divided into districts on the basis of the Tribes of Israel, Jerusalem was never divided. This Holy City is now doomed to stagnate in its present position since it has no chances for further development on account of the strangulating land laws which are effective also in the District of Jerusalem. Every important town in the world is being rebuilt and continues to expand; shall the town of God be fettered forever?

This is also why we demand the abolition of the existing Land Laws for the reasons outlined in paragraph 7 of Part I of our memorandum.

*The Ashkenazic Jewish Community Council.* I now come to the demands of our Council which are based on Article 4 of your Terms of Reference. As a Rabbi of more than fifty years standing I have had the privilege to see two generations of the most authoritative Religious Heads in Israel. I am therefore able to acquaint you with the binding religious opinion concerning the management of Jewish public affairs. According to our Holy Law any Jewish community organization must satisfy all religious requirements since otherwise decisions of such Council carry no weight or binding force. For the people of Israel and the Law of Israel are one. And as a people or as a public community Israel is but considered in relation to its Torah. The basic conditions for all arrangements in Jewish public affairs is the recognition of the Holy Law in such affairs by electing as its representatives the Religious Heads of the community who are loyal to the Traditions of our Law. That is the reason why orthodox Jews can never recognize the Jewish Agency as the representative body of the entire Jewish people as envisaged by the Mandate.

However, the problem of the foundation of Jewish Community Councils in the Holy Land is one of the most painful. Official recognition has so far only been given to community councils of the Vaad Leumi known under the name "Knesseth Israel", for example, Councils who have so far refused to embody in their statutes the fundamental requirements of our Holy Law, notwithstanding the clear verdict given by eminent Rabbis and Scholars of the Law and a decision of the greatest Religious Authorities in Israel that the basis of all such councils must rest on the recognition of the authority of Torah in Jewish Public Affairs. As a result of the refusal of the Vaad Leumi to fulfil those religious conditions our Rabbis have at the time prohibited the affiliation of our communities to the Vaad



Leumi. Details are to be found in Part II of our memorandum, paragraph 10.

It should be pointed out that the rules of the Knesseth Israel of the Vaad Leumi of the year 1927 are based on the Religious Communities Ordinance, 1926. The intention of the legislator was to create religious communities, Jewish and other, that is to say a community council loyal to the Law of Israel. Yet the rules of the Vaad Leumi are in open conflict with the religious requirements of the Holy Law.

Justice requires that religious affairs of orthodox Jewry who have but fulfilled their duty by leaving the community of the Vaad Leumi shall not be suppressed and that their own community councils shall benefit to the same extent by official recognition as those community councils that have refused to incorporate the basic conditions of Religious Law in their statute, for example, to enable orthodox Jews to organize in officially recognized community councils throughout the country in accordance with the spirit of their religious conscience.

The Council of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community, Jerusalem, which continues the Tradition of the Jewish Yishuv in Jerusalem as developed throughout the centuries has received assurance in writing from the General Officer Commanding British Occupation Forces at the beginning of the Military Occupation of Palestine that the rights of our community will be safeguarded together with those of other communities. However, with the inception of civil government in this country after the confirmation of the Mandate, events developed to the detriment of organized Orthodox Jewry. Our community council, the first of its kind in this country, which represents thousands of orthodox Jews who do not belong to the Vaad Leumi and who look after their own religious needs, by maintaining their own Religious Law Courts, Ritual slaughter, registration of marriages, rendering of certificates, social welfare, etc., suffer from the lack of official recognition of their activities in this field. In particular the withholding of recognition of jurisdiction over personal status from our Rabbinate and Religious Law Courts is in open contradiction to the very British assurance referred to above, the text of which will be found in Appendix I of our memorandum. It is furthermore contrary to paragraph 7 of the Mandate which requires the Mandatory Power to honour and preserve the personal status and position of religious institutions of the various communities in the country. It thus appears that our Christian neighbours have benefited to a far greater degree than orthodox Jewry in as much as official recognition was granted to every Christian community, even in cases where very few members belong to such communities, and certainly far less than the number of our own members.

The present position as regards our Council runs counter also to the requirements of paragraph 15 of the Mandate; in which connexion I refer in particular to the two questions asked by the Permanent Mandates Commission as de-

scribed in Part I, paragraph 12 of our memorandum.

On the just solution of the invidious position of the orthodox Jewry in the Holy Land depends the strengthening of our Holy Law, which will also improve the general position in the Holy Land as pointed out by his Eminence the Chief Rabbi of the Holy City and the Holy Land.

At the end let me thank you for this opportunity to place before you the opinion of orthodox Jewry and their just demands and we are convinced that these opinions will be useful in coming to a just solution of the problems confronting you.

In the name of orthodox Jewry of Jerusalem and the Holy Land may I express the hope that as you find a generally acceptable and just solution of the problems of the Holy Land you will also succeed in assisting orthodox Jewry which is at present degraded to a community consisting of second rate citizens, in regaining their position which is due to them as requested in the summary of Parts I and II of the memorandum. The Lord of Peace and Truth may enlighten you and pitch through you his Tabernacle of Peace over the Holy Land and the City of Peace. Amen.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you.

I have one question that I would like to have answered. What is the number of adherents to your Community?

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: We have no exact number. We have registered members and we have sympathizers.

CHAIRMAN: How many registered members are there?

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: Seven thousand members in Jerusalem, adults, not counting their families. This number includes male adults only because only male Jews are considered members of the Community. The number of persons is estimated at sixty thousand, at least.

CHAIRMAN: Your followers?

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: Our followers.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): May I ask one question. The Rabbi says that the Religious Courts of the Ashkenasic Community are not legally recognized. Nevertheless, Rabbi Bengis calls himself President of the Religious Law Courts of his Community. I would like to know whether in practice these Courts give sentences, exercise jurisdiction? What is the legal consequence of their action in this respect?

Rabbi DUSHINSKY: We claim recognition. We are only by sufferance a Court on grounds of submissions. The members who came to the Religious Court have to submit themselves to an arbitration proceeding, and they have no legal right. Their judgments cannot be executed as judgments of a Religious Court, only as judgments of an arbitration board.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Are they recognized as judgments of an arbitration court by the civil courts and other religious courts?

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: The judgments of the

awards of every arbitration are recognized if confirmed by the ordinary courts, not only of religious courts, even of three gentlemen, two gentlemen, or one, sitting as sole arbitrators, also. After the court confirms it, it is recognized.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to put a concrete question to you. If there is an Ashkenazi married couple who want a divorce, can they go before your court?

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN: There is no award given by your court?

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: No.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else want to ask any question?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN: Then, I thank you gentlemen.

Rabbi DUSCHINSKY: We thank the Chairman and the Committee for granting us this hearing.

### Hearing of Representatives of the General Federation of Jewish Labour

CHAIRMAN: The next item on the agenda is the hearing of representatives of the General Federation of Jewish Labour. I understand that Mr. Rubashov, Mr. Lubianiker and Mr. Shkelnik are going to speak for this Federation. Will you gentlemen please come to the platform.

(Mr. Rubashov took a seat at the table.)

CHAIRMAN: I recognize Mr. Rubashov.

Mr. RUBASHOV: (The General Federation of Jewish Labour in Eretz Israel (Palestine) (The Histadrut): Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, at the final stage of your hearings, before you come to make your decision about the future of our country and of our people, we come to address you on behalf of the General Federation of Jewish Labour, the largest organization in the Yishuv—for whose members the development of this country and the liberation of this people are a daily task and a life work.

You will find our basic principles and main ranges of activities described in some detail in the memorandum already submitted. You have doubtless seen what we have achieved in this country in the course of the numerous visits you have paid to towns and settlements.

You have seen with your own eyes the outcome of our unrelenting campaign against desolation and the habits of ages. You presumably have taken note of our efforts to create new social units on a firm basis of equality, justice and maximum co-operation conjoined with individual freedom; and you have doubtless found out how the Mandatory Government has promoted, and how it has obstructed, the great work which the nations required it to aid in this country. If we have now come to offer oral evidence, our purpose is only to underline our fundamental demands; and to offer our services in clarifying some details or matters in connexion with which you may consider our information to be useful.

The General Federation of Jewish Labour—usually referred to by its Hebrew name the Histadrut—represents the Jewish working class in this country, which together with its dependents is half of the Yishuv.

The Histadrut does not select its members according to their political, public or spiritual views. It accepts every Jewish worker in the country who makes his living by his own toil and not from exploitation of others; no matter whether that worker lives in town or country, whether he is a member of a co-operative or belongs to one of the many different kinds of collective settlements. All the trends and currents to be found in the world labour movement and within our own community in this country can be, and indeed are, found within the Histadrut. But one common bond has brought all our members here from the lands where they were born. That bond is the fate of a landless nation that has no security regarding the morrow; and all of them are united by a common aspiration in their work here. They aspire to live a life of dignity, of work, of freedom and of independence.

Our Histadrut is a Labour Movement and a movement for labour. The great majority of our members are not workers by birth. Just as we came up to our homeland from different countries, so we came up to work from different classes. It is a fundamental principle for us that our national and human redemption requires us to take root in every possible kind and grade of work. Our future depends on the toil of our hands and our capacity for work. It depends on our own work, in agriculture, in handicrafts, in industry; by land and by sea. Only through our own work shall we achieve our restoration and our future. And that is why we set out to engage in every field of activity ourselves, from the simplest, roughest and most exhausting work upwards, without harming and without exploiting any other nation. We stand for organized labour. We aim to protect the worker in every manner possible, to improve the conditions under which workers live and the conditions governing productivity; and to raise the spiritual and cultural level of all the working people within our developing society.

And our Histadrut is a movement that is based on immigration and fights for immigration. When it was founded 26 years ago we had a membership of about 4,400 men and women workers. Most of them were immigrants from Eastern Europe. Today we have 170,000 members, four-fifths of whom have come from abroad.

A whole generation before European anti-semitism achieved the political power whereby to carry out the Satanic plan of mass murder of the Jews, our Movement sensed the future and called upon Jewish youth to prepare to come up to our eternal Homeland and create here, by the sweat of their brows, the basis for a free and independent gathering-place for Jewish masses from all the ends of the world. While the favourable effects of Jewish emancipation were still at their height, our comrades left the

lands where they were dwelling and all the prospects afforded them there, and took upon themselves the yoke of settlement work in the wastes and desolation of our country. The spell of the land did not lie in its wealth. In those days the land was very far indeed from being described as wealthy. Nor did any prospects of personal liberty attract them. Those were the absolutist days of the Ottoman Empire when freedom was the last description that could be applied here. What brought them was one everlasting vision of Jewry—the vision of returning to this land and becoming a free nation once again, rooted in our own soil, living our own cultural life and associated with all other peoples as a nation of equal standing and equal rights.

The Jewish nation has aspired throughout the ages for full redemption, and its choicest sons have always yearned, each in his own way, to return and strike firm root in the Homeland. Now this aspiration, this yearning, was made manifest with all its ancient vigour in this youthful torrent, these young folk who made the Jewish Labour Movement. It was imbued with a fresh social content, with the spirit of our generation in its search for social and human betterment; and with a sense of pioneer responsibility for the fate of our Jewish masses throughout the world. In our own land there came into being the Jewish worker, who with his own hands fulfilled the mission of his nation and his age: the mission of delivering this land from its desolation, and this nation from its geographical dispersion and its political dependence on others.

There is not a single country in all the lands of our Diaspora whose young Jews have not participated, in our upbuilding work here. And in all the lands which have seen the mass murder of Jewry the survivors, old and young alike, now long and yearn to join us, and secure themselves a future here, together with us.

In the name of all these myriads we come to demand from you precisely what we have just been demanding from the World Trades Union Congress of which we are part; what we demanded of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry before which we appeared some sixteen months ago; and what we shall never grow weary of demanding from a righteous judge, and from whoever may be called upon to consider our fate. We call upon you for free Jewish immigration: Abolish the White Paper which sets out to reduce to nothing all the solemn British and international pledges to the Jewish nation, which is a death-trap to the Yishuv and which condemns the whole of this country to be frozen and strangled. Make it possible for us to develop the ample blessings concealed in the resources, yes in the very desolation, of our country! Make it possible for us to turn all this into a source of happiness and contentment for our own people and for all the other residents of this country! Give us the opportunity of meeting the Arab nation as a nation of equal status and equal national independence!

If we had come before you a few years ago,

we would have brought the same demands in the name of hundreds of thousands of organized young pioneers, dispersed throughout all the lands of Europe, who were preparing themselves to be together with us as trained, useful and faithful fellow-workers of ours. In their own lifetime they had no other desire and no other longing. There was no obstacle preventing them from coming here except the laws of the Mandatory Government. But now the furnaces of Treblinka and Bergen-Belsen have turned them to ashes for ever.

And what robs us of all rest is the knowledge that at the moment of their gravest peril, when the enemy walled them up within the Ghetto and cut them off from the world of the living, their choked and anguished cry was addressed to us. First and foremost to us, whom they trusted boundlessly and who, they were convinced to their very last breath, would not abandon them to their fate, but would find a way of rescuing them.

It was beyond our power to help. We ourselves were in the hands of those who held us back by force. We were in the hands of those who tore from us the only life-belt that might have been of use, and which we had prepared for generations against such a day.

We have not forgotten this. And we cannot forget this, particularly now, when the terror-stricken appeal reaches us once more, and we again find ourselves helpless, unable to aid because of that same governmental policy.

Those hundreds of thousands are no more, like the whole six million. But there are still hundreds of thousands of others who, fortunately for our nation, have survived the mass murder. The surviving Jews of Europe have seen cruelty, savagery; yes, and miracles beyond belief, such as no man ever saw before them. They long for life and, with their ample experience, they are struggling for their future. About a quarter of a million of these surviving Jews are still kept in internment camps, without any status, without any rights, without any hope for the morrow. They are being kept in countries where the poisonous heritage of Hitler still ferments among the population. Just think! In a little while the question of the rule over those countries is to be given a new solution. What will the new authorities do with those camps? Who can give any assurance as to what is awaiting them, when the duty of finding a solution for them is entrusted to the new territorial authorities of those countries. In Austria the demand that Displaced Persons should be removed from the country has already been made. But to where are they to be removed?

They are being called upon to return to the countries of their origin. Who is it that sets out to mock at the last survivors of our catastrophe? I personally have just returned from visiting Poland. Only a week ago I was standing on those piles of ruins under which the whole of Jewish Warsaw lies buried. More than three hundred thousand Jews used to live in this capital. Among them were the best of our spiritual

forces; creative figures, writers, workers, religious leaders and artists, the spiritual and material enterprises which Polish Jewry had accumulated in the course of generations. Now a dumb, death-like silence spreads far and wide over the veritable ocean of ruins, as far as the eye can reach in all directions! Under those ruins, still lie the corpses of the tens upon tens of thousands of Jews who were buried alive. Our vast orphanhood shouts aloud to us from this red earth covered with fragments of fallen bricks. Are the rescued Jews to return there? To that ocean of death?

And this should be clear: the situation in Poland does not depend on the attitude of the Polish Government alone. The Polish Government is actively combating anti-semitism. But does the position of the Jews depend on this alone? I have just visited dozens of towns in Poland, cities that had been renowned in Jewish history for long centuries, cities which had been steeped in the very essence of the Jewish creative spirit. Now there is not so much as a memory of them. The Jews have been murdered and are gone. Their place has been seized upon by others, and there is no law which can now restore happiness, quiet and contentment to Jews of those spots. Is it a matter for wonder if the overwhelming majority of those who are still to be found in Poland wander about like shadows, their eyes and their longings directed to us.

I shall try to make it perfectly clear that I am talking of inevitable and objective necessities. To do so I shall tell you a tale which comes from a country with a rare and magnificent tradition of tolerance, of absence of anti-semitism and also with an almost non-existent Jewish community. Until the war, there were, I believe, about twelve thousand Jews all told in Sweden, and there have never been any anti-Jewish outbreaks there throughout the two centuries since the Jewish community in Stockholm came into existence. During the last few years, Sweden, has accepted Jewish refugees and made them welcome, as you know, Mr. Chairman. Eight thousand Jewish girls were brought there from a concentration camp. I saw some of them a year ago. They came from Hungary and Carpatho-Russia, and from Lithuania and Latvia. Some of them are the only survivors of great and noble families. Some of them are the sole survivors of their native towns and their communities.

In Sweden they have been given rights and work. But in Sweden there are not enough Jewish men with whom they can establish fresh families and family life. Recently a Jewish institution,—non-Zionist, I should add—conducted an inquiry as to which of them wished to remain in Sweden. The total number desiring to do so was 53. A total of 7,947 replied that they did not wish to stay, and implored to be taken away.

Are we going to listen to their entreaties? Or shall we allow this last salvaged human remnant to perish as well?

I would cite yet another example:—In Roumania something has happened which is, in itself, politically irrelevant, being a natural phenomenon, pure and simple, which in any case has not the slightest trace of anything anti-Jewish about it.

There were no rains in Roumania this year, and there was every prospect of a famine.

The moment this became clear, the earth began to quake under the feet of the Jews and the Jewish refugees who are the first "superfluous" persons to be fed. Because they are a defenceless minority, because they have no shield or protection. Because they have no homeland. And above all, because this evil world has already seen how the problem of an unwanted and defenceless Jewish minority can be settled.

Maybe you have also come across this propaganda, which is now being so skillfully disseminated with a view to besmirching the Jews of the camps? But we have seen and become convinced of two things. We have become convinced first of all that the falsehoods spread in the days of Hitler by his followers have taken root in the hearts of many groups among those who fought against Hitler. And, secondly, in so far as the great catastrophe may have broken their spirit and driven them towards internal dangers—the tried and tested cure for them is in the resources of our creative work here. We have the talisman with which to heal them. Give us the opportunity to heal them and it will be to their benefit and our own. We shall restore their human dignity to them; their hope of a future and their pride in creative effort; and they too will be transferred into magnificent pioneers.

Then there is another call for help. You have heard this appeal. It is the call of the Jews in the Arabic-speaking countries. Choked and strangled though that call may be, it pierces to our very hearts. Many Jews from these countries have long been here with us, pioneers after their own fashion, and they are the support of those who now so urgently need a refuge. The Jews in Arabic-speaking countries have none to aid them, apart from those of them who have already come here. Can anyone imagine that we shall hear their appeal and ignore it? Are we to believe that you will be prepared to ignore their appeal?

Here, therefore, a historic necessity has become interwoven with an urgent need. A lofty national mission is united with an individual thirst for life. Economic, moral and political needs have come together and been transformed into an overwhelming natural force. Is it surprising that no artificial law does, or can, withstand this driving force? Is it surprising that the ships steal across the face of the waters in the night, regardless of laws and those who enforce the laws? Is it surprising that there is an irresistible urge among our fellow-Jews in Europe—an urge that impels them to make their way to us?

The Histadrut, with all its institutions and

enterprises, its experience and its pioneer spirit, with all its organizational forms and constructive plans places itself unreservedly at the disposal of the Jewish Agency for the reception and absorption of this immigration. Our history and our achievements, yes our very existence, bear witness to our ability to receive and absorb all these immigrants, systematically and progressively; to our ability to transform them into a productive element who will be a blessing to themselves, to us and to all who dwell in this country.

You have seen our youthful settlements. "Whose ox have we taken? Whose ass have we stolen?" During the past ten years we have virtually doubled in number. In the year 1935 there were 350,000 Jews in the country. At the end of the War we were about 650,000. And these years, please remember, were years of disturbances, years of war, years during which we were cut off from the world. Would it have been beyond human power to have doubled the Yishuv again since the end of the war and so to have solved the problem of the last remnants of our anguished nation?

Yet, precisely during these fateful years, when the time had come for the Jewish National Home to prove its value and to do its duty, the Mandatory Government, whose function was to promote and encourage our National Home, rose up to prevent it. We had believed that in so far as we proved that it could be realized, we would be given freedom and encouragement to bring it about. But what actually happened was the absolute opposite. And the closer we came to our objective, the more the Government placed difficulties and obstacles in our way.

The Mandate, which Great Britain had received from fifty-two nations, was treated as a scrap of paper. The 1939 White Paper, which directly contradicted all the basic principles of the Mandate, was imposed as the law of the land. Every immigrant exceeding the arbitrary and ridiculous monthly total of fifteen hundred was declared illegal. Anyone who brings a Jew into the Jewish homeland is thereby considered a criminal. The long arm of the British Empire was extended to ensure that Jews should not proceed to their National Home; no, even if they had been delivered from hell, not though the land needed them, not though their only alternative was the deeps of the sea. The rescued Jews who succeed in surmounting all these obstacles and in reaching our shores are dragged away afresh like criminals, and flung into the Cyprus camps. The British Government did not hesitate to use tear bombs, fire-hoses, batons and even firearms in preventing these defenceless refugees from reaching the shores of their Homeland and in forcibly deporting them to Cyprus, there to continue their lives of frustration and despair, again behind barbed wire fences and again under armed guard.

Cyprus has become an island of torment for many thousands who have succeeded in escaping from all the camps; and it is here, at the shores of the land of their hopes, that the net is spread out before them.

Ninety-five per cent of the whole area of Palestine has been removed from all prospects of Jewish colonization, which was the essential purpose of the Mandate. The Government has published a draft Irrigation Law which threatens to debar us from using the water resources of the country, though they and they alone can make the desert blossom and banish desolation.

The Mandatory Government proposes to transform the Jewish National Home into a "ghetto"—the only ghetto now left in the whole world. And it really seems to imagine that it can succeed. It has brought its military and police forces here to suppress the Yishuv and to maintain a permanent regime of fear. It aims to undermine the Jewish Agency, to undermine our educational autonomy and the status of the Hebrew language, as shown by its recent Memorandum. It has woven a tangled web of legislation covering matters large and small, in order to shackle our progress, to freeze the Yishuv and keep it a permanent minority dependent on the good nature of others.

In order to force the Yishuv to submit to its policy, the Government has imposed upon this country a regime of wilful repression, which came to a head on the 29th of June, 1946, when a concentrated effort was made to break the strength and unity of the Yishuv. On that day, the headquarters of our Federation and many of its institutions were searched and raided, some of our prominent leaders detained. Many agricultural labour settlements were surrounded and searched, some of their members killed, many wounded, and thousands taken from their daily work and held prisoner in detention camps. The failure of the Government to achieve its aim on that occasion has only led to a further tightening of its repressive measures. Our country has become a police State where punitive curfews, searches, unwarranted arrests, and even the imposition of Martial Law upon large Jewish areas has become the accepted method of rule by Government.

As Jews, as Zionists, as workers, we cannot but raise our voice against this policy which has been followed by the Government since the promulgation of the White Paper. This policy is devoid of any moral justification. It violated the basic undertakings upon which the rule of Great Britain in this country is based.

It introduced official racial discrimination against the Jews, as Jews and as citizens, and its implementation has been marked by frequent and excessive use of force.

Has anyone thought of the traces which the expulsion of Jewish immigrants has left and continues to leave on the soldiers and policemen engaged in this unholy work, against their own desires and conscience so often? Has anyone troubled to think what takes place in the heart of a Jewish child who sees his kinfolk, after having been rescued from the hells of Europe, expelled by force from our own land, how they are driven into camps, how they are kept behind barbed wire? Can such a child possibly be expected to respect such laws and

their makers? Is it surprising to find the entire Yishuv rising like on man to oppose such laws?

Is there any reason to be astonished if this White Paper, which was issued as a premium on criminal acts of violence, awakens the appetite and spurs irresponsible Jewish elements as well to proceed to acts of criminal violence? During your stay in this country, gentlemen, you have been in a position to observe how the Yishuv condemns these criminal deeds and combats them. Yet what other way is there out of this maze, except to rise and tear up that White Paper legislation, and to fling open the gates of this land and its development resources to Jewish immigration and settlement, as required and promised, and as is now so vitally and urgently demanded?

As far as the Arabs of Palestine are concerned, they will obtain even greater advantages from this Jewish immigration than they did from that of the past. A considerable increase in Jewish immigration means a strengthening of that force which is most vitally interested in doing away with the differences between the standards of living to be found in Palestine. It means raising the lower standard of living to the level of the higher. As long as Jewish workers are a minority, they naturally have to protect themselves against the majority who accept lower working conditions. Once this situation changes, the efforts to bring about an equalization of the standard of living at the higher level will be much more likely to succeed. Mutual understanding will bear fruits in every aspect of life. Jews and Arabs will meet as equals; and as equals mutually concerned in working to raise the standard of living, they will find a common ground.

The leading spokesmen of the Jewish Agency have already made their statement to you as to the political form of our future. We wish only to underline that our own development and existence is witness that the rights and development of the Arab population will be safeguarded and secured. Ever since the Histadrut has existed it has endeavoured to bring about mutual understanding and achieve true solidarity with Arab workers. We were the first in this country to try to organize labour, and we are gratified to see that our persistence has led to the beginning of an Arab labour movement. The Arab standard of living has risen appreciably in the vicinity of Jewish settlement. We have always tried to promote these beginnings. Even at the periods of highest tension we recognized in the Arab worker the man and the fellow-worker, and did everything possible to encourage his progress, regarding this as the duty of one group of workers towards another. In all the professional struggles of the Arab workers, whether with the Government or even within the Arab sector, we helped them both by our guidance and by material aid.

We are not satisfied with what we have achieved. We know how many obstacles there are in the way, and how many there are who wish to stir up strife between us; and it must be admitted that Government activities in this

respect were far from being what can in any way be described as helpful.

In our memorandum we have dwelt on the attitude of the Government towards the question of labour legislation and social policy. This attitude only accentuates the fact that the Government—in this as well as in other fields—has followed a backward colonial policy. It has shown no understanding for the social needs of the Jewish worker, for the dynamic character of his effort, and has failed to make any effort to bridge the gap between the standards of the Jewish and Arab worker and to promote any co-operation between them.

But it is our great desire that the day of true co-operation may soon dawn. And we are convinced that increased Jewish immigration and increased Jewish working power will multiply the forces interested in and capable of realizing real and true solidarity.

We do not call upon anyone to reduce either the rights or the requirements of the Arabs in any shape or form. But we ask you not to restrict our rights, and not to prevent us from developing the untouched and neglected parts and intensifying the cultivation of other parts of this country.

Gentlemen, you represent many different nations and you have come here on behalf of an even greater number. Listen to your own consciences. Call for the abolition of the White Paper. Demand that the gates of this country be opened wide to the Jews beating upon it. Help to deliver the refugees from inevitable degeneration and destruction. Give our youth the opportunity of doing their duty to their people. Help us to establish contact with the Arab nations, as an equal with equals. Give us the opportunity to establish the Jewish State in our homeland.

And what is more, do it quickly. There is very little time left. This volcano, on which our people have been left, is beginning to smoke once again. We cannot afford to be too late again, as we have been before.

Gentlemen of the Special Committee,

In the Death-Court at Teresin (called by the Germans "Theresienstadt") I saw a little room. It is room number 9, a special torture chamber reserved for important Jews. In this little room there is space for ten men standing. Into it they used to thrust from fifty to sixty persons, one on top of the other. There was neither light nor air in this room. No food was brought in. The people were left there to perish slowly and horribly. And the most dreadful and terrible thing of all was this: In the door there was a tiny little window covered with thick wire netting. Through this window the Nazi beasts used to watch their victims floundering and gasping and perishing one by one. Ever since I have seen that torture chamber, that Black Hole of Theresienstadt, I cannot forget that little window. It refuses to move out of my thoughts. Hitler is gone. All that he stood for has been destroyed. . . . Yet how about the Jews of the Displaced Persons Camps?



What more are all the Displaced Persons Camps of Europe but that one tiny hopeless deadly Black Hole? Is it not obvious that there is no air to breathe in those camps, that there is no future existence? What are we doing, all of us together—we here, you there, the whole world everywhere? What more are we doing than standing, looking in with folded arms? Are we going to permit our arms to remain folded? Shall we not rise up to break down the door, to rescue and to redeem?

Gentlemen, we have the honour to address you on behalf of a youthful pioneer movement which is the offspring of an ancient nation, a nation whose contributions to world civilization have been matched only by its sufferings. Both of these factors have helped to forge the strength of spirit with which a whole generation is devoting its entire life, to rescue and to redeem.

It is our desire and our deepest prayer that the work we have in hand shall be carried out in the way of peace, mutual understanding and continuous creation.

Gentlemen, give us your helping hand, and may the blessings of the future rest upon you.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mr. Rubashov. I understand that Mr. Lubianiker and Mr. Shkolnik are not going to address us, but that they are here to answer questions.

MR. RUBASHOV: That is right.

CHAIRMAN: I have one question. I have read in the address that the number of your members is 170,000, and I think it has been said also that, with their dependents, they represent about half of the Jewry here—every branch of activity. That includes also intellectual people—what is called people in free professions.

MR. LUBIANIKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I shall ask one thing more. It has been stated also that you support the views expressed by the Jewish Agency.

MR. LUBIANIKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that a unanimous opinion in the Histadrut, or are there different opinions?

MR. LUBIANIKER: We are a democratic organization—not a totalitarian one. Apart from a few basic questions like freedom of Aliya, our absolutely negative attitude to the policy of the White Paper, and the freedom of Jewish colonization in Palestine, we generally manage our affairs by a vote of the majority, and this majority makes the policy of the Organization.

CHAIRMAN: I think I have seen in the papers that there is a group among you called the Left Wing, which favours another solution than the one favoured by the Jewish Agency. Is that so?

MR. LUBIANIKER: It is true. Outside the Histadrut about 83% of the organized workers are against any form of bi-national solution; and inside the Histadrut there is one group only which polled in its last election about 17 per cent of the voters, which is in favour of such a solution. All the other groups in the Histadrut are in favour of a Jewish State as a final solution of the problem. Of course, in this majority

of 83 per cent there are, too, many differences of opinion. There are some who oppose absolutely, definitely, without any readiness to any form of compromise, every thought of partition into two States, and they propose for the solution of the Palestine problem only the preparation of Palestine for the erection of a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine. But on the whole, it can be said that the great decisive majority of the organized workers does not accept any form of bi-national solution as satisfactory to them.

CHAIRMAN: The 17 per cent favour bi-national solution?

MR. LUBIANIKER: Yes; it is one small group.

CHAIRMAN: Can you give me any figure or proportion of members who are opposed to any plan of partition?

MR. LUBIANIKER: Of course the Hashomer Hatzair is opposed to it in any case and in any form. There is a second group which numbers, if I am right, about 20 per cent of the electorate, which is opposed to bi-nationalism and to partition as well.

MR. FABREGAT: On page 10 of your statement, in the final part, you declare that "Our country has become a police State where punitive curfews, searches, unwarranted arrests, and even the imposition of martial law, etc." At this moment the Government of Palestine has placed under martial law one section of the country whose centre is in the city of Nathanya. Can you tell me what is the situation of the worker of Palestine when martial law is applied in the city in which he lives and works? Can he leave the city? Can he cross the barbed wire in order to go to work? Can he go back home after work?

MR. LUBIANIKER: It is clear that every form of martial law, curfew and other restrictions hits first of all the working population which depends on its daily work and daily wages for its subsistence. And as Palestine, as you know, is a rather small country and people are very often working outside the place of their residence, in every case of curfew and in every case of martial law or other restrictions of this kind, from thousands of workers is taken away the possibility to work, to earn, to live; and it can justly be said that these measures are, objectively, first of all measures directed against the poor and the working people of this country.

MR. FABREGAT (Uruguay): I should like to know something about the situation as regards children in a city under martial law. Can the children of the worker attend school?

MR. LUBIANIKER: We had some experience when we had martial law for a fortnight in the area of Tel-Aviv, Ramat Gan, etc. About a quarter of a million Jews were living under this law for the first time. I can say without exaggeration that the whole life of the community was disturbed. Children, instead of going to school, spent their time in the streets. People had not enough food. Many thousands of workers could not go to their working places. A lot of cultural activities had to be stopped.

The whole normal trend of life was disturbed in a dangerous fashion.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): In these cities under martial law do the newspapers appear as usual?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: In Tel-Aviv they did appear, but I read today or yesterday in the newspaper that, for example, in Nathanya—which relies on the newspapers brought from Tel-Aviv or to Jerusalem—they have the opportunity to get their newspapers during one or two hours when they are allowed to leave their houses and to make all their other purchases at the same time.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Under martial law can food supplies be brought into the cities?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Not freely. It is done by the military authorities in the fashion and in the way they think satisfactory.

CHAIRMAN: I would ask for some precision. You said that these measures were in the first place directed towards the poor. Do you mean that they are expressly directed against the poor?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I said "objectively".

CHAIRMAN: You mean the effect is felt most by the poor?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Yes, I do not say that is the intention, but it is the effect.

Mr. PECH (Czechoslovakia): On page 12 of the address it is mentioned that "Ever since the Histadrut has existed it has endeavoured to bring about mutual understanding and achieve true solidarity with Arab workers." May I ask how far this mutual understanding—these attempts—have gone, and what is the present state of this understanding?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: More specialized information on that question you will find in our memorandum. There is a full chapter on these activities of the Histadrut. I will only say in general that everywhere, where Jewish and Arab workers meet in the same work, it was the action of the Histadrut to organize them into a common international organization of workers. Everywhere, where Jewish and Arab workers do work shoulder to shoulder—as in the Government, in the work of the military authorities, or in other places—every action taken by the Jewish and Arab workers together is generally taken on the initiative of the Histadrut. Even now, in spite of the political tension which exists in Palestine, there are thousands of Arab workers organized in the Palestine Labour League who adhere to their connexion with the Jewish workers and lead their action hand in hand with Jewish workers. Of course, with the political tension, there are factors which limit—objectively again—the possibility of this kind of common work. And as Mr. Rubashov said in his opening remarks, the Government was not generally very helpful in assisting in building up mutual relations of co-operation and solidarity between the Jewish and Arab workers. We had this work to do against the Arab leadership, against the Government. The results are not very great, but even the small results which we achieved up to date give hope for the future if the reasons and the factors

which have stood in the way of real co-operation were abolished.

Mr. PECH (Czechoslovakia): May I ask whether in the Arab working associations are there any trends which are sympathetic with the basic demands of the Yishuv?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: There is one trend, the Palestine Labour League. The two other trends I suppose aren't very sympathetic.

CHAIRMAN: What is the colour of the Palestine labour?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: The Histadrut?

CHAIRMAN: The Palestine Labour League.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: That is an organization of Arab labourers who co-operate and want to co-operate with the Jewish labourers.

CHAIRMAN: What I want to know is their political colour.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I cannot tell you, sir. I do not know. It is a non-political organization which has no party programme of its own. We have two basic principles only: to raise the standard of living of the Arab worker and to do it, as far as possible, in co-operation with the Jewish workers.

CHAIRMAN: What proportion of the Arab labour is organized?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: It is very difficult to say, sir, because fluctuations in the Arab labour organizations are sometimes overwhelming. In a moment of strike, there may be an influx of tens of thousands of workers into the Organization. If the strike succeeds, they may stay for some time. If there is no strike, or if there is a failure—which happens quite often—people do leave. But there is a certain number of people in all these organizations who stay. Generally, it could be said that the right wing of Arab labour, which is practically controlled by the Arab Higher Office politically, is a majority group among the Arab labourers. Apart from that, there is a left wing, and there is a Palestine Labour League.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Do I understand rightly the policy of the Histadrut that from the beginning it has never tried to have mixed labour unions? I mean, in reading the Resolution of the Convention of 1927, on page 65 of your memorandum, I see that for this purpose an International League of the Workers of Palestine shall be established on the basis of autonomous national units. I am not quite clear about the meaning of "international" in this respect.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I can explain it in this way. The idea of the Histadrut of the best way to organize Jewish and Arab labour in Palestine was, and is up to day, that in every economic sector where workers of the two nationalities work together there should be a united, a common organization. All the other workers who work respectively in the Jewish or the Arab sector should be organized in autonomous national sections. Both sections are to build up what is here called the International League of Workers of both nations. I do not know if I have made it clear.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): If I understand you correctly, workers of the same profession but working in different parts of the country or in different industrial undertakings could not be welded into one unit?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Right, sir.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): And I take it this does not mean international in the normal sense.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: No. It means a federation of two autonomous national organizations, not a united federation.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): More racial than national?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I would not accept that definition.

Mr. RUBASHOV: It is an international federation which is connected with two autonomous organizations.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): But on the understanding that there are two nations living here in this one country.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Yes, sir.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Is the Histadrut a federation of labour unions, or does it have direct membership of individuals?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: No, direct membership. Every member is a member of the Histadrut as such. According to his trade, he belongs to one or another trade union, but the bodies of the Histadrut are not elected by the central bodies of the trade unions but by the whole membership of the Histadrut individually.

CHAIRMAN: Do I understand rightly that there are branch unions, trade unions, and they are federated in the Histadrut but the membership in the branch union gives membership in the federation.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Yes, sir.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Would you explain what is the Ahdut Avoda?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: The words Ahdut Avoda mean a unity of labour. This is a group inside the Histadrut about which I told you before in answer to another question. The programme of Ahdut Avoda is against bi-nationalism, against any form of partition of Palestine. It is a political party, of course.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Not a trade union.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: No. You see, the trade unions are non-political. Every member of the Histadrut, whatever his creed, belongs to his respective trade union, but members of the Histadrut have the right to organize themselves in political parties that take part in the elections to the bodies of the Histadrut. So, a member of a trade union may be a member of a party or not.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): This is just a political party then?

Mr. SHKOLNIK: The members of this political party are members of the Histadrut.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: We have a principle in Palestine that our parties do not accept as members people who are not workers and cannot be workers.

CHAIRMAN: Do you receive as members also enterprises?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: No.

CHAIRMAN: The question is perhaps not so strange because it may be a small enterprise, such as a bus conductor who owns his bus.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Oh yes. Every man who works on his own without exploiting hired labour, or who works in his own plant has a right to be a member.

CHAIRMAN: But you do not receive, for instance, a shopkeeper?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Neither a shopkeeper nor an *entrepreneur* who hires labourers.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): We have just been told that lawyers and architects can be members. Are they allowed to have a clerk at the office?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: That is just the problem we are now considering in the Histadrut, what to do with these members who have become in the meantime entrepreneurs on a rather large scale. I cannot tell you what the Histadrut is going to do in this matter. I can only say that it gives us quite a headache.

Mr. SHKOLNIK: May I add that all the members of the agricultural settlements, the labour settlements, are members of Histadrut too. All the settlements you have visited, for instance, in the Negeb, on the shores of the Jordan, in the Emek, in the Kibbutzim are members of the Histadrut too.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Are there special fees for membership?

Mr. SHKOLNIK-LEVY: Yes, of course.

CHAIRMAN: Are they paid to the Histadrut or to the trade unions?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: All fees are paid to the Histadrut. The Histadrut is responsible financially for the needs of all the trade unions that are affiliated.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): In what year have you held the last elections?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: About two and a half years ago.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): These elections, I presume, are quite separate from those for the Vaad Leumi?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Yes, of course. That is quite a different electorate.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): I have noticed that there have been several efforts to get labour legislation here, efforts in 1935 and in 1942. What is the reason that these appalling conditions of labour legislation exist here, this lack of protection for the workers?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: That is a very important question for us as workers in this country. Our discussions with the Government of this country about introduction of progressive labour legislation started almost with the first days of the Histadrut. There are quite a few obligations which the Mandatory Government signed in this direction. I must say most of them have not been kept. For example, all the members of the ILO have signed an obligation that every

labour convention which is decided upon by the ILO and ratified by the mother country must be introduced into all the dependent countries. Truly, it happens that in Great Britain all these conventions—and there are a lot of them, very important conventions—have been introduced. I must say that in the labour legislation of Palestine we find only a few slight traces of that. We are speaking here of an undertaking signed by the Government when it signed its acceptance of the laws and the statutes of the International Labour Organization. After the war, the ILO Conferences accepted a number of recommendations. They were not conventions, but they were recommendations. I must state the fact that most of these recommendations have not been introduced in the life of the Palestine worker here. Palestine is a dependent country and depends for its development on the measures taken by the Mandatory Government. It is one of the countries which has a rather developed economic life and a rather developed industrial life, but only a few vestiges of a modern, social legislation.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): The same thing goes for social security, I understand.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Yes, we have demanded time and again the introduction of a system, even a primitive system of social security in this country. We have seen in that one of the main elements for raising the standard of life of the Arab worker, for filling in the gap between the standard of living of the Jewish and Arab worker. I must say that up to now all our demands from the Government on this score have gone unheeded.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): There is something else I wish to ask him. I think that even the few laws that do exist are violated. I do not say that they do not pay any attention to them, but some industrialists do not pay attention to them because I noticed that many children were working in two or three industries that we visited. By the way, they were non-Jewish industries. I should like to know the reason why this law is not enforced.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Yes. That too is a very important question to us. There are some labour laws in this country, but I must say these labour laws are not of very great assistance to the Jewish economy because we, by voluntary means and with the power of our own organization, have achieved more than any labour legislation in this country up to date can give us. But what is more dangerous, even these few labour laws that do exist in Palestine are not applied in the Arab-economy. They are practically a dead letter. And the Arab industry, manufacture and commerce are factually living as if those laws were not in existence at all.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): Does the Government not enforce them?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: It should enforce them, but you have seen with your own eyes—and not in a small plant—child labour in Palestine, in the centre of a large town. If you will walk over the streets of Jerusalem, of Jaffa, of Haifa, you

will find thousands of Arab children working ten and twelve hours daily at appalling wages. I do not speak about agriculture where perhaps a system of control is more difficult. I do speak about the large towns in this country where it should be possible, if there is a will, to find ways and means to put a stop to it.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Is it not on account of lack of organization and poverty?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: Sir, we are speaking about labour legislation.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am speaking about the answer you gave just now. I am continuing the question in regard to that answer. You said that Arab labour had been working in Haifa, Jaffa and other places against these rules. I asked you the question: was it not on account of poverty and lack of organization among the Arabs.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: No, but that was just the case in every country in the world—

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am only asking the question—

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I am only answering, sir, or trying to answer.

That was just the case in every country in the world where Government started this business of labour legislation. The real reason why this business was started was poverty and exploitation. This poverty and exploitation of the needy has caused this action. Right, there is poverty, there is exploitation; but the labour legislation has to be one of the factors to put a stop, at least, to the most appalling forms of poverty and exploitation.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Do you not see that both of them go hand in hand? On the one side, poverty should be diminished; on the other side, these rules should be enforced. If poverty is not diminished, these rules would be meaningless.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: No, that is just the task of the modern government, to have the initiative and to enforce laws which are beneficial to the community. Otherwise, it is senseless to promulgate laws of this kind. What we are saying against the Palestinian Government is that up to now, we have not seen in this Government an initiative force in the sphere of raising the level of life in this country.

Mr. SHKOLNIK: I would like to add something. We have poverty in the Jewish Community too—tens of thousands. But our labour organization does not allow children to work. First of all, the Government should fix a fair minimum wage and then the adults would earn enough for their families. If there is no minimum wage, of course, there is poverty, and the children want to work. So, the first step should be to fix a fair minimum wage.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): I am going to refer to what Sir Abud Rahman said. Do you not agree with me that due to the better organization of the Jewish Community these labour laws that are lacking here and this protection of the state should benefit more the Arabs than the Jews?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: It is a difficult question to answer. I do not believe it is possible to enforce labour legislation in a community for only one section of the workers.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): You did not understand my question. I did not say that they were going to enforce for one section or the other. I merely said that they would benefit the Arabs more than the Jews, because the Jews have a higher organization.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: That is right, sir.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): They have social security by themselves.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: That is right.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): They have been working for themselves, and they have an understanding with their enterprises, so I think the benefits would be more for the Arabs than the Jews.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I would only say this: that the Jewish workers, as they are now in Palestine, can live almost without labour legislation by the Government and can help themselves. If they are interested in the introduction of progressive labor legislation, it is not for their sake. It is because we do not want to see the situation of this difference of standards of living between the two sectors as something eternal. We see in the introduction of this labour legislation one of the means—perhaps the most important means—which may speed up the process of unification of both standards of living.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Was there an Ottoman Agricultural Bank in Palestine, which was abolished by the Mandatory Power about 1922?

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I am sorry, sir; it would be better for you to ask this question of Mr. Kaplan.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): I am asking you.

Mr. LUBIANIKER: I do not know.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Then say you don't know; there the matter ends.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a recess. The meeting is suspended for ten minutes.

(The meeting adjourned for a brief recess.)

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The third item on the agenda is the hearing of the Jewish Agency. Mr. Shertok, will you please come up? I will recall our understanding about the limitation of your address.

### Hearing of Representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine

Mr. SHERTOK: I should like to begin by answering a few questions put either to me or to my colleagues, which have so far remained unanswered.

I wish to take up first a question the reply to which was left over from the very first session which I had the privilege of attending here, when I gave what was supposed to be a factual

introduction to our case. I was asked by Sir Abdur Rahman what had been the profits of the Palestine Potash Company. The question was put to me in public, and therefore, I think that although it is purely factual, it would not be improper for me to answer it at a public session. I have the figures before me. The Company commenced its operations in 1930. For the first six years it ran at a loss. The total loss incurred in those six years amounted by the end of 1935 to £26,000. In the next four years, 1936–39, there were profits totalling £150,000. If we deduct the loss previously incurred from that net profit, it would give us a figure of an annual average of £31,000 for those six years.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Four years.

Mr. SHERTOK: Yes, I am sorry, it is four years. Now, during those four years, the Company paid £44,000 to the Governments of Palestine and Transjordan, in royalties and profit participation, and £30,000 to the Government of the United Kingdom in income tax. The next six years were the years of the war, 1940–45. 1945 is the last year for which I have figures. Now, profits in those six years dropped considerably. They dropped from an average of £31,000 to an average of £17,000. The Company did pay some dividends on the preferential shares, but it paid no dividends whatsoever on its ordinary shares. On the other hand, the burden of taxation also increased very considerably. In those six years the Company paid to the Palestine Government, to the Government of Transjordan and to the Government of the United Kingdom, in royalties, in profit participation to the first two Governments, and in income tax both to Palestine and to the United Kingdom, the sum of £821,000, that is eight times as much as its net profit. Of that amount more than half, £425,000, went to the British Treasury in income tax and excess profit tax and less than half, a total of £395,000, was paid to the Governments of Palestine and Transjordan in royalties and profit participation, and also to the Government of Palestine in income tax. So much for the Palestine Potash Company.

I now come to another question which was put by Sir Abdur Rahman to my colleague, Mr. Ben Gurion. I should very much like you to regard my answer to it as a substantive part, an integral part, of my statement to you this morning. Sir Abdur Rahman mentioned the names of some 20 villages. I think there were 21, but there was one we were unable to trace. This may have been due to the fact that the spelling might have been mixed up in the process of transliteration. However, we managed to trace twenty villages. Sir Abdur Rahman told us that he had been informed that those twenty villages had been wiped out, erased from the map, and he wanted to know if we would corroborate that statement. Well, there are three names there which are not villages at all, and which have not been villages for a long time past. They may have been villages in antiquity. The map of Palestine is full of the so-called Khirbets—that is, ruins of old places or habi-

tations which in the course of time have been abandoned. However, if you take the very detailed map of the Palestine Exploration Society completed in 1875, and compare it with the map of Palestine today, you will find scores, perhaps a couple of hundred villages not marked at all either because they did not exist or because they were so small and insignificant that the cartographers of the Palestine Exploration Society did not think it worth while entering them on the map. Now they are quite sizeable and substantial centers of habitation. So, three names as just names of areas. They went by that name for a long time past. They still go by that name, and there never have been and there are no villages there. But three others in that list exist today, and the curious point is that of those latter three villages one has only come into being after the purchase of part of that area by Jews; previously there was a Beduin camp there which shifted from place to place, crossing and recrossing the Syrian frontier. The place is near the frontier—it is Khiam el-Walid. Since the acquisition of part of the area by the Jews, the Arabs, with the compensation which they got from the Jews, for the first time built permanent dwellings there. Now it is the village of Khiam el-Walid, whereas previously there was only an area known under that name. Now, 14 villages actually ceased to exist. Of these 14 it is significant that 13 are in the Emek—that is to say in the valleys of Esdrachon and Jezreel. Of the 13, twelve villages were occupied in the past by tenants of the well-known Sursock family of Beirut. So, even at first glance, one sees that this is a special case. And it was indeed a special case. I would first of all like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to this paltry figure. We have in Palestine about 1000 Arab villages—over 1000 Arab villages—and we have in Palestine nearly 350 Jewish agricultural settlements. So, if it is a question of 14 villages having ceased to exist, it is not a very high percentage in regard to either of the two totals that I have mentioned. On the other hand, I would point out that just as I indicated, there was one village which sprung into being anew so I know of three other new Arab villages set up since the settlement of Jews. So, if you credit me with three and debit me with fourteen the actual net debit account is only eleven, and the percentage is still lower.

Now, I said that this was a special case. Large parts of the Emek were concentrated, as far as ownership was concerned, in the hands of that very wealthy family in Beirut. They were absentee landlords *par excellence*—not only absent from their property, but even absent from Palestine, and very often from Beirut. The land was very heavily infested with malaria. You saw the map which Dr. Katznelson showed you—malaria-stricken areas stretching right across the country from Haifa Bay to the Lake of Tiberias. That is practically identical with what we call the Emek, the Valley. It was very sparsely and wastefully cultivated. The tenants changed fairly often, gave up their tenancies, went to other places; new people came and they also were

transferred by the landlord from place to place. It was impossible to properly develop that area, to drain the swamps, and to put it to proper use without shifting the tenants. It has always been our principle in regard to land acquisition that those who had cultivated the land before should not remain landless. We paid compensation, ample compensation, but we saw to it that the people were accommodated elsewhere in villages, in rural life and on the land. This was eventually put to a test, that is, whether we actually succeeded in attaining that aim of our land policy. In 1932 an inquiry was instituted into the problem of landless Arabs; the technical definition of landless meaning “rendered landless by Jewish land purchases”. No interest was taken in the problem of whether there were landless Arabs as such. The question was whether Jewish settlement had made the position worse in creating a class or a category of landless Arabs, rendering them landless as a result of purchase of land they had previously cultivated passing into Jewish hands. The inquiry took some time. We co-operated in it. Every claim was referred to us. Every claim put up by an Arab was referred to us and we tried to trace that Arab and to find him wherever he was, and to tell the investigators what we knew of his position at the time. By 1936 a total of 664 claims were recognized. The rest were dismissed as unfounded. I will come back to that total of 664. All these Arabs were offered facilities for resettlement by the Government. Only 300, actually a few less than 300, took advantage of that offer. But when it came down to actually moving and resettling these Arabs on areas of land which the Government had offered, most of them refused to move from the areas where they were. One group of 50, after having accepted the offer and after having been resettled on the new area, deserted that area and drifted back to their places of origin. I use the word “deserted” as a quotation; that is how the Government’s annual report for the year 1936, I think, described what had happened. So that roughly 250 Arabs were resettled. I said I would come back to the total of 664; that total included 200 families which were also a special case. So, in the resettlement of 250, 200 were that special case and only 50 were Arabs, collected from all sorts of places, who the Government thought were entitled to be resettled. An insignificant total, and that was after many many years of Jewish land purchase and settlement.

I am coming now to that second special case which is well-known in Palestine to Jews and Arabs alike. It is certainly well-known to the Administration. It is the case of the Arabs of Wadi-Hawareth, an area which is now known under the Jewish name of Emek Hefer. That was an area of about 40,000 dunums, if we take it in its wider perimeter, on which originally two beduin tribes numbering a total of 1,100 souls roamed about. They kept shifting their tents, they grazed, they sould manure to the neighbouring Jewish settlements. They sold sea-sand which is used for building in this country,



and they eked some living out of that area. They planted melons, they grew cereals. It was very sparse, as there was no irrigation whatsoever over the whole of that area of 40,000 dunums. Now, I am not going to take you through all the stages. At present that area of 40,000 dunums supports 26 Jewish settlements, none of which existed when the land was bought in 1930 or in 1931. Twenty-six settlements! The population of those twenty-six settlements is now about 7,500 souls. I cannot say that the entire area is irrigated, but all the settlements are irrigating land; wells have been sunk, water has been found, and a considerable part of the land is under irrigation—witness the progress in terms of the condensation of the population. The two beduin tribes are there. They have been accommodated on land previously completely derelict to the north and south of the area. They are Wadi Hawareth Shamali, and the Wadi Hawareth Kibli tribes—Shamali meaning north and Kibli meaning south. The population of those two tribes has gone up from 1,100 to 1,700 today. I could give you a table showing how it went up gradually. But, it is 1,700 today. Originally those Arabs were offered resettlement in another part of the country. They refused it and preferred to resettle on the adjacent strips of land. And, for the first time, with the help of the compensation which they got from the Jews, they built houses. In this way two new Arab villages have sprung up. In the olden days when you mentioned Wadi Hawareth Shamali and Wadi Hawareth Kibli, they were names of tribes who drifted into that area and roamed over it. Now when you say Wadi Hawareth Shamali and Wadi Hawareth Kibli you mean two villages, houses built of stone, of bricks, of concrete. The people are on a much higher level than they ever were, and more numerous. This is indeed a characteristic case. The total of the 200 families is included in the 300 which have been resettled, although they have been resettled right on the spot and refuse to be shifted.

I said in my introductory statement to you that as a result of the acquisition of land from peasant proprietors not one single village has disappeared from the map. I differentiate land bought from absentee landlords where tenants had to be shifted and land bought from peasant proprietors. But our case is that they all remained in rural life and agriculture, although they changed their abodes occasionally, as they had done before, under the normal conditions. But wherever we bought land from peasant proprietors, and we buy land from peasant proprietors up and down the country, not one single village disappeared from the map. The chief zone which I have in mind is the coastal plain. I can do no better, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, than quote myself and read to you a short extract from the statement which I made on the subject to the Anglo-American Committee. I said about the coastal plain: "There, over 130 Jewish villages have been established since the First World War." The number is now greater. To continue: "A large pro-

portion of the land was bought from peasant proprietors, yet not a single Arab village has disappeared from the map,—not one. Dr. Weizman quite rightly said with regard to our development process that you cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs. But in the coastal plain something like a miracle was achieved: a huge omelette was made and not a single egg was broken. Moreover, using largely the same frying pan, the Arabs managed to make quite a decent omelette for themselves: practically all villages in this zone, and particularly those which sold a part of their land to the Jews, are more populous today than 25 years ago, and considerably better off than they were, and than other Arabs are elsewhere. If you analyse the position more closely you will find that prosperity and increase of population are in direct ratio to the sale of land to the Jews. The sale of the surplus created the necessary capital to finance the transition from primitive to more advanced farming. And with regard to that transition, abusing a little your patience, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read another very short paragraph. I said: "The main feature of Arab agricultural development in the last few decades has been the continuous transition from tents to houses, from mudhuts to tile-roofed buildings, from grazing to agriculture, from sowing to planting, from unirrigated to irrigated farming, and in recent years from primitive ploughs to tractors, from sickles to mechanical reapers. All this has been happening not despite Jewish settlement, but concurrently with it, and thanks to it. The curious fact is that as a result of, or should we say, despite the fact that over one and half million dunums have passed from Arab to Jewish ownership, not only have Arab fellaheen grown in numbers" . . . (it is a very significant fact that the Arab agricultural population has increased, and has particularly increased in areas affected by Jewish agricultural settlement) . . . "but they have become more deeply rooted in the soil than they were before, and their stake in the land of Palestine has increased—more houses, more trees, more wells, more livestock, more implements", and I might add more surviving babies.

Now, in our estimation, the sale of land to Jews was the main source of capital for the improvement of Arab farming, and therefore was the main agent of Arab agricultural development; also Jewish development generally. The growth of Jewish urban population expanded the market for Arab agricultural produce, and so on; the work of the Government to improve Arab farming methods also helped, but this too was done with the revenue which got chiefly from the Jews. Now, in our experience, and I think it will be borne out by any unbiased person who knows the facts, when a peasant sells land he sells only a part, and he sells it chiefly in order to invest money in the development of the remainder, or in order to wipe out his own indebtedness which is completely sapping his financial position. We know of no process of Arab peasants selling out their lands completely. There has been no such

thing in Palestine. I have here a definition from the Government's Blue Book as to what kind of person the Arab is. They say that "most of the Arabs are peasants and small land holders, hard-headed and stubborn, with a profound sense of attachment to the land". I fully subscribe to this. I do not subscribe to everything that went into the making of that Blue Book. I am sure I will have an opportunity to return to some parts of it to which we take a very strong exception. But not only would I subscribe to this, but I would add that he is also a very stiff and close-fisted bargainer, as he should be. And our contention, Mr. Chairman, is that what has been happening in the past cannot but go on happening in the future if there is freedom to sell, and if for us there is freedom to buy. We never bought land from very small proprietors. Not simply because we did not want to touch them, not because it was too costly and impossible, but actually because then we would have been acquiring property broken up in tiny fragments. We could only buy from the wealthier peasants—from people with surplus—from people who had to hire labour to cultivate their land. In so far as there are still such people in Palestine, provided we are given the chance, we will go on buying so far as we have the means. We have always been handicapped as to means, and that process of development will continue. If it does not continue, then the Arab peasantry will lose its chief source of capital for a substantial improvement of their position.

This brings me straight to my next subject, which incidentally served as a subject for another question put by Sir Abdur Rahman, that is the operation of the Land Law. Sir Abdur Rahman asked whether we could give him figures as to areas of land bought by Jews in different zones of Palestine since the inauguration of the new racial land regime. (This is my terminology, Sir Abdur Rahman). Well, in the seven years that have passed since that date, February 1940, say from 1940 to the end of 1946—that is my latest figure, I have no figures for 1947—the Jews have acquired 38,000 dunums in the prohibited zone, 23,500 dunums in the so-called "regulated zone", and 45,000 dunums in the free zone. The land acquired in the prohibited and the regulated zones was not acquired by way of the High Commissioner using such discretionary powers as are vested in him to permit sales in certain cases. It was acquired by virtue of rights previously acquired—that is to say of sales practically concluded previously but not yet quite executed. It was acquired also by means of processes by which according to the law, transactions do not require any approval of the Government. So it was all done within the four corners of the law. It may not have been intended by the authors of the law, but it has happened. And it has happened not in defiance of the law, but in accordance with it. Mr. Ben Gurion said that we are very sorry we did not find ways and means of breaking the law. I share his feelings, but I am stating his facts and not feelings. Where it did lie within the

discretion of the High Commissioner to permit sales of land from Arabs to Jews in certain areas, in 99 cases out of 100, and perhaps 99.9, permission was withheld. I think Mr. Ben Gurion was asked by one of you gentlemen to say something about the way the law was being applied. Well, I will say this: When that was discussed in the British House of Commons it came under a terrific barrage from the opposition benches, and the opposition benches of that time join the Government of today. One of the Labour front benchers, who is today the Lord Chancellor, Lord Jowitt, the head of the British Judiciary, defined the law as a "savage law". I myself, was in the gallery, and I remember it, it rings in my ears. The way he repeated the word once, twice, and three times, with more and more emphasis—Savage! Savage! Savage! I say that savage law is applied in a savage manner, with a vengeance. I am not here to argue the question of application of the law: I am here to condemn the law. But is a very eloquent testimony of the spirit which prevails in the whole administrative machine in regard to its obligation to us to encourage close settlement of Jews on the land. For instance, the law says expressly that it does not affect state property—Government lands. Government lands are exempt from it. That is to say if there is an area of Government land in the prohibited zone the Government may transfer it to a Jew. But, by an administrative ruling, which took us a great deal of trouble to unearth, we eventually managed to get it admitted by the Government that they were conducting their business on the basis that ruling by virtue of which Government lands were assimilated to Arab lands, and today we cannot get a single square inch of Government land in the prohibited zone. Even when our soldiers returned from the fields of battle, having left some comrades behind buried in the war cemeteries, and some of them wanted to be resettled,—they were very modest in their requirements: they did not want much land to plant and sow, they wanted just a little plot of land to put a house upon—and we wanted to get the Government to allow us to acquire a certain amount of land near Jerusalem, just on the outskirts of the city—it happened to be outside the municipal boundary and therefore in the prohibited zone—it was a completely waste plot of land, of no use at all for any purpose other than building, the Government did not say that the scheme was not sound or that our soldiers were not entitled to that form of assistance. They said, "Your soldiers are Jewish soldiers. They are Jews, and the Jews may not acquire land in the prohibited zone." If there is a case the law does provide for, it is consolidation of holdings. If there is a Jewish holding, an Arab holding, and again a Jewish holding, that makes cultivation very difficult. It is a question of consolidating it and the law does give power to the High Commissioner to sanction transfers of land in the interests of consolidation. But when we applied the Government said: "No, must not buy, you can only exchange one plot against another plot of yours."

That is to say, "Your property, Jewish property, Jewish holdings in the prohibited zone must not increase by one square inch. It must be crystallized."

On your way from Jerusalem to Tel-Aviv, on the left as you pass Latrun, you see a young Jewish settlement which bears the very ancient name of Gezer, known from the days of King Solomon. There is a new Jewish settlement there, and there is a plot of Arab land which drives a wedge into the area where they are building their houses. A small plot of land belonging to an Arab in a neighbouring village. The colony has land near his village. They are offering him in exchange two dunums per dunum. They are not only giving him land nearing his village, but they are also giving him two dunums per dunum. He agrees, and petitions the Government to sanction the exchange. The Jewish settlement also petitions the Government to sanction it, but the High Commissioner says, no. And the wedge stays. You cannot tamper with it; it is sacrosanct.

As you travel again from Jerusalem to Tel-Aviv you see on the right the forest of Maaleh Hahamisha. There is a Jewish village perched on a hill and they have planted a forest which has completely transformed that landscape, and you see that forest in its configuration following a very curious zigzag line. You might think the line was drawn by some climatic condition, or that the soil got worse there and no more trees could be planted. The border of that forest is a political boundary. That is how the Land Law bound that forest. It crystallized it. Beyond it no tree may be planted. Of course the Arabs may plant trees, but they do not. The Government may plant trees, but it does not. The forest is a living thing, but its spread has been arrested by the Land Law.

It is not a measure intended for social protection; it is a measure intended for political protection, and ethnic crystallization is by means of racial discrimination. The Government has shown no consideration for the question of displacement of Arabs where Arabs alone are concerned. We have protection of Cultivators Ordinance. We have always accepted its principle and co-operated with it. It says that when land is bought over the head of a tenant and the tenant has no place to which to go, he must be given land, preferably—I think it is a condition—in the same neighbourhood. But after the passing of the racial discriminatory Land Law the Government very seriously considered the abolition of the Protection of Cultivators Ordinance in the prohibited zone. That is to say, if an Arab displaced an Arab tenant, the Government did not propose to interfere. They only revised it because they realized this would be going rather too far and would show that their only interest in the land was political and not social protection.

From this background which I have sketched very roughly in regard to one section of the Government's activities, and I have by no means exhausted the subject. I pass to a theory which

I should like to discuss—a very singular theory now advanced by the Mandatory Government as to the rather lame and feeble excuse of its lamentable failure and its flagrant breach of trust, and that is the theory of disparity between Jewish and Arab standards, the growth of that disparity as being the root of all the trouble that has been experienced. That negative theory pervades the Blue Book which I have mentioned—a most characteristic document, if I may say, supremely intelligently written from the point of view of the thesis which it sets out to prove, but, I would presume to add, containing very little statesmanship and constructive wisdom.

What is the essence of that theory? It is that the Jews in their excessive zeal have progressed too quickly, that the Arabs have lagged behind; that although the Arabs have benefited from the Jewish development, the gap—the disparity—between the respective standards has grown, and that this is at the root of all the difficulty. No proof whatsoever, no factual, no statistical proof has been advanced in support of that theory; not a single fact, not a single figure. We believe the onus of proof is on the Government. We believe, on our part, that this cannot be proved. Further, we believe the contrary can be proved. We believe that in many walks of life, in large fields of economic activity, the Arabs have progressed relatively more than the Jews. There is still disparity—a very wide one. But if you use a comparative method, if you examine things relatively in proportion, you will find a relatively greater progress among Arabs than among Jews, for all the disparity that is still there. In certain trades Arab wages have risen demonstrably more in proportion to the previous level than in the case of Jewish labour. In certain branches of farming it is the same thing. In general, there has been a very marked rise in prosperity. But this is not the main point. The sting of the theory is not in the proposition, but in its implication.

What is the implication? The implication is that Jewish development must be checked until Arab progress catches up with it. The theory is not merely contrary to everything that the Jews have been entitled to expect. It is in itself fallacious and self-defeating.

May I explain? To the Jew it means that the whole purpose of his coming here—which is that he should be free to work out his own salvation—is disregarded. The basis on which the British Government obtained the Mandate—that is to say, to assist in the establishment of a Jewish National Home, primarily—is scrapped. The Jew is no longer here in his own right and for the sake of his own future. He is relegated in this country to the humiliating role of merely assisting in the progress of others, of serving as an instrument for the development of other people. And he has to justify his presence and his activity by reference to the part he plays in the life of others—not in his own life. That is, as far as the Jew is concerned.

But what about the Arab? The point is that he can only lose from the Jew being checked.

Jewish development is the prime agent of Arab progress, as has been abundantly and overwhelmingly proved. If you retard the first, you slow down the second. Whether that new, abstruse notion—disparity—will grow greater or smaller is a matter of speculation, but in plain language, if you check Jewish progress it will mean less food, worse food for the Arabs, lower wages, more primitive conditions. You do not speed up the Arab by putting a brake on the Jew. You harm both.

Apart from this, the question is, how do you propose to do it? You can do it by administrative pressure, and that has been done continually. Spokes have been put in our wheels and obstacles placed in our path. And the result has been that not only the pledge to us has been broken, but the Arabs have been denied the full chance of further progress, and the gulf between Jew and Arab was widened, not bridged.

May I give you one or two examples as to how the Government of Palestine exerted itself in this business of bridge-building between Jew and Arab, in this enterprise of narrowing the gap, of doing away with the disparity between the two peoples in fields where it depended entirely on its own initiative, where it lay fully within its own power, when it was not a question of merely checking the unseemly haste of the Jew, who is too impatient, but where the Government was free to act on its own.

My first example is the Huleh concession. You have been in that part of the country, I believe, and you have seen that swamp in the north-eastern corner of Palestine. It has been there for centuries past. It is there today, intact, twenty-nine years after the conquest of Palestine by the British. That hotbed of disease infesting the entire neighbourhood. It is not merely a nest of malaria, which is destructive of human life and strength. It also excludes from cultivation an area of excellent soil, and it does not enable exploitation of rich deposits of peat. It is all hidden behind that stagnant pool of water. The water itself cannot be used for irrigation. So there is treble waste there—waste of human life and strength, waste of soil, waste of water.

In 1914, I believe—a few months before the war broke out—two Effendis from Beirut bestirred themselves and applied to the Ottoman Government for a concession to drain and reclaim the area. They were given the concession. For the concession itself they paid a purely nominal sum, quite insignificant. The undertaking was to drain the area within six years, at the end of which they were to pay for each dunum two Turkish pounds, and also had to give up 10,000 Turkish dunums, which is 9,000 metric dunums, to the Arab cultivators, but the cultivators had to pay them for the land and the drainage costs. The War came; they did nothing. At the end of the War they found the British Administration here. They came to the British Administration and asked for confirmation of the old Turkish concession. They had the right, the title; the concession

was confirmed. But an obligation was imposed, that they should start to work within a certain period of time. They did not keep it. No work started. They kept going to the Government and begging for prolongation, and invariably the request was granted. And so years passed, and nothing changed. The buffaloes wallowed in the mud; mosquitoes swarmed, and carried the poison far and wide. Arab babies died like flies. Arab fellaheen eked out a miserable existence from sparse cultivation and from mat-making out of the reeds which grew in the swamp. Englishmen, splashing through pools of water in high boots, shot wild duck.

Jewish pioneers cast hungry eyes on that sluggish surface of water hiding beneath it the previous soil. The Government, indifferent to both the land-starved Jews and the disease-ridden Arabs, completely unidentified with either, let things drift. It had the money. In those years it had money—there was a very big surplus. Palestine paid the United Kingdom one million pounds for the railway from Kantara to Haifa, which was originally built as a military asset. We paid off the full cost of the railway. We paid off the full share of the Palestine debt, 814,000 pounds. No other part of Turkey paid off its share. We did. But for Huleh there was no money. And the Arab effendis, completely progress-proof, sheltering securely behind the wall of Administrative passivity and indifference, waited with folded arms, placidly, patiently, for the Jews to come forward and pay as high a price as their fancy and greed would dictate. That is actually what happened.

In 1935 Jewish patience snapped. They got weary of waiting for the Government to enforce the concession, either to compel the Arabs to drain the area, or to take away the concession and offer it to somebody else. And so they went to the Arabs, and by direct negotiation they bought the concession. They paid for it the fantastic amount of 200,000 pounds. That was a little more than it is now; just for the concession, for the title, for which the Arabs had paid nothing. But the transfer of the concession was subject to the Government's approval, and the Government made certain stipulations, with all of which the Jews complied. The Government stipulated that the Jews give up not the 9,000 dunums, but 16,000 dunums—the exact figure given is 15,774—to the Arab cultivators who were to get that area completely free of charge. They had not given up the area, but the Jews were to drain it, carry out all the major drainage work and the major irrigation work, for which the Arabs were to pay nothing. The Jews complied. The Government, on its part, said it could not make any contribution to the removal of that festering sore on the geographical body of Palestine, no contribution whatsoever from the taxes, sixty-five per cent of which it got from the Jews. The Jews complied with everything. But then the question arose of engaging a properly qualified firm to make the plan, and a British firm was engaged—Randall Palmer and Tritton. They sent down engineers and they went out and looked. They

not only looked, they also put in some work there, and they found that it was idle to speak about the drainage of a part of the concession. You would have to drain the whole basin in order to make it habitable and healthy, and to control the waters of all the springs nearby so that they should not recreate swamps, and the water should be used for irrigation—which meant that the cost of drainage would be much higher. It also meant that the Jewish company, the Palestine Land Development Company, would have to do work outside the concession areas which was quite inconceivable. So it came to the Government, and this time found a ready ear. The High Commissioner at that time, General Sir Arthur Wanchope, was a dynamic person. He said, all right; that part of the job the Government will do. And the sum of 235,000 pounds was earmarked for this purpose. So, with the moneys of the Jewish company, and other companies who were ready to join it, it looked as if the thing would take shape and be carried through at last. But then a series of hitches occurred. In 1936, Arab riots; in 1937, the Partition Report of the Peel Commission. The Government said, how can we tackle the job? We do not know whether it will be in a Jewish or in an Arab State; whether the Jewish State or the Arab State will recognize our commitment. We have got to wait. Back it went into cold storage, with the mosquitoes swarming, the buffaloes wallowing, and the Arab babies dying.

In 1938 there was the Woodhead Commission; in 1939, the White Paper—certainly no impetus for carrying through a scheme for bigger Jewish colonization. At then of 1939 the war came, and naturally, the whole thing was taken off the agenda.

Coming to the end of the story, during the war the problem arose of adjusting the Huleh Concession to the concession of the Palestine Electric Company. This also caused delay. But the end of it is that the Government now says, we are not going to spend 235,000 pounds; we will go back on that; we have no money. And they not only say that they have no money, they also say it is not necessary to drain that area because other and cheaper means have been found to combat malaria. They mean D.D.T., that marvellous discovery which is now being used very effectively in Jewish and Arab homes, in Jewish and Arab areas. It is true that the incidence of malaria has gone down very much in the Huleh area. But it struck me as fantastic, incredible, that the Government should place reliance on that. I addressed myself to our leading expert in anti-malaria work, Professor Mer, a man who lives in Rosh Pina, and whose life work is the study of conditions in the Huleh primarily among the Arabs, a man who was taken into the Royal Army Medical Corps during the war and given a Colonel's rank. He writes to me that it is fantastic. He says: "D.D.T. is a palliative measure of temporary effect. It is no guarantee against violent outbreaks of the epidemic. On the contrary, just because people in the meantime lose the immunity which they acquire through having been sick with malaria,

several times, they would fall an easier prey to renewed attacks of malaria after a few years' use of D.D.T. The only radical way of curing the disease is by means of drainage and the control of water, exterminating the mosquito by removing the breeding ground. The same opinion is expressed by the above-mentioned English firm. The question is not merely one of sanitation. What about agriculture? What about land? What about the springs converging from outside? How is that water going to be used for irrigation? The Government is washing its hands of the whole business, and the Government thinks it is contributing to the removal of the disparity between Jews and Arabs. The swamp is still there.

My other example is the way the Government acts in its capacity as an employer of labour and as legislator on labour matters. I will concentrate on wages. The Government is a big employer of labour. According to its own statement, between civil and military authorities they employ some 80,000 people. If you add to that those employed by the oil companies you will find that perhaps over 50 per cent of Arab workers work for these three: the Government, the Army and the oil companies. Wages in these undertakings are notoriously low. Witness the strikes! A strike of Government employees in 1946—when tens of thousands struck; a strike after all patience has been exhausted, after endless delays and refusals. A strike in 1947 of army and police employees because of the miserable wages, of the impossible conditions. Here the Government is completely free to remove the disparity.

Why is it that of the 121 officials in the Palestine Government, receiving salaries from 1000 pounds a year upwards, 113 are British, only four are Arab, only three are Jews. One is described as "others". Is that removal of disparity? Here is disparity, a very great one, completely within the power of the Government, if not to remove, at least to reduce. Why is that the British policemen get paid so much more than Palestinian policemen? I do not grudge them their expatriation allowance, I do not grudge them their housing allowance. They are strangers to this country and they should get them. I do not enter into the question of whether the bringing of so many British police is justified or not. That is not my point. Naturally, if people are brought over from afar for a certain purpose, they are entitled to an allowance. They are strangers here. But why is it that their basic salaries are not only higher, but so much higher? You will find figures in the Survey.

Then why is that the Government has consistently, obstinately, refused to insert a fair wage clause into public works contracts in the teeth of Jewish insistence through all the years? Why is it that when the Iraq Petroleum Company, a big employer of labour, got its concession and signed its agreement with the Government, no fair wage clause was inserted? Was that in order to reduce disparity? Why is it when the time came for signing an agreement with the

Trans-Arabian Oil Company—that was only last year, and the Jewish Agency wrote a letter not only for the sake of Jews, but also for the sake of all employees and the tradition is that far more Arabs than Jews are employed by these companies.

To insert a clause obliging the oil company to pay a fair wage which should be more or less equal to a wage received by an unskilled Arab worker in this country? The Government did something on that occasion, but all it said was that the wage should be similar to the wage paid by good employers in the same field—which means by the Iraq Petroleum Company, which is under no obligation to pay a fair wage.

In 1928, as a result of Jewish insistence on minimum wage legislation, the Government appointed a committee of three. The chairman was a British District Commissioner, there was an Arab gentlemen of the employer class, and there was a Jewish gentleman, my friend Mr. Benzvie, at present head of the Vaad Leumi, but at the time spokesman of the Histadrut, of the Labour Federation.

There was a majority report and a minority report. The majority report was signed by the British official and the Arab employer. The minority report was signed by the Jewish labour spokesman. I will read just one extract from the majority report. The date is 1928. The extract reads as follows:

"We are not satisfied that there is a conscious demand for a minimum wage law among the majority of workmen in Palestine. That the view of the General Federation of Jewish Labour, that is the Histadrut, represents the opinion of the large majority of its members is undoubted. A number of Arab workmen are members of the Railway and Postal Workers' Section of the Federation, that is, of the Histadrut. That a certain number of non-union Jewish and even Arab workmen sympathize with these views is probable, but we do not consider that the views of the Federation necessarily represent those of Arab labour as a whole, nor have the Federation claimed that position. In the absence of any democratically organized Arab labour organization of any size, we have been unable to ascertain what are the opinions of Arab labour on a minimum wage law."

There they let the matter rest. They were unable to fathom that impenetrable secret as to what the Arab workers thought, whether they wanted a decent wage or not, because there was no properly constituted instrument, no democratically organized union to serve as an instrument for the ascertainment of that elusive notion.

I looked up the terms of reference. I thought maybe the terms of reference were just to ascertain the views of others. Not a word about that. The terms of reference were to study the question of minimum wages and to make proposals.

So here, these two gentlemen, before the whole public, abdicate their title to an independent

personal opinion on the subject which they had been appointed to investigate.

Still, there is some progress in Palestine. In 1943, in the middle of the war, we had a new wages committee. It was under the chairmanship of the then Chief Justice of Palestine, Mr. Justice F. Gordon Smith, K.C. Again it included Jews and Arabs. It discussed the question of minimum wage legislation, an over-riding uniform minimum wage for all labourers, irrespective of race or creed. That is to say, a move to bridge the gulf, to do away with disparity was pressed by the spokesman of Jewish labour, a member of the committee. It was resisted. It was resisted again by a combination of government officials and Arab employers. Nevertheless, the majority of the Committee said something must be done.

There should be no general minimum wage, and industrial boards were to fix a minimum in each trade; that is, a differential minimum. Well, that was some improvement. The spokesman of the Histadrut was not satisfied, and he said in his minority opinion: "A great many witnesses who expressed an opinion on this question before the committee, including the representatives of the Jewish and Arab mixed labour organizations . . ."—so this time there was no lack of clear expression of the views of Arab labour—" . . . as well as representatives of employers' interests, and also heads of government departments associated with labour problems, spoke with one voice in favour of an equal minimum wage for both the Jewish and Arab unskilled worker whose occupation is regular industrial employment." Well, this was not accepted. They passed a recommendation in favour of the industrial boards. The Government did not set up those industrial boards. It took no action whatsoever on even that minimum recommendation of the majority of the committee. That is the Palestine Government's conception as to its duty, obligation and opportunity of reducing the disparity of standards. Nevertheless, the problem of discrepancy is there, and it is not merely a problem facing the government. It is facing the Jews and it is facing the Arabs. The Jews have a responsibility to discharge here. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Jews claim an opportunity to discharge that responsibility. They do not want to rest content merely with facing that responsibility. They want to be saddled with it. Saddle the Jews with the responsibility. Do not leave them to struggle against the overwhelming odds of administrative obstruction. Make them responsible for it.

If you really want the disparity to disappear, you must entrust the task to those to whom it is a matter of direct self-interest. I am not inviting you to trust the altruism of the Jew. All I am saying to you is that you should trust Jewish intelligence in appraising at its full value Jewish self-interest. Trust the Jew for being enlightenedly selfish. Not more than that. Enlightenedly and intelligently selfish. And I say selfishness is a more effective guarantee than altruism. I do not disparage altruism. I do not deny myself or my friends the right of being



altruistic. But I say that here we are on a much firmer basis when our self-interest is so directly affected.

Now, why is it in the self-interest of the Jews that there should be equality of rights and that there should be an equalization of standards. Naturally, there is a difference between rights and standards. Equal rights you can grant by a decree, by an act of legislation. Equalization of standards is not a one-time act; it is a process, it is an evolution. You can speed it up, you can slow it down, you can promote it, you can impede it.

First, I would suggest to you a moral consideration, but a moral consideration rooted in self-interest. The Jews come here to stay; they come here to live, to die eventually, or if necessary. They do not come here to rule. They do not come here to seek well-paid jobs of temporary duration. That is also perfectly legitimate, but that is not the purpose for which the Jews come. They identify themselves with this country. It is their country. That is what they believe. They are completely and irrevocably identified with it. It is their home. They do not want to see inside and around that home, in their own midst, poverty, squalor, ignorance, social oppression. They want the air of Palestine purified of all these befouling influences, because it is the air which they and their children have to breathe. It is a matter of self-interest.

Secondly, there is another compelling, perhaps a little more compelling self-interest of a material kind. The Jews are anxious to protect their standard of life against the competition of cheap labour, against the encroachment of poverty, ignorance, and social inequality. Levelling up is to them a process of self-defence. Levelling down the Jew to the Arab is a matter of administrative convenience for the British. But levelling up the Arab to the niveau of the Jew is a matter of self-defence for the Jew.

Thirdly, again on the material side, the Jews are and would be most vitally interested in raising the purchasing power of the Arab population for Jewish industrial products. The expansion of the internal market is the chief source of strength of Jewish industry.

Fourthly, another vital Jewish interest will be to prevent an influx of cheap labour from the neighbouring countries, to do away with the state of things which exists today in the port of Haifa, where Huaranis and Sudanese laborers work for wages which even a Palestine Arab labourer will not accept. Therefore, it is for the interest of the Jew, first, to raise the standards of the Arabs of Palestine, the Arabs in the Jewish State, to the level of the Jew in order that it should be also a self-interest of the Arab to set his face against the infiltration of cheap, unorganized, and backward labour. It is in the vital interest of the Jew that there should be development in Syria, that there should be development in Iraq, that there should be development all around, in order that everywhere the level should rise and the neighbouring countries should not be able to dump their

unemployed surplus on Palestine, as they have been doing for years past. Whenever there is a crisis in Syria, whenever there is a drought anywhere, they flock here and they undercut and underbid local labour.

We are interested that there should be development in drainage and irrigation and range of productivity there so that they should stay there and prosper and not invade us and encroach upon our standards of life. It is a matter of self-interest.

Fifthly, the relations of the Jews—call it what you will, Jewish State, Jewish Palestine—with the neighbouring States will primarily depend on the treatment of the Arabs by the Jews in their own State. Being surrounded by Arab territories on all sides, except from the Sea, it would be for them an elementary point of self-preservation to have their hands and their consciences clean with reference to the Arabs.

Lastly, the sixth guarantee for the Arabs is the presence in all oriental countries of Jewish hostages, and in fact, the presence of Jewish hostages throughout the world, Jewish minorities throughout the world which will forever remain very closely—and as time goes on, more and more closely linked up with Jewish Palestine. Jewish Palestine will feel responsible for so behaving towards the strangers in its own midst so as not to give an excuse for persecution or for taking it out on the Jews anywhere else.

The elimination of disparity will be a very important function of the Jewish State. But it will only be a by-product of the establishment of the Jewish State. That is not its main purpose. If we claim statehood, it is not in order to do away with disparity between us and the others or to help others; we claim it because we believe that it is due to us. There are four trends which converge in the present day situation to make the Jewish State an urgent international necessity.

The first is the coming of age of the Yishuv, its maturity. It feels that it has outgrown the leading strings of any tutelage—Mandate or trusteeship, call it what you like.

The second is the general international pattern of the Middle East, of the countries around us. They are all states; they have all achieved independence. Far from being a note of discord, this claim for a Jewish State harmonizes completely with the orchestra that is playing around us. Today we do not fit in with the general pattern. We want to fit in. We want to be an element in harmony, not in discord.

Thirdly, there is an imperative need for large-scale immigration and settlement in this country to save the surviving remnants of European Jewry, the threatened Jews of the Orient, and to put our work here on very firm foundations; and that can only be done with full effectiveness if we have instruments of State power in our hands, that is to say, if State power is placed in the hands of these who are vitally interested in the job.

And fourthly, the future of the Jewish people, the status of the Jewish people in the world is

here at stake. It is a question of whether the Jewish people once and for all will be helped to get rid of the scourge of homelessness; by being given a *pied-à-terre* on the face of this earth, and it can only be done in this country. We believe that there can be no prospect of real peace without the conferment on us of a definite political status of independence, internationally recognized and guaranteed.

Why should the Arabs be interested in coming to terms with us so long as they can hope simply to keep us down or put us down? Why should they have to negotiate if we are not at par with them, not on the same footing? Is it an accident that the Feisal-Weizmann Agreement came after and not before the Balfour Declaration which gave us that status, or at least the Arabs thought it did? They learned better from the sliding back of the British Administration, which came very quickly. Why were there approaches made in 1937 of all years? I note that this has been very vehemently denied in the Arab Press. I am not here to make for them the business of denial unduly easy. I will make it a little more difficult. There was not only one approach, there were two approaches, one in the summer and one in the winter of 1937.

CHAIRMAN: How much have you left? We have to retire for a private meeting and I want to know about arrangements.

Mr. SHERTOK: In that case, I would suggest that perhaps we break off here.

CHAIRMAN: Is it convenient for you, or would you rather go on for a couple more minutes? We are going to continue tomorrow in any case.

Mr. SHERTOK: No, I would rather stop here.

CHAIRMAN: In that case, the public hearing is adjourned until tomorrow at 9.30 a.m.

*(The meeting adjourned at 1.20 p.m.)*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building  
Jerusalem, Palestine  
Thursday, 17 July 1947 at 9.30 a.m.*

### *Present:*

Mr. SANDSTROM, Sweden, (*Chairman*)  
Mr. HOOD, Australia  
Mr. RAND, Canada  
Mr. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
Sir ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
Mr. ENTEZAM, Iran  
Mr. BLOM, Netherlands  
Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
Mr. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
Mr. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

### *Secretariat:*

Mr. HOO, *Assistant Secretary-General*  
Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES, *Secretary*

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order.

The agenda for today's hearing contains two items: public hearing representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and hearing of representatives of the Palestine Communist Union. Do you adopt this agenda?

*(No objection voiced.)*

CHAIRMAN: The agenda is adopted.

## Continuation of Hearing of Representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine

The first item is the continuation of the hearing of representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Mr. Shertok, will you come to the table please?

*(Mr. Shertok, representative of the Jewish Agency, took a seat at the table.)*

Mr. SHERTOK: Mr. Chairman, I said that status was an essential prerequisite of political peace. I think that this is so, in matters large and small. The problem of mutual adjustment in this country is an extremely difficult one. Its solution entails a sense of realities, a capacity to accept facts. And it is essential in the interest of peace, in the long run, that certain facts should be very firmly fixed and that any idea that they can be disregarded or changed by threats, or by force, should be discarded. I will illustrate by an example what I am trying to convey to you. I will take the case of the Municipality of Jerusalem. There is a Jewish majority in the City of Jerusalem. Yet there has always been an Arab mayor at the head of the Jerusalem Municipal Council. As time passed this became anomalous. The city kept growing, so did its population, and its services developed. The Jews came to play a very important part in the administration of the city's affairs, and they felt that it was to their detriment, and they also presumed to think that it was to the detriment of the city as a whole, that they should be denied their fair share of the city's Government. They felt that they should also have a chance of being at the head of the Municipal Council. Now, this problem engaged the attention of the Government and of both Arabs and Jews for a long time. Eventually the Government reached a certain decision and announced that decision officially. They worked out a scheme for the rotation of the Jerusalem mayoralty — a triple rotation — a Moslem mayor, a Christian mayor, and a Jewish mayor should serve in turn. The idea was not quite palatable to the Jews. It was particularly unpalatable because if you appoint as a Christian mayor a Christian Arab, they it means that the proportion is established of one Jew to two Arabs and the Jews are then in a way, in terms of time, if not in terms of space, relegated to the position of a minority. But the Jews realized, at least they tried to realize, the wider aspect of the problem, the unique character of the city of Jerusalem, the associations which it carried, and they decided to acquiesce and accept that proposal. They informed the Government accordingly. Though they were and are a majority and felt entitled to having the post of the mayor permanently, in view of the past tradition, in view of the present associations, they declared them-

selves willing to co-operate in the implementation of that scheme. They had certain additional desiderata which they formulated, but they made no condition in regard to those desiderata. They did not make their acceptance of the scheme contingent upon the acceptance of those desiderata; those were an expression of a desire. And they definitely stated in black and white that they accepted the scheme. Mind you, that was not in the process of preliminary soundings or informal negotiations; that was after the Government had definitely committed itself by announcing officially that that was their decision. The Arabs refused to co-operate. They rejected the scheme. They insisted on the office of Mayor remaining their exclusive possession—the exclusive possession of the Moslem community for all future. The result was that the Government backed out—the Government retreated from the scheme—they dropped it. In retreating from the scheme they blamed their failure on both parties in equal measure. Unqualified rejection and complete acceptance with certain additional desiderata, were represented by them in an official announcement as ranking equal—as if both parties refused to co-operate. They proceeded to disband the Municipal Council. The Jewish councillors were ready to carry on. A Jewish gentleman was at the time acting Mayor and had been acting Mayor for years. There was no complaint whatsoever on the merits of the way he conducted municipal affairs. Yet, all the municipal councillors, including the Jewish councillor were sent packing and a direct British rule was instituted in the City Hall of Jerusalem. For two years now Jerusalem has not enjoyed elementary municipal self-government. Municipal affairs are being ruled by appointed British officials. Now what does it mean? It means a premium on intransigence—a definite discouragement to face realities and to develop a spirit of accommodation to those realities. It is a victory for boycotting tactics. We all felt that the Arabs took that uncompromising attitude only because they knew that by so doing they would wreck the scheme—that they would force the Government to retreat. If they had the conviction that the Government would stick to its decision and that what they would then be facing would be that the conduct of municipal affairs would be exclusively in the hands of the Jews, and they would be left completely out, they would think twice before deciding on the attitude which they adopted. They would give in, and it would not mean in any sense sacrificing any legitimate rights. Although the Jews are a majority, the composition of the Council is fifty-fifty between Jews and Arabs, and they would have had their share of rotation of office of mayoralty. It would not mean any unwarranted concession—any undue concession on their part.

Well, to us that was a lesson. We are setting it as an example not to follow. I believe the same is true on higher planes—on the highest plane of political affairs in this country with regard to settling the major political problem. I am convinced that once the Arabs realize they will

have to face us in the United Nations as an equal partner, the whole complex of Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine and in the Middle East will be transformed. That will be a fact which they will not be able to disregard.

Actually, from our own subjective and selfish point of view, if you will, the fact that we are not in the United Nations is an intolerable anomaly. We wonder by what principle of elementary fairness our exclusion from that high international body can be justified. The answer is clear, we are not a State. But that answer only raises the question: why are we not a State? Why should we not be a State? How can anyone justify a position where nations assembled from all corners of the world, of the civilized world, sit around a table and discuss a problem which most vitally affects the fate and future of a certain people, infinitely more, in any case, than it does the fate and future of anyone of those who are around the table and yet, that one people is excluded from the Council.

Mr. Chairman, some of my friends and I went through such a mortifying experience already in 1937. In 1937 Mr. Ben Gurion and I attended the session of the General Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva and the meetings of the Sixth Committee which discussed the mandates, including Palestine. We were sitting in the Press Gallery among the guests. On the floor of the house all the nations of the world as then organized were assembled. A representative of Iraq and a representative of Egypt delivered frontal attacks from the rostrum of that Assembly against the Mandate, against Jewish rights in Palestine, against the status of the Jewish people in Palestine. Nobody answered their charges. Our case went by default. The way it was put it could only have been answered by a Jewish representative. But the Jewish representative being absent, the interests of the Jewish people remained undefended. In the Sixth Committee everybody who was anybody in the international arena got up and gave the world a piece of his mind, as he was perfectly entitled to do, on what the Jews did or did not deserve in Palestine. We felt how world policy with regard to us was being shaped before our very eyes. Only we, we alone of all those concerned, and we believed and did not think it was immodest to believe that our fate was of more concern to us than to anyone of those who discussed the problem—we alone had to keep silent. Now that injustice was only partly remedied at the last extraordinary session of the Assembly at Lake Success. We deeply appreciate that partial remedy, but we cannot rest content with that form of admission, with our being admitted merely on sufferance. We must claim to be there as of right. Can you imagine on the supposition that there is a Jewish State and the Jewish State has a seat in the United Nations, the Arab States boycotting us the way they do now by official edicts of their respective Governments, publicly, officially promulgated and enforced in one of the countries to the point of the death penalty? Can it be conceived? We would then have in our hands most legitimate

and perfectly peaceful weapons of self-defence. We would be able to retaliate as any State placed in our position would. We would be able to prevent the transit to Palestine of goods destined to the countries which would be boycotting us. We could withhold visas from the nationals of those countries if they wanted to visit Palestine. We could discontinue our purchases from those countries. And, finally, we could challenge them in open court, in the Assembly of the United Nations, for a flagrant violation of express provisions of the Charter — and of their trade agreements, their treaties with Palestine. All these potentialities of defence exist today. They are not in our hands. They are in the hands of an administration which does not care to use them. We are not admitted to the Arab countries. I do not want to become journalistic and refer to the developments of yesterday or the day before. You all know what is happening in connexion with your forthcoming visit to the Lebanon and the way the Jewish press representatives are being discriminated against. Today anyone from all neighbouring countries can visit Palestine. The Jews of Palestine cannot go to all the neighbouring countries. Today we still buy, and are forced to buy, foodstuffs from some neighbouring countries at exorbitant prices. We could have obtained those foodstuffs at lower prices elsewhere. We must buy them where we are told. And nobody, in the Assembly, has so far taken up the cudgels on our behalf and challenged the unconstitutionality of this racial boycott practised by Members of the United Nations who swore allegiance to the Charter.

Now, I do not relish the prospect of such a clash — a snapping of all ties, the withholding of visas, discontinuation of trade, etc., nor do I think it would have actually come to that because the very knowledge that such would be the reaction to a boycott would act as a very powerful deterrent. The Arab States again would have thought twice under such circumstances before they would embark on a boycott, and having thought twice they would not embark upon it. The temptation to be aggressive would be nipped in the bud. It is defencelessness that invites aggression, and once the door to such counsels is closed other counsels begin to prevail — constructive counsels. After all, they are not merely nationalists — they are also heads of States. They have State interests to look after. They cannot be indifferent to interests of trade, to interests of communications. They must be realists. They must take it all into account. They may hate the Jews, but they cannot help their presence in the Middle East and the fact that they are a political power. Under this set of circumstances, which I am trying to visualize, by sheer impact of realities they would be brought to realize that they need us just as we need them and that it is no use quarreling. Some *modus vivendi*, some *modus co-operandi* would have to be worked out. Barriers of prejudice would then break under the pressure of common needs and mutual interests. That is a process which a Jewish State and nothing but a Jewish State would set in motion. It would not be

consummated overnight. It would take time to mature. But, slowly and surely it would mature.

Mr. Chairman, it is our conviction that the issue which I am trying to stress cannot be met by a federal arrangement. We would draw a very sharp distinction between two conceptions — two alternative possible conceptions of federalism — the conception of a federal State and the conception of a confederation of States. We would oppose the first. We would favor the second. We have not come here to live in isolation. We came here to be integrated, and confederation of States is one of the forms of integration. We observe today that the Arab League is not a federation — it is just a community of States loosely bound together for joint action in certain matters. Even Syria and Lebanon, such closely connected countries, do not form a federation. That is to say they show no desire at all to give up a part of their sovereignty in favour of some central body. But we, in principle and *a priori*, are not opposed to the idea of a federation of States, provided it is a federation of independent States. Not only are we not opposed to it, but we see that a great deal of good may come of it.

What we do not think would meet the issue is a federal State; that is to say, our being a component part of a State which would rule over us and which would not leave us free and independent. Such kind of federalism would mean a continuous clash of divergent tendencies which would pull the State structure to pieces. And the only way to prevent the State structure from being pulled to pieces would then be to place at the head of the federation a very strong, very powerful umpire — a third party — and that third party would then become the receptacle for the concentration of power. More and more power would be concentrated in its hands. In any case, with regard to what I might term the dynamic issues that would arise, the third party would have to have a decisive voice. That would mean denial of independence. The umpire would be subject to continuous pressure and counter-pressure on both sides, and the position would be bound to degenerate, as it has degenerated. The problem would remain unsolved; another committee would have to be appointed to re-investigate. The craving of the Jewish people for statehood would remain unsatisfied. And that craving would not be eradicated from the hearts of the Jews and would still constitute an international problem.

The issue can certainly not be met by the adoption of a bi-national solution, a bi-national solution based on parity. Such a solution, to be operative, presupposes two collective wills acting by and large in unison. It is not a question of individuals combining on some minor matters. Individuals may combine across the barriers of race or community or religion, but on major matters, what one would have to face for a considerable time — heaven knows for how long — would be two national entities, each with a collective will of its own. And to imagine that such a State would be something workable is to

presuppose a willingness to walk together on the part of those two national entities.

These prerequisites do not exist, and therefore the issue, I am afraid, is a purely academic one. If, for the sake of argument, I am to assume that it may be practical politics—which I do not—then I would have to say that it would either lead to a state of permanent deadlock on major matters, or that it would lead to the virtual abolition of independence.

Again, in order to save the situation from a state of perpetual deadlock, a third party would have to be introduced, either as a result of foresight or as a result of an *esprit d'escalier*. I do not think I am fully competent to judge the subject from the point of view of comparative constitutional law, but I am not aware of any precedent for such an arrangement. There are bi-national and multi-national States in the world, and in all of them, I believe, sovereignty in the ultimate resort is vested in the majority of the population or the majority of some elected assembly. In the last resort the majority prevails, and nowhere do you find two equally balanced communities set against each other. It would have been more logical to expect such arrangement in those countries than in a country like Palestine, because in those countries there are no such fundamental cleavages and no such diametrical divergences as we have to face in Palestine.

It is not a workable solution. I must stress again and again, the question is not whether Jews and Arabs can live together within the framework of one State. They can. They will. The question is whether they can operate a State machinery by pulling an equal weight in its councils. They will pull apart. The problem in this country is not how to compose the differences between two static sections of the country's population. If that were the case, it would not have been so difficult. The problem is how to reconcile independence with the dynamic development of the Jewish section and of the country. Perhaps I could formulate it a little differently, and that perhaps would be more correct.

The problem is how to make of independence an instrument of development and not a stranglehold on development. But if you assign equality to both statics and dynamics, then the statics will have the advantage.

Equality of veto will mean Jewish defeat. What can a Jewish veto do to the Arabs, vitally, crucially. The Arabs are here. Nobody in his senses would try to eradicate them; anyhow you won't do it by a veto. What positive act can doom the hopes of the Arabs to live here, to enjoy prosperity. But an Arab veto can and would prevent Jewish immigration, and that is the most fundamental issue for the Jews. And you do not solve the problem by taking immigration out of the context and entrusting it to some *ad hoc* authority. It cannot be taken out of the context. The problem of immigration is bound up with the whole machinery of Government, with economic policy, with fiscal policy. It is not merely

a question of issuing visas and letting people in. It means absorbing these people, providing for them, so shaping the country's economic policy as to enable it to absorb immigrants. No; if there is harmony between the *ad hoc* immigration authority and the State machinery, then it is all right. But if there is complete discord, the possibility of it, may the certainty of it, then it will not work, and the immigration powers which you might grant to the *ad hoc* authority would prove a delusion.

May I draw the Committee's attention to our memorandum called "The Political Survey 1946-47"—I know how voluminous is the material that you are expected to read, and therefore I permit myself to draw your special attention to one chapter in the memorandum, and that is the chapter called "Solutions"—the last twenty pages of the memorandum, p. 49-71, where we have made an attempt to elaborate on all the proposals that have been heard, discussed them analytically and critically.

Again, in a bi-national State—if I may continue—we shall be irresistibly driven to the installation of a third party with all the negative results—primarily, no independence. Moreover, the whole approach which leads to bi-nationalism misses the real point at issue. When people talk of bi-nationalism their starting point is the country of Palestine; how to solve its problems. Here is a country with two peoples. But that is not the real starting point of the problem. The real starting point is the position of the Jewish people. The problem of Palestine is nothing but a function of the Jewish problem. Had there been no Jewish problem, there would have been no problem of Palestine today. What is called technically the Palestine problem—if you go even a little beneath the surface—you will find it to be the Jewish problem. That is the core. You cannot solve the problem if you disregard its roots in history, if you do not project it into the future. You will not solve it if you restrict its scope to present-day Palestine, if you ignore the world position of the Jewish people on the one hand, and the international position of the Arab world today, on the other hand. And what we believe must be realized is to what extent and with what intense determination Jews all over the world have set their hearts on Palestine; the urge of hundreds of thousands to get in, the urge of the entire Jewish people, so far as it thinks and acts and wills collectively, to achieve statehood in Palestine. The full, wide international scope of the problem and its historic import must be taken into account. The international aim must be to try to cure the world of that peculiar *malaise*, a world *malaise*, which is called "the Jewish Question."

There is today a great upsurge of Jewish consciousness throughout the world, not only in the countries where the Jewish position is still very precarious, but also in the countries, and perhaps particularly in these countries, where Jews are fairly firmly entrenched in economic and social life and enjoy complete equality of rights. In so far as they do not completely dissolve in their environment—and the vast majority does

not—in so far as they care about the future of the Jewish people, they become more and more drawn to the banner, more and more active in trying to solve the problem of their people through Palestine.

There are two momentous developments in contemporary Jewish history, the effect of which is cumulative: the extermination in Europe and the renaissance in Palestine. They are like two poles which between them galvanize Jewish national will into action. They generate that will. And they make it more and more active. The urge is to ensure the consummation of our renaissance in order to prevent a recurrence of extermination—at least to provide one secure haven, secure by being the possession of the Jewish people.

There can be no permanent stability, there can be no permanent contentment in Palestine, or in the world, insofar as the Jewish position is concerned unless and until that elemental craving is satisfied. If not, tension will continue and explosive situations will continue, repression will continue with all its tragic results. We are fully aware of the force of opposition which we have to face, but we believe that once that craving is satisfied, as far as it can be humanly satisfied, opposition will die down. The force of facts, the convincing and compelling force of facts is bound to assert itself. If a certain stage has been reached and passed, beyond that stage opposition will lose point. It will have no further prospect. The opposition is fed by the belief that it can succeed in preventing a certain consummation. Once it is there, it cannot be changed. And there is nothing really vital behind that opposition, no interests of life and death are behind that opposition. It is not a matter of life and death for the Arab world to keep the Jews out of Palestine. It is a matter of life and death for the Jewish people as a people,—I am not now talking of individuals—to establish itself in Palestine. If you satisfy the constructive urge you set a limit to the period of turmoil and difficulty. If you yield to obstruction you prolong indefinitely the period of turmoil and of unsettlement.

Just as the 650,000 Jews have been accepted today by our neighbours, near and far, so will the Jewish State be eventually accepted. Arab fears may be, in the subjective sense, genuine. They are none the less irrational. To conceive that the wellbeing of Palestine Arabs, that the independence and integrity of the Arab countries around us, are likely to be threatened by the creation of a Jewish State is just morbid fancy. The fears will be dissipated by the realities. Just as the terrifying visions which were conjured up in the very recent past, as to what happen if a couple of hundred thousand more Jews entered Palestine, the way the Arabs would be turned away from their soil, transformed into bands of homeless vagabonds roaming over the country and taking to the profession of highwaymen, the way the Arabs would be driven out, would be completely subjugated, etc. etc., just as all these terrifying visions have been dissipated, so will be the fears that are still being

entertained. The question is whether these imaginary fears are to prevail against this dire need which the world has to face today, and against considerations of international justice. The question is whether Palestine's function in history is to be perverted under the threat of brutal reactionary force. We are convinced it is an empty threat. The verdict of international conscience will not be defied, certainly not in the long run.

But I have to stress again that the starting point is the position of the Jewish people, and the concrete link between that position and the problem of Palestine is immigration, the right to return. If that is acknowledged, the rest follows automatically. If that right is acknowledged, the one corollary is that there must be ample territorial scope for settlement, as ample as possible, and you know that even the whole of Palestine is not too large a country.

Another fundamental corollary is sovereignty, Jewish sovereignty as the only effective ultimate guarantee of entry. What we must strive to attain is an international sanction for something which is deeply imbedded in Jewish consciousness in that regard. For in the matter of the return of the Jewish people to Palestine, the Jewish people has always considered itself sovereign.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, at the risk of abusing your patience I feel I must very briefly recall the fate of that boatload of Jews who, in 1942, went down to the bottom of the Black Sea. I do so not in order to harrow your feelings; I do so because in that one tragic event was exemplified, was epitomized the whole political situation which is the crux of the problem. That boat stood two months in Istanbul. It stood there crying out for mercy, for refuge, for salvation, to the entire civilized world. What civilized State, allied or neutral, did not have its representatives in Istanbul? The whole world, therefore, saw the boat. The whole world knew what was at stake. And the whole world let those people perish.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, please do not misunderstand me. It is not that we were staggered so much by the death of another 764 people, men, women and children. At the time the war was raging around us, not only throughout the world, but the enemy was at our gates. Even we in Palestine had our war losses. Scores of us perished as a result of enemy air-raids. Hundreds of our sons and brothers fell on the battlefields of Africa and Europe. On one occasion a whole boat carrying Palestinian troops was sunk by the Germans in the Mediterranean. Several of our young men and women, the flower of our youth, the pride of the Yishuv, volunteered to be dropped by parachute behind enemy lines, and were executed by the enemy in Dachau, in the prison yard of Budapest, in the Nazi posts of Slovakia. We mourned them all, but we were proud of them. They went down fighting. It is not the fact that 764 more died. It is the way they died that affected us. Can you conceive such a fate befalling the members of any other people? Can you imagine it happening, let us say, to a transport of Polish refugees, of Czech refugees, of Greek refugees, of Yugoslav refugees, refugees



belonging to any European or American or Asiatic nation under the same conditions? That they should flee from death and find the doors of all lands barred and locked in their face—first and foremost, the doors of the land which the whole world promised would be their home. Any such group would be accommodated somewhere, wherever it may be; just as in this part of the world, before our eyes, Greek refugees were accommodated in Palestine, Yugoslav refugees in Egypt, Polish war refugees in Iran, in Palestine, in East Africa. They were given temporary shelter. They were given that shelter on the understanding that as soon as the war was over they would go back to their respective countries. The sovereignty of their peoples, although submerged temporarily at the time, but which the world was certain would re-emerge, was a guarantee of their eventual repatriation and therefore was an instrument of their immediate rescue.

That decree of death that was passed on the "Struma" because of the lack of any refuge over the entire face of the planet was something reserved for Jews alone. What national representative ever had to plead with such helpless and suppressed rage for mercy, for commiseration on behalf of his hunted and doomed brothers; then, failing to obtain admission for the whole transport, to climb down and entreat at least that children should be admitted, and to fail even in that—because the permission came too late—that mortification was also reserved for Jews alone. Now would not every one of you, after such experiences, take a holy oath to fight to his last breath for the restoration of his people's statehood and sovereignty, so that there should be one territory on the face of the earth, an adequate, a secure territory, the people's own country where it would be free to receive its persecuted sons and daughters without having to resort to any one else's permission?

And now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, may I say that the tale of the "Struma" did not end with that disaster. It then only just started. And it goes on today. It still goes on. The camps of Europe are full of potential passengers of the "Struma". The camps of Cyprus are full of them. There are quite a number of them already in the settlements in Palestine. You have devoted such time and energy and physical strength to the visiting of our towns and settlements. Please complete the programme. I am making this appeal to you on behalf of the Jewish Agency. I am sure I am making it on behalf of the people directly and physically concerned. Please visit the camps. Those people are an integral and organic part of your inquiry. It is their plight and the historic position of the Jewish people which has made that plight possible that is the real subject of your investigation. You saw them here reviving under the spell of new hope and the very hard, hard but productive work which they are doing. You should see them there, how they are going under in enforced idleness, deprived of any hope except today this new faint glimmer that may be as a result of your investigation and your recommendations, that they

will be rescued and rehabilitated before it is too late. We know your time is very short and your task is formidable, so make a very rigorous selection, but please visit a few camps; and also at least one typical centre of Jewish life in post-war Europe where, outside the camps, the prospects for Jews are as black as inside the camps.

In conclusion, I have one more request to address to you on behalf of the Jewish Agency. In about six weeks you will be addressing your recommendations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for transmission to the annual session of the Assembly. The session of that great body will take many, many weeks, may be a few months. In the meantime, the homeless Jews of Europe will be facing their third post-war winter in the camps, a third winter of mental anguish, of physical suffering. The Yishuv, the Jews of Palestine, will still be in the throes of their struggle against the suffocations of the White Paper regime.

Please, therefore, preface your report with an emergency recommendation to the Assembly that, pending its consideration of an adjudication upon the major problem which, even within the session of the Assembly, must take a little time, the Assembly should decide on an immediate alleviation of the position in those two respects. It should insist on the immediate removal of all the bars and bans imposed by the White Paper, and on the immediate large-scale admission to Palestine of homeless Jews. This should be the first and immediate installment of the solution of our problem. But do not delay the solution. Do not recommend that it should be delayed by the Assembly.

As to the solution itself, we pray, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for your wisdom and for your courage.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mr. Shertok.

Does any member wish to ask any questions of Mr. Shertok?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): Excuse me, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Shertok, for insisting on a problem of an educational character. In the memorandum presented by the Administration of Palestine, it is stated: "The regions of cultural activity in which common ground might be found are definitely narrowed by the co-existence of separate systems of community education. Without doubt, the training in a common culture of children with the very variegated background of those of the Jewish community has presented a complex and difficult problem." The memorandum speaks of an undue concentration on nationalism of an assertive and exclusive quality in the community education system.

Do you think, Mr. Shertok, it will be possible in the near future to establish a system of common schools—in Spanish we say *escuelas comunes*—for all the children, without discrimination, in the country? Do you think that is possible?

Mr. SHERTOK: I do not think so, sir. I do not think that will be possible, nor do I think that will be desirable. I think that to throw Jewish and Arab children into one educational pool will

raise an insoluble problem, the problem of language and the problem of national culture. You cannot educate unless you do so against the background of a certain national culture. And you certainly cannot educate unless you have a certain language as a medium of instruction.

Now, I would not like to see Jewish children assimilated to Arab language and Arab culture, nor would I like to see Arab children assimilated in the opposite direction.

CHAIRMAN: May I enlarge on the question of Mr. Fabregat. Do not common schools exist where Arab and Jewish children are educated together?

Mr. SHERTOK: There are some missionary schools attended, among others, by some Jewish and some Arab children. I am not now dealing with the religious aspect of the question—there is no question of any direct conversion going on in those schools. They are schools, and some of them are very good schools, as schools go. But I would regard it as a first-rate national disaster if all Jewish children were educated in such schools, because then there would be no hope of any cultural revival of the Jewish people, of any independent cultural life. And I believe that a race so educated would be culturally sterile. It would not be creative.

I am rather grateful to Professor Fabregat for having drawn my attention to that paragraph in the report. I think I remember it. It is a very curious paragraph. The Government of Palestine complains that children are being educated separately. How does it propose they should be educated? The Government of Palestine in that paragraph complains that Hebrew and Arabic are official languages, and they say—they do not use the word nuisance, but that is what they very nearly imply—that it is a great handicap to have to translate speeches at common meetings in those two languages. The underlying conception seems to be that the country must exist for the convenience of the officials, and not the officials for the convenience of the country. The underlying conception seems to be that it is a pity that both Jews and Arabs have their national languages, that they have some cultural heritage to carry on and to hand down to the coming generations. Why shouldn't they all speak plain English? English is a very good language and a very rich language, but is not theirs. It does not have roots in their hearts, it does not have roots in their memories, it does not have past associations; therefore it offers no possibilities of creative self-expression for either.

I think that is an astounding paragraph, and so is the implication which it carries. This country harbours two peoples, two cultured peoples. They have their languages, and they are determined to go on developing them. It is very useful to know English. It may be useful to know French. I think it is very useful to know Spanish. And English is being taught in our schools.

By the way, if it is a question here again of reducing the disparity, practically in all Jewish secondary schools and in a large number of elementary schools, Arabic is taught. Hebrew is not

taught in a single Government school. Why is that? That would bring Jews and Arabs a little closer together.

I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that it must be the policy in this country to increase, as far as possible, the number and the percentage of bilingual people, bilingual in Hebrew and Arabic. Those who have the time and can afford to learn a third language, by all means let them do it. But it is very important that the number of Arabic-speaking Jews and Hebrew-speaking Arabs is increasing: with the Jews as a result of concerted effort, as a result of conscious policy; with the Arabs simply because many Arabs find it useful to know a little Hebrew. I am sure this process will develop in the course of time. Just as in Switzerland. In French Switzerland, education is based on French, but German is taught. In German Switzerland, education is based on German, but French is taught. This, I think, should be the policy of Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have any further questions?

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay): No, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: That is all I want to ask.

Mr. GRANADOS (Guatemala): In paragraph 10 of the Administration Blue Book, already mentioned by Professor Fabregat, it is said—I am not quoting because I do not have the document here, but the sense is more or less this: that if the Agency had limited itself to the accomplishment of certain functions this situation would be different, but that the Agency has not complied with the terms of reference.

What have you to say about that statement?

Mr. SHERTOK: I will answer you in a minute. I would like to look up the paragraph and refresh my memory. I think I remember seeing it. It is also a paragraph to which we must take very strong exception. I think it contains an attempt at a *post-factum* rationalization with regard to something that was originally conceived in an entirely different spirit.

The main point is that the Jewish Agency was sanctioned by the Mandate but was not created by the Mandate. The Mandate recognized the Zionist Organization as the Jewish Agency. Now, the Zionist Organizations existed before the Mandate. Maybe, if there had been no Zionist Organization, there would have been no British Mandate over Palestine. The Zionist Organization rested on its own strength. It was already, before the First World War, the chief Jewish colonizing agency in Palestine. During the war, it made itself responsible for ensuring the survival of the Jewish community. During the war again, it was instrumental, through its leaders, in obtaining the Balfour Declaration. When the British Government, through the Mandate, conferred that status of the Jewish Agency on the Zionist Organization, it did so not merely in the full knowledge of the facts, but because of its knowledge of the facts. Because it knew that that was a strong party, a national representative body, that it appeared worthwhile to the British Government to accept is as a partner in the undertaking. Otherwise, such partnership would have been of no value, and most certainly, the presumption

was that the Jewish Agency should continue to act as an independent instrument of development.

I remember the phrase that was very currently quoted in those days. At the San Remo Conference, when the Supreme Allied Council decided to entrust Great Britain with the Mandate. Mr. Lloyd George met Dr. Weismann and communicated to him that decision, and when he finished his official communication, he said this: "Now you have been given a start; it is up to you to make good". "To make good" did not mean merely to co-operate with the Palestine Administration. It meant to accept responsibility for the bringing over of immigrants, for settling them, for planning and development, for mobilizing finance.

It just occurs to me, suppose the Jewish Agency had failed. Suppose it had failed miserably and very conspicuously. Suppose the land it had acquired had not been put to proper use, had been wastefully cultivated. Suppose the Jewish farms were miserably vegetating units. Suppose there was large unemployment in Palestine, a tremendous backwash of re-emigration, and so forth. I am sure then that this Blue Book would not join issue with the Jewish Agency as to why it had done all these things at all. It would have blamed the Jewish Agency for its failure. Now that we have not failed—it is not for me to say to what extent we have succeeded; I know we have not succeeded up to our expectations—the very basis of our existence is challenged in this document. It is not an attack on the Jewish Agency. It is an attack on the Mandate and on the basic premise on which the Mandate was built.

CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to ask any questions?

*(No response)*

CHAIRMAN: Then I thank you, Mr. Shertok.

MR. SHERTOK: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN: The hearing is suspended for ten minutes.

*(The hearing was suspended for ten minutes)*  
*Hearing of Representatives of the Palestine*

### Hearing of Representatives of the Palestine Communist Union

CHAIRMAN: I call the meeting to order. The item we are going to take up now is the hearing of Representatives of the Palestine Communist Union. I understand that Mr. Preminger, Dr. Marchant, and Miss Zabari are going to speak for the Union. Will you please come up on the platform.

*(Mr. Preminger, Dr. Marchant, and Miss Zabari took their seats on the platform.)*

CHAIRMAN: We have granted you a hearing which is supposed to be an address for you, all together, for a half hour. The reason why we have granted you this hearing is because you have a specific solution that you favour. What we expect now is to hear your proposals about that solution. We do not expect you to go fully

into all these other questions which have been debated by other organizations, immigration and so on.

MR. PREMINGER (Member of the Central Committee of the Palestine Communist Union): Yes, I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN, gentlemen of the Committee, I am very glad to have the opportunity to greet you in our country and to present to you the proposals of the Palestine Communist Union. Seventeen enquiry committees have visited this country before you. Common to all of them was that they were appointed by the British rulers themselves to investigate their own deeds. The British Government was plaintiff and defendant at the same instance. At the last—the Anglo-American Enquiry Committee—the U.S.A., which has her own interests in this country, participated—and therefore it is evident, that this Committee could not serve the true interests of the country and its peoples. We, and with us the whole Jewish Yishuv in Palestine, greet you not as the eighteenth committee of this sort but as the first enquiry committee of United Nations. The Jewish Yishuv knows that among you are members who themselves took part in the liberation movements, and in the struggle for national independence against the enslavers of their peoples, and this fact gives us the conviction that the aspirations of an oppressed people fighting for its national independence will find a deep echo in your hearts and will be given expression in your findings. The Jewish Yishuv, groaning under the yoke of colonial enslavement, chained under a dictatorial regime which denies it the basic democratic rights, the Jewish Yishuv, struggling for its very existence as a nation, has brought before you the evidence of its struggle and aspiration to independence.

The aspiration to freedom and national independence is common to the great majority of witnesses who appeared before you. But unlike many of them we, the Hebrew Communists, wish to stress as our deep conviction that no people gains its freedom as a gift from anybody.

We, the Hebrew Communists, present to you our democratic proposals which will contribute towards the deliberations of your committee and the decisions of United Nations, since we greatly value your help in our struggle against colonial oppression and for national independence. For the elucidation of our proposals we would like to point out that for the realization of a democratic programme the mass struggle of the nation fighting for its independence is necessary. Only the combination of these two elements—democratic programme and popular mass struggle—will be able to convert the desire for liberation from colonial rule and for the establishment of independence from a dream into reality.

The passive resistance and struggle of the Jewish Yishuv's masses has abated recently due to political miscalculations of various circles still occupying a position of leadership of the Yishuv. You have heard that the inhabitants of Nathanya surrendered to the overwhelming numbers of

troops who poured into their town. Yet, not always such has been the sequence of events. One instance may be sufficient. In September, 1946, curfew was imposed upon Haifa in order to cover the use of gas and truncheons against the immigrants—thousands of the inhabitants of Haifa broke the curfew and actively resisted the oppressive laws. People streamed out into the streets, even though they were aware that the soldiers had been given orders to shoot at every curfew-breaker. As a consequence 3 people were murdered by the soldiers, among them a young girl of eighteen, who, together with her mother, went out into the streets in order to outlaw and prevent the realization of the dictatorial rule. This was not an isolated instance.

We reject the method of individual terrorism which is pursued by certain groups within the Jewish Yishuv. Nevertheless, everybody knows that within the Jewish Yishuv are dormant vast and consequent forces of liberation, which will fight untiringly against every oppressive regime until national liberation is achieved. Not we alone, but wide masses of the Yishuv know that freedom and independence are not bestowed as a gift but gained through mass resistance to all legislation of the Police State and the struggle for the realization of the democratic proposals we wish to present to you.

A programme guaranteeing the interests of both peoples of Palestine. A programme for which every honest patriot among both peoples can be enlisted. A programme which, if recommended by the United Nations, would be able to render the utmost help to our enslaved country and to its peoples striving for independence.

Our proposals are based upon the recognition of the just rights of both peoples to full national sovereignty and complete independence of any foreign factor, the defence of which is the foremost and noblest duty of United Nations.

The main difficulty of the Palestine problem is the false argument that in Palestine there exists a contradiction between right and right. It is argued that each of the peoples aspires to a status of majority and exclusive rule. The opposition to political parity is put forward under the pretence that it creates a deadlock. In connection with this stands the question of immigration. There are many who fear that an Arab majority will deny our right of immigration.

Let us examine the question of majority. The Hindus constitute the majority in India, but does this fact guarantee their independence? The Arabs in this country can learn from their own experience that they did not attain sovereignty in spite of being the majority. In connection with this has to be considered the problem of immigration. The Arabs have no economic or social arguments against immigration, their opposition springing mainly from the fear of political domination.

What we need is a political settlement that will safeguard both peoples against the danger of domination and will solve the problem of majority and minority—and will certainly also guarantee the right of the Jews to immigrate.

From these considerations becomes evident our opposition to set up Palestine as a one-national State. We do not wish to enter here into the complicated problem of ensuring justice to both nationalities and only want to point out the impracticability of such a State.

The setting-up of Palestine as a one-national State would mean:

1. The denial of sovereign rights to one of nations,
2. The complete mobilization of the other nation against such a State,
3. Economic and political boycott up to armed uprisings, bloodshed and mutual massacres.

It must also be taken into account that a wronged people will be ready to assist war mongers inciting them to a new world war, hoping thus to rise from its downtrodden position.

The second proposal, partition, seems just and practical. But actually it is quite unpractical and leaves most problems unsolved. For in the proposed "Jewish" State conditions will be as follows:

(a) The Arabs will still constitute a third of the population, so that the difficulty of majority and minority as existing in the non-partitioned Palestine will remain (although in this case the Jews will be in the majority and the Arabs in the minority).

(b) As regards land ownership, more than two-thirds of the lands will be in the hands of the Arabs.

(c) The problem of development, though, will be more difficult because the raw materials (oil, Dead Sea resources) as well as water resources are distributed in such a manner as will prevent their being exploited under conditions imposed by any partition of Palestine into two separate States.

(d) Industry, even now suffering from marketing difficulties, will altogether suffocate, being boycotted by surrounding antagonistic countries. For it has to be remembered that partition, which can only be forced on the peoples of the country against their wish, will not minimize, but intensify tension between the two peoples.

(e) Such a State will, of necessity, turn into a typical police State, as it will have to suppress a large national minority.

(f) Lastly, what is most important, is that, after partition, none of the two nations will be independent, and both will serve as pawns in the hands of foreign imperialist powers. It is therefore no coincidence that all the various partition plans were born in the British colonial office. Partition, according to a local popular saying, gives the hair to the Jews, the nails to the Arabs and the body to the British. This scheme does not offer a final solution, and certainly—as shown by India's bloody experience—it will not improve relations between the neighbouring peoples.

There also are proposals of another nature. They seem "idealistic" but they are much more realistic than those of the first category. They

recognize that in Palestine there exist two nations and they take into account the just rights of both peoples in one way or another. Yet these proposals are not consequent, since they are not based on the principle of the recognition of the right of both peoples to national self-determination up to secession, the principle which alone can bring about co-operation free of any fear of domination or deprivation of rights.

Therefore, the authors of these proposals built upon trusteeship or even a British Mandate in order to "educate" the people towards co-operation. We reject any proposal designed to bring in any third factor, whose task will be to conciliate as it were between the peoples. A bi-national proposal of this kind does not grant in fact sovereignty to any of the peoples.

Our plan is based on the principle of territorial federalism:

It seems to us that the best means of using national sovereignty for the good of both nations in order to ensure economic success and the absorption of the Jews desirous of entering Palestine, consists in the creation of an independent, democratic united State, common to both Jews and Arabs, built on full national and political equality for both its nations and on full democratic rights for all its inhabitants. The form of government ensuring political equality will have to be based on parity. We do not here wish to enter into a detailed constitutional description of the future Palestinian State for we think it early to discuss its constitution so long as the basic principles on which co-operation between the peoples depends have not been guaranteed. If, on the other hand, such principles are accepted, the representatives of the two peoples will be able to work out the details for their constitution according to the interests of the two nations.

We wish again to emphasize that, as the experience of the Soviet Union and other multinational States (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, etc.) has proved, it is only the right of self-determination up to secession that can serve as a sufficient guarantee to each nation that no danger exists of the other nation dominating it.

Nevertheless we stress that it is in the interest of both peoples not to make use of the right to secede because only the united bi-national form of government will be able to secure free economic development, peace between peoples, exercise of the national right of the Jews to absorb immigration and settle on the land, and a rising of the standard of living of the two peoples.

A joint Government can be established when both peoples understand that their interests demand a united State and an agreement on a united government. No outside power has the right to force this form of government upon the peoples. Therefore, in order to enable them to reach a settlement, the fear of domination should be removed, sufficient guarantees against national domination should be given.

We have already shown that such a guarantee is inherent in the right of self-determination up to secession, in the right of each nation to create a State of its own. This right can be exercised

only on a territorial basis. Therefore, we think that the joint State of Jews and Arabs should be composed of territorial districts possessing regional authorities of their own, being equally represented at the supreme Government institutions.

The cancellation of the colonial political and economic restrictions is to be regarded as a pre-condition of the establishment of a bi-national regime based on parity. The Ottoman law, to this day the basic law of Palestine, has to be abolished as well as all the extraordinary and "defence" regulations which were issued by the Mandatory Government. Furthermore, the existing system of property qualifications for voting should be liquidated as well as the undemocratic taxation system which is a heavy burden upon the wide masses of the people, on the one hand, and bars them from the right of voting, on the other.

Under the supervision of United Nations, democratic local institutions should be established in all regions.

In one-national regions these organs should be elected by direct democratic vote. In bi-national regions these organs should be constituted on a parity basis, but elected democratically by both Jews and Arabs. A parity Constituent Assembly, elected democratically by the two nations of Palestine, should be convened and proceed to demarcate, under a special commission elected by the September General Assembly of the United Nations, the territorial regions and work out the future constitution of Palestine.

The right to absorb immigration and to settle on the land is one of the fundamental national rights of the Jewish Yishuv. To try to deny these rights is tantamount to striking at the national independence of the Jews, since every nation has the right to choose its own way in all questions, especially more so regarding such a vital question as the admission of Jewish brethren, the remnants of the terrible destruction of the Jewish people by Fascism. Our members who were sent to Europe have, on their return, reported on the terrible plight of those pitiable remnants of Jewry that are now in the camps. We, and the Jewish Yishuv as a whole, would like you gentlemen of the Committee to visit those camps, as well, the Cyprus concentration camps and the middle-aged prisons existing in this country until this very day. After the Kishinev pogrom, 43 years ago, our national poet wrote of "Revenue such as Satan could not have"—and those that do burst through and succeed to enter the country, are thrown out with rifle fire and tear-gas and expelled to Cyprus. A girl and her dog arrived on one of the ships—the dog was granted permission to land and sent with a soldier to the girl's relatives, but the girl was thrown out. Government permits only the landing of the bodies of those immigrants which it has murdered—those that remain alive are sent away.

On the other hand, immigration should be carried out in such a way as not to strike at the right of the existing population of Palestine. Therefore, within the framework of the bi-na-

tional State, large-scale immigration can be carried out only on the basis of a development plan for the whole of Palestine, especially of the sparsely populated regions, the object of which will be the exploitation of the national resources of Palestine (oil, potash, irrigation, etc.) The development plan can be carried out with the aid of United Nations so that it will be able to ensure both the absorption of immigration by the Jews and the rising of the standard of living of the Arabs.

These fundamental principles, if applied to the solution of the problem of Palestine, will be able to create in this country the best conditions for both its peoples, avoiding the defects inherent in other plans and laying the foundations of a free national and political development of the nations of Palestine. A solution based on these lines is in agreement with the spirit of the United Nations Charter and could bring about the conversion of Palestine from a country endangering the peace of the world into a peaceful State, contributing to the strengthening of peace throughout the world, as an equal among equals within the framework of the United Nations Organization.

It has to be kept in mind that in order to carry into effect the solution of the problem of Palestine on the above-mentioned lines, a period of transition may be necessary, during which, with the aid of the above-mentioned special commission of United Nations, this settlement, which will secure the national independence of the two peoples in a free Palestine, will be carried out.

Our proposal guarantees to each people the inalienable right of secession and creation of a separate State, and therefore our proposal of territorial federalism is based not on force and compulsion but on the free will of both peoples of Palestine to unite.

The advantage of our proposal rests upon the fact that in the very structure of the federal State sufficient safeguards are provided for the sovereignty of both peoples and conditions for free association are provided. Thus there is no need of the interference of a third party. There is no danger of deadlock, since the right of secession will compel both peoples to agree. The vital interests of the two peoples of Palestine specially demand the territorial integrity of Palestine (as we have proved regarding the possibilities of development, immigration and the realization of its true independence). From all that has been said it is easy to see that this plan, the principles of which we have here expounded, embodies all the advantages of the other plans (including the partition plan), excluding their shortcomings. For whilst our proposals recognize the right of each of the peoples of Palestine, to form its own State and make use of its sovereign political rights, they do not deprive the other people of its rights and do not strike at the territorial integrity of the country, the possibilities of its development and absorption of immigration. Two conditions are imperative for the realization of this plan.

The immediate termination of the British Mandate, abolition of the foreign administration, the evacuation of all British forces and liquidation of their military bases in this country without delay.

The intention of the leaders of the British Empire at the time of the Balfour Declaration was not consideration for the needs of the Jewish people, but the creation of a national minority in the Middle East which would serve them as an excuse to fight the aspirations of national independence of the Arab nations. The strengthening and the national consolidation of the Jewish Yishuv have uncovered the unbridgeable contradiction between our people, an oppressed colonial people striving for its freedom, and the intentions of the Empire's leaders. Thus was born the struggle of national liberation of the Jewish Yishuv.

By its policy of "Divide and Rule", and the fostering of national hatred and with the help of the reactionary leadership among both peoples, imperialism has succeeded to turn the justified fight against itself into a fight between the peoples of this country. Today, though, wide sections of the Yishuv realize more clearly every day who is their real enemy. It becomes apparent that under the skies of Palestine there is no room both for a flowering and developing Jewish Yishuv and British rule. That is the source of the mass resistance movement which grew in the Yishuv. Realizing this fact, the leaders of the British Empire have started a campaign of repression against the Jewish Yishuv in order to destroy it as a national entity, as a nation. Such a campaign is aimed to destroy the economic basis of the Jewish Yishuv, strike at its political life, and undermine its morale.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Commission, I will not tire you with a description of the systematic destruction of the Yishuv's economic existence, I shall only show three examples.

1. The estimated income of the Government for the year 1947-48 is £23.5 million. Of this only 2.5 millions are from income tax, whereas 10.5 million come from taxation of the population's essential commodities.

2. The only commercial institution, seemingly a very poor one that is exempt from duties, tax or any other obligations is the British Oil Company, I.P.C., in the concession of which we read as follows: "... to carry out and establish on the territory of Palestine bureaux, pumping stations, workshops, ... means of transportation on the land, on the sea and in the air, telegraph and telephone installations ... Refineries ... Income free from any tax, duties or any other import taxes on all goods, tools. Only the company will have the right to impose postal dues, lighting dues ... on ships entering the coast of the company. To keep an armed force ... not only for the case of mutiny, disturbances, war, but also for the case of strikes and lock-outs ... " This company which fulfils no obligation whatsoever towards the State, which lets its by-products flow into the sea, to prevent the growth of any chemical industry that might compete



with I.C.I.—has in these last days obtained special permission of the Government to increase the price of kerosene by a further 9 per cent.

That the inflationary trends are caused by the Government's policy of buying in dear markets, may be proved by the fact that while the general high cost of living index is 276 points, the index of cereal prices for 1946 was 374, that of fodder 502, and of cattle for slaughter—554 points.

As we have already pointed out, the political regime intends to break the power and might of the Yishuv. Here also are a few facts:

A. Discrimination in Government employment. A Jewish supernumera policeman gets 16.688 pounds per month; the allowance for wife and child is 3.512 pounds, while the same allowance for a British policeman whose wife and child have been transferred to England is 25 pounds apart from his pay!

B. Discrimination before the law. According to regulations published in the Palestine Gazette of January the 28th, 1946—page 152, extraordinary issue No. 1470—the death penalty is incurred by any person who is a member of "... any group ... of persons, any one ... of whom has committed ... terrorist activities ...". On the other hand only two days ago the murderer of Esther Tobi (a soldier who, without any reason shot and killed a girl of 18 standing in a bus queue) was sentenced to five years imprisonment, and even this is an isolated case where the authorities were forced to find out the identity of the murderer. The case of Major Farran uncovered all the rot of the form of Government in the country, the existence of "special squads" among the police, the system under which any soldier or policeman may, without having to account for his actions decide the fate of people. The boy Rubovitz was murdered during a "voluntary investigation" by Major Farran, as exactly any inhabitant of Palestine may be arrested any day on any corner, and then murdered during "additional investigation".

During the last two days we have been witnesses to martial law and curfew in Nathanya, attempted rape of a girl by soldiers in Tel-Aviv, alarms in Jerusalem. Is it not obvious that underlying this system is the clear will to break the morale of the Yishuv?

C. All this happens at a time when death-sentences have become a daily occurrence (just now the death sentence on three youths has been confirmed, and as is noted by the "London Tribune", at a time when Kesselring, the murderer of thousands of people, had his sentence commuted; these three youths, who had tried to free prisoners, have not received a pardon.) It happens at a time when Jews, who, under tremendous difficulties and untold suffering, reach the shore of the country and are again sent to concentration camps—with tear-gas, baton-charges, and rifle fire.

These things happen following a long tradition of persecution of people because of their political views. Had it been true that all these repressive measures are being carried out in

order to stamp out terrorism, how is the persecution of people (investigations by the C.I.D., taking of fingerprints, etc.) who have nothing to do with terrorist activities to be explained, as, for instance, in the case of the leaders of the Yishuv, or of members of our organization, the Palestine Communists Union, explained?

That this tradition is one of long standing, and has been well established long before there were any acts of terrorism is evident from the fact that Miss S. Zabari, who is sitting next to me, served five years in the jails of Palestine, and our President, Meir Slomi was imprisoned for six years. In our written memorandum, submitted to the Committee, we extensively described the political regime and the legislative and executive activities of the Palestine Government.

From the aforesaid it clearly appears that any rectification of the present situation and the realization of a democratic plan can only be based upon the abolition of the dependence of Palestine upon Britain, in whatever form. This is to be achieved by fulfilling two conditions:

(a) The liquidation of the British Mandate, the withdrawal of British troops, bases, police and administrative apparatus.

(b) The international recognition of the independence of Palestine and of the right of its peoples to national self-determination up to secession (this point has been elucidated in paragraph 3 above.)

At the time the various proposals were put forward, there have been a great variety of calculations as to the supporters and opponents of those proposals. But in most cases those calculations did not materialize.

We Hebrew Communists regard ourselves as one of the most loyal champions of the Hebrew working class in Palestine. Among the working class, within the General Federation of Jewish Labour, only 60 per cent expressed themselves in favour of the "Biltmore" programme, the political programme of the Yishuv's leadership, while 40 per cent were, and are against this plan. Forty per cent of the Jewish working class, found expression at the last elections, desire a solution in the spirit of a national democratic programme, in the spirit of recognition of the neighbouring people and of alliance with the democratic forces the world over.

We do not claim that all those accept our programme as put forward to you. We only wish to stress that they all have a common basis and a common fundamental attitude to the problem.

If the recommendations of the Committee be in the spirit of what has been proposed by us in the foregoing, that will undoubtedly help to consolidate the democratic forces within the Yishuv to strengthen those who honestly seek the way towards a just and democratic solution of the problems of Palestine.

Due to the un-democratic ban of the Jewish Agency Executive upon the appearance before the Committee of the opposition parties, the Hashomer Hatzair and the Ahdut Avoda, we think that, notwithstanding the differences between our specific position, as has been ex-

pounded here, and the position of the above-mentioned parties, we did service to our common cause.

We hope that your activities will advance the solution of the problems of our much suffering country, and help our Jewish brethren, who have been driven to the verge of desperation by the Anglo-Saxon rulers of the various occupation zones, and who regard Palestine as the only place of their redemption. The Jewish Yishuv increasingly comes to see this struggle for its national independence as the decisive struggle, a question of life and existence. We are sure that in this struggle the Yishuv will be victor and not surrender, just in the same manner in which its brethren in every quarter of the world have held out through many years of persecutions and darkness, carrying forward the light and hope of freedom.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you. You have filled up all the time allotted to you, and therefore I think we shall go on to the questions and answers.

How many members are there in your Union?

Mr. PREMINGER: Nine hundred.

CHAIRMAN: Have you a paper?

Mr. PREMINGER: We have a weekly paper.

CHAIRMAN: How many copies are printed?

Mr. PREMINGER: It is printed in 3,000 copies.

CHAIRMAN: How many do you reckon your followers are—the followers of your Organization?

Mr. PREMINGER: Some thousands.

CHAIRMAN: You put forward a scheme for a federal State. The working of a federal State depends very much on the sifting out of powers between the different States and the federal Government. Which special questions had you thought would be reserved for the federal Government?

Mr. PREMINGER: All the questions of development, relations with other countries, financial questions; also the working out of a scheme of development which can enable the absorption of large grant of Jewish immigration.

CHAIRMAN: No more functions for the federal government? I mean, in the federal State you have to make up your mind which functions you will give the partition stated and which functions you will reserve for the federal Government. What I ask is, whether the functions you mentioned were the only ones you thought would be left to the federal Government?

Mr. PREMINGER: I think they are.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): In the statement we have just heard there are several places where it speaks of federation of bi-national State organization, with free and equal rights of all inhabitants up to secession. We have heard that the idea is that there will be Jewish districts, Arab districts, and mixed districts. I should like to know how could secession be materialized in mixed districts?

Mr. PREMINGER: We think the question is a broad one because there are only two possibili-

ties. The right of secession—the right of self-determination including the right of secession—is the only guarantee which can convince each of those peoples that there is no possibility of domination on behalf of the other people. So if both peoples agree to accept that guarantee and agree to live together in one united State for their own good, for their own development, because they think that the partition scheme is worse, then there is a possibility of establishing the above-mentioned federal State. But in the other case, if those elements which are opposing a common solution of the Palestine problem are on top of the peoples, there is no question that then there will be partition.

There are only two questions, two possibilities. Either both peoples will agree to live together under the guarantee of the right of secession, or there must be partition. I think it is obvious; there is no third possibility. But we think both peoples will recognize their own good. They will recognize that the partition scheme will only bring new and harder oppression than before and they will agree to accept that guarantee of the right of self-determination, including the right of secession, and will unite in one common Palestinian State.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Do I understand that you would have a referendum letting the people themselves decide whether they will live together in one bi-national State or have a partition?

Mr. PREMINGER: We think that the immediate steps which we are proposing before the Committee are, to decide in the September Assembly to abolish the Mandate, to evacuate the foreign troops and to hand over the question of Palestine to a provisional assembly elected by Jews and Arabs on a parity basis, which, with the help and assistance of a special committee elected at the above-mentioned assembly, together with the help of the United Nations, will decide all the other questions. I agree with you that the Palestine peoples will be against a solution like this. We think it is impossible to influence the power of the United Nations. We think the solution of the problems of the peoples is a matter first of all for the peoples themselves, but we hope that if the United Nations Assembly in September reaches a decision like this, it will give an opportunity to the democratic elements in both peoples to rise, strengthen their forces and to convince their peoples that it is better to decide in favour of a united State than in favour of a partition scheme, which will only bring a lot of harm, disturbances, murder, etc., for both peoples of Palestine.

CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Blom's question aimed at something else. His question was, assuming that there is going to be a State of the structure that you propose, but later on when other States want to secede, how is that going to be brought about?

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): That was my first question.

Mr. PREMINGER: I am sure that in case, after the establishment of a united State, a question

of separation should arise, then we will be in the same situation as we were in before the establishment of the united State. Then certainly both nations must decide to vote democratically within both nations; either they want to be together, or they want to be two separate States.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): My second question was how they think the first decision will be taken; whether they want to have a referendum before the United Nations decides on what form of State is to be established.

Mr. PREMINGER: If the United Nations Assembly will decide in favour of our proposals, we think the United Nations must ask the peoples themselves, and there is no doubt that then there must be elections or votes between the two peoples in Palestine. But furthermore, we are sure that such a decision of the United Nations will give the possibility to the democratic forces to rise and to convince their peoples in favour of a common solution. On the top of both nations in Palestine there have been people who were against such a solution and who were in favour either of a one-nation State or of a partition scheme; but we think that the opportunity may be given to the British Government to incite the peoples of the two countries, one against the other, the opportunity to back those reactionary leaders in both sections. We have many examples of such a backing; for instance, in the past when a mayor of Tel-Aviv was elected about twelve years ago, Mr. Chlouch, the Government decided in favour of another mayor of Tel-Aviv and they put in Mr. Rokach, and since then the Government did all it could to prevent any new elections in Tel-Aviv and aided the reactionary rulers in the Tel-Aviv Council to prevent those elections. But we think such a decision of the United Nations will help to democratize the inner life of both peoples in Palestine and will help to bring to the top those democratic forces in favour of our proposals.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands): Do you think the majority of the Jewish people, for example, will vote in another direction from the one in which they have voted now when elections such as you visualize are put through?

Mr. PREMINGER: In the last election to the largest and most important organization within the Jewish Yishuv, the Jewish Federation of Labour, the majority party, Mapai, who favours mostly now a partition scheme or a scheme of one-nation State, got only about 53 per cent of all the elections. On the other side, the opposition parties, the Hashomair Hatzair and the Ahdut Avoda, got about 40 per cent. That was the situation in Palestine before the decision of the United Nations. But I am sure that in case of such a decision, the peoples of Palestine, especially my own people, the Jewish Yishuv, must decide, and must decide either in favour of a scheme which does not give it anything but harm, as I told you before, or in favour of the possibility of establishment of a State which will grant the national independence of my own people, the Jewish Yishuv. So I think it will be possible for the democratic forces to convince

the Jewish Yishuv in favour of such a proposal as we put forward to you.

CHAIRMAN: Any more questions? Then I thank you.

We have now gone through the agenda and the hearing is adjourned. If there are going to be more public hearings it will be announced in the proper way.

The hearing is adjourned.

*The meeting adjourned at 12.20 p.m.*

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

*Held at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Beirut, Lebanon, on Tuesday 22 July 1947 at 11 a.m. Present:*

Mr. SANDSTROM, Sweden, (Chairman)  
Mr. HOOD, Australia  
Mr. RAND, Canada  
Mr. LISICKY, Czechoslovakia  
Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS, Guatemala  
Sir ABDUR RAHMAN, India  
Mr. ENTEZAM, Iran  
Mr. BLOM, Netherlands  
Mr. GARCÍA SALAZAR, Peru  
Mr. FABREGAT, Uruguay  
Mr. SIMIC, Yugoslavia

*Secretariat:*

Mr. HOO, Assistant Secretary-General  
Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES, Secretary

### Statements by the Representatives of the Arab Countries

CHAIRMAN: I declare the meeting called to order, and I call upon His Excellency, the President of the Council of Lebanon.

*(H. E. the President of the Council of Lebanon spoke in Arabic).*

CHAIRMAN: I understand that a translation has been prepared. I request that it be read.

H.E. THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF LEBANON *(translation from Arabic)*: Gentlemen, on behalf of the Lebanese Government and the other Arab Governments who have chosen to meet in Lebanon, I wish to extend to you a hearty welcome, and I sincerely hope that your brief stay among us will be very happy.

We lay before you a case in which we have borne many hardships. It is gratifying, however, to feel that the Arabs had no hand in creating this problem nor in inflicting it upon the United Nations and the rest of the world.

In passing through Lebanon, a sister State of Palestine and co-partner in the annals of history, you may have seen remnants of what in the past this country has contributed in the way of civilization and proof of its appreciation of spiritual values.

You must have observed signs of modern development in a people which has only recently begun to attempt to take an active part in one

universal civilization after it had been liberated from the fetters that had constrained its activities in the attainment of possible territory.

You have been sent by the United Nations to look into a problem that continues to be a source of anxiety in a sensitive part of the world and to find for it a proper solution in accordance with the principles laid down by the United Nations as a base for international relations. The problem may seem complicated. It may seem impossible to find a final settlement. It is in fact very simple if settled in the light of right, as no doubt you will be doing. Much has been said about the rights of the Arabs and the claims of the Zionists. The Arabs never found it necessary to invent theories to supplement their rights. It suffices them to refer to conscience for the manifestation of their unmistakable right.

We often assume the position of those free peoples who look at our case in Palestine from a distance. We try to imagine whether we could refrain from helping the Arabs of Palestine without having first ignored the democratic feelings for which we have given great sacrifices. We often stand as Jews to compare the Zionist method of pressing their claims on the basis of religious grounds and that theory of the lords of races who caused the most terrible war in history.

In passing through Lebanon, a sister State of Palestine, you must have seen remnants of what in the past this country has contributed in the way of civilization. That which you have seen was not the product of foreign funds, bringing forth artificial prosperity. In order to maintain that prosperity, artificial sustenance must be continued. What you saw was the result of the efforts of this people, who do not discriminate between individual success, but unite in constructive work as they have united in the past for the achievement of independence and sovereignty.

Gentlemen, the Arab countries which have been together for thousands of years, free from anything which marred their harmony, will not allow the imposition of a home that will menace their close relationship. They will therefore defend themselves by defending Arab Palestine and by putting an end to Zionist ambitions. Thus they will destroy the home of evil in the Middle East, will serve world peace and will prove their loyalty to the principles of human rights.

CHAIRMAN: Your Excellency, I wish to thank you for the very kind words of welcome you have directed to us.

First, I wish to thank very sincerely the representatives of all the Arab States who accepted our invitation to come here to help us solve this very difficult problem.

I now call upon His Excellency, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Lebanon.

Mr. HAMID FRANGIE (Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Lebanon) (*translation from French*): Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, the Governments of the Arab States, though convinced that there is only one solution for the Palestinian problem, namely cessation of the Mandate and independence for Palestine, and that any investigation of so obvious a question

has become unnecessary, nevertheless warmly welcomed the invitation of your Committee, as representative of the highest international authority the world has yet known.

The Governments of the Arab States are persuaded that the Committee, desirous of establishing the conditions necessary for international co-operation, as the result of its investigation will adopt recommendations in conformity with the principles of self-determination and independence consecrated by the United Nations Charter.

The Governments of the Arab States do not intend to enumerate in this Memorandum all the arguments in support of the Palestine case. They will confine themselves to drawing the Committee's attention to two main points:

1. Palestine's right to self-determination.
2. The need to maintain peace in the Middle East.

#### *I. Palestine's right to self-determination.*

When the Balfour Declaration was issued, envisaging the establishment of a Jewish national home and opening the way for Zionist immigration, the Arabs formed 93 per cent of the population of Palestine. The Declaration, which cannot in any case be considered valid as regards Arab Palestine, ignored Palestine's right to self-determination both at the time it was issued and afterwards. Later, attempts were even made to silence the Arabs and bring them to an attitude of resignation. Far from stifling their claims, these attempts had the effect of strengthening their desire for liberation and their faith in the justice of their cause.

Their struggle for independence and for the safeguarding of their rights started at the beginning of this century with the natural awakening of the Arab peoples and the movement against Ottoman domination. They took part in this liberation movement and spared no effort or sacrifice. Together with the rest of the Arabs, they rose against the Turks, fighting alongside the Allies on all the battlefields of the Middle-East, in the Hedjaz, Palestine, Syria, the Lebanon, and Iraq.

As partners of the victorious Allies in 1918, they were entitled to enjoy the freedom for which the Allies had fought. But that freedom to which they aspired and for which they had fought was denied them, for reasons irrelevant to their case. Abruptly confronted by Zionist ambitions and Allied promises to satisfy them, the Arabs of Palestine were forced to turn their struggle against the Ottoman Empire into one against their own Allies.

The Allies renounced the promises they had made to the Arabs at the beginning of their struggle for independence, imposing a mandate system which is nothing less than colonization. And the strictest of the mandates was the one applied to Palestine.

In spite of the promises made in the course of hostilities, the mandates system imposed upon all the Arab countries which had formed part of the old Ottoman Empire was applied at the same time, in all its severity, to Palestine.

Whereas by the texts of the Mandates for the Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, the Mandatory Power was under obligation to assist the mandated State and lead it towards independence, the principle of which had been recognized by Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant, the text of the Mandate for Palestine provided for the establishment of a Jewish national home and opened the door to immigration and the settlement of foreign Jews in Palestine.

The Mandate thereby distorted the normal development of Arab Palestine and deflected the natural course of its history. In the attempt to recover their lost freedom and independence, the Palestinian Arabs found themselves compelled not only to throw off the yoke of foreign control but also to struggle against the inroads of a foreign population whose ultimate aim was to relegate them to a secondary position in their own country.

Whilst the people of Iraq were casting off the heavy burden of the Mandate and Syria and the Lebanon freeing themselves from foreign occupation and gaining full independence and sovereignty, the situation in Palestine became steadily worse. Wave upon wave of Zionist immigrants streamed into the Holy Land. National liberation became nothing more than a mirage.

The origin of Palestine's troubles is to be found in two documents, which are null and valueless, although it is upon them that Zionist claims are based: the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate.

In the first of these documents, the British Government undertook to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish National Home, thereby violating the principle of self-determination and the rules of international law. At the time when the undertaking was given, Great Britain had no legal relations with Palestine, which then formed part of the Ottoman Empire. Further, the Balfour Declaration violates the undertakings given by the British Government concerning the Arabs in the letters exchanged between Sherif Hussein and Sir Henry MacMahon, recognizing Arab independence within boundaries which included Palestine. Finally, the Balfour Declaration contravened the 1918 Declaration which stated that the British Army was entering Palestine not as a conquering but as a liberating army.

As for the Mandate, it contains the same redhibitory defects as the Balfour Declaration. It also violates Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant. Whereas the Covenant states that the purpose of the Mandate is to serve the interests of the mandated territory and requires the Mandatory to lead it towards independence, the text of the Palestine Mandate envisages placing Palestine under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of a Jewish National Home.

The same article of the League of Nations Covenant provides for consultation of the inhabitants of the mandated territories. The inhabitants of Palestine were not consulted.

However, the American King-Crane Commission, which was sent to Palestine in 1919, ex-

pressed its views on the Balfour declaration in the following terms:

"For a national home for the Jewish People is not equivalent to making Palestine into a Jewish State; nor can the erection of such a Jewish State be accomplished without the gravest trespass upon the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine . . . The fact came out repeatedly in the Commission's conferences with Jewish representatives, that the Zionists looked forward to a practically complete dispossession of the present non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine by various forms of purchase . . . To subject a people so minded to unlimited Jewish immigration . . . would be a gross violation of the principles (for which the Allied Powers had fought the war).

"The Peace Conference should not shut its eyes to the fact that the anti-Zionist feeling in Palestine and Syria is intense and not lightly to be flouted. No British officer, consulted by the Commissioners, believed that the Zionist programme could be carried out except by force of arms. The officers generally thought that a force of not less than 50,000 soldiers would be required . . .

"That of itself is evidence of a strong sense of the injustice of the Zionist programme on the part of the non-Jewish populations of Palestine and Syria. Decisions requiring armies to carry them out are sometimes necessary but they are surely not gratuitously to be taken in the interests of serious injustice. For the initial claim often submitted by Zionist representatives, that they have a 'right' to Palestine, based on an occupation of 2,000 years ago, can hardly be seriously considered . . .

"It is to be remembered that the non-Jewish population of Palestine—nearly nine-tenths of the whole—is emphatically against the entire Zionist programme. The tables show that there was no one thing upon which the population of Palestine was more agreed than upon this . . . It must be believed that the meaning . . . of the complete Jewish occupation of Palestine has not been fully sensed by those who urge the extreme Zionist programme. It would intensify . . . the anti-Jewish feeling both in Palestine and in all other parts of the world which look to Palestine as the Holy Land."

The Zionists however were not satisfied with the Balfour Declaration or the Mandate, in spite of the extent to which these documents violate the sacred rights of the Arabs. They took advantage of the ambiguity of the texts in order to extinguish the very life of Arab Palestine.

Great Britain recognized the abnormal situation created by the conflicting Allied promises to the Arabs and Jews. She also recognized that in fulfilling her obligations as a Mandatory Power she came into conflict with the rights of the Arabs in their own country on the one hand, and on the other with the promises given in the Balfour Declaration, the result being to make application of that Mandate impossible. That is why she has referred the Palestine question to the United Nations.

In his concluding statement, after the failure of the last Conference on Palestine, Mr. Bevin said:

"We shall explain to the United Nations that the Mandate has proved to be unworkable in practice and that the obligations undertaken to the two communities in Palestine have proved to be irreconcilable."

That is proof that both the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate were irregular and could not provide the basis for an acceptable legal situation; and that therefore the Arabs are entitled to reject them and to regard any interpretation of either as contrary to the elementary principles of justice and implying a threat to the most cherished of rights, their right to existence.

To sum up, the right to self-determination to which the Arab people of Palestine are entitled and which they should be able to exercise, has been continually violated and is still violated today. It is none the less a natural, absolute, inalienable right, which neither force nor "fait accompli" can remove; and it consecrates the Arab claims and condemns Zionist ambitions.

The Governments of the Arab States, looking towards the democratic principles on which the United Nations was founded as the best defence and surest guarantee of that right, demand the full application of those principles in Palestine. They are convinced that the Special Committee would not envisage a solution violating that right or the principles of the United Nations.

## *II. Threats to peace in the Middle East*

The attitude of the Arab Governments and peoples to Zionism is based, secondly, upon their anxiety to maintain peace in the Middle East.

Peace there is threatened by the expansionist aims and terrorist methods of Zionism.

1. At the outset the Zionist movement was content merely to look to Palestine for a refuge. Then it demanded a National Home. Having obtained that, it sought to extend its domain and create a kind of State within the Palestinian State, with its own institutions and finances, its own economy and its own army. Now the the Zionists are planning to establish a Jewish State on Palestinian territory, a State which will take in the whole of Palestine. And even before achieving that, they are already seeking to spread further at the expense of the neighbouring Arab States.

As far back as the 1918 Peace Conference, the Zionist Organization issued a memorandum, dated 3 February 1919, officially claiming the whole of Transjordan and part of Syria and the Lebanon, up to Saïda, Jisr el-Karaon, Wadi-el-Tein and the Harmoun. In the course of negotiations which took place that same year between France and Great Britain, in their capacity of Mandatory Powers over the countries formerly belonging to the Ottoman Empire, the Zionist Organization demanded the extension of the northern frontiers of Palestine as far as the Litani River and the plains of Hauran and Jaulan in Syria.

These plans for territorial expansion have subsequently been supported in public. Every responsible Zionist leader, every Zionist doctrinaire and publicist has continually proclaimed that the boundaries of Palestine as drawn in 1919 were the "Mandate boundaries" which Zionism refuses to recognize and aims to extend considerably in the future.

Not long ago, on the occasion of the Histadruth elections at Haifa, in 1944, Mr. Ben Gurion publicly declared that the Jews who propose to settle in Palestine, by force if necessary, will not hesitate to extend the boundaries of the country, since the Jewish State demanded by the Zionists is not their movement's final goal but only a preliminary step thereto.

When at the beginning of 1946 the British Government made known its intention to recognize the independence of Transjordan within its present boundaries, Mr. Shertok told the press, on 23 January 1946, that the Jewish Agency would make every possible effort to prevent the execution of this plan and that although the Zionists had not previously opposed the Mandate over Transjordan, nevertheless they could not approve the final secession of Transjordan from Palestine.

This statement by one of the heads of the Jewish Agency was officially expressed in a note to the British Secretary of State for the Colonies protesting against the proclamation of the independence of Transjordan and stressing the fact that Transjordan, which formed part of the territory under British Mandate, could only be considered as the eastern part of Palestine.

The Zionists did not fail to reveal to your Committee their organization's real intentions as regards the boundaries of Palestine. These intentions were clearly evident from the statements made by Mr. Shertok and Rabbi Fishman, who recalled that God had promised the Jews a land stretching from the peninsula of Sinai to the Euphrates.

2. Zionism however does not content itself with mere propaganda in favour of the fulfilment of its expansionist projects at the expense of the Arab countries. Its plan involves recourse to terrorism, both in Palestine and in other countries. It is known that a secret army has been formed with a view to creating an atmosphere of tension and unrest by making attempts on the lives of representatives of the governing authority and by destroying public buildings. The assassination of Lord Moyne in Egypt, the attacks on the British Embassy at Rome, the incidents of the King David Hotel and the Officers' Club in Jerusalem, the St. John of Acre prison, the destruction of road and rail communications and the kidnapping and flogging of British officers, are all examples of the terrorists methods instituted by the Zionist organizations for the purpose of gaining possession by violence of a country which is not theirs.

This aggressive attitude, resulting from the Mandatory Power's weakness in dealing with them, will not fail to give rise in turn to the creation of similar organizations by the Arabs.



The responsibility for the disturbances which might result therefrom throughout the Middle East will rest solely with the Zionist organizations, as having been the first to use these violent tactics.

It is the hope of the Governments of the Arab States, however, that the situation of the Jewish communities in their country will not be affected thereby.

3. No State could tolerate mass immigration such as that to which Palestine is subjected. Immigration restrictions are established in all countries to protect the best interests of the country and the rights of the inhabitants. Thus the Canadian Government has just announced that it will admit only 5,000 foreign refugees to its vast territories. The Australian Government has also made known the fact that it will not permit the refugees admitted to its territory to form colonies and that they are to be distributed throughout the country in order that they may become assimilated. Similar measures have been taken in Norway and various other countries.

Your honourable Committee will surely have realized that the situation in Palestine is very unstable and contains within it the seeds of possible conflicts which may spread throughout the Middle East.

The Governments of the Arab States cannot remain indifferent to this state of affairs. The safety of their own country is at stake and this gives them the right to oppose Zionism by every means at their disposal and even makes it their duty to do so.

Moreover, Palestine has for centuries been an Arab country and its preservation as such is a prerequisite for the harmonious development of the peoples of the Middle East and for their co-operation in the work of world peace and progress.

For ethnic, cultural, political and economic reasons, Palestine is in fact an integral part of this Arab world, which is organized into sovereign States bound together by the political and economic pact of 22 March 1945. This organization of States, which subscribes to the Charter of the United Nations, fulfils, its aspirations in encouraging regional organizations and agreements.

Any breach in this union, any scission between the States of which it is composed, threatens to destroy it and to cause unrest and confusion in this particularly vulnerable part of the world.

4. The Jewish State which the Zionists are endeavouring to establish in Palestine is not moreover a viable State either from the political or from the economic point of view.

The Arab States could not, in fact, tolerate the creation of a State composed of foreign elements from so many parts, each with its own mentality, its insatiable desires, for the fulfilment of which they deliberately use violent and destructive means such as those we have mentioned.

Against a State established by violence the Arab States will be obliged to use violence; that is a legitimate right of self-defence.

Moreover, the foreign State on Arab territory

will not in any case be able to count upon the establishment of economic or any other relations with the neighbouring Arab States.

A State created under such conditions could not but be doomed to failure.

#### *Concluding remarks*

The Governments of the Arab States firmly hope that the Committee will bear these considerations in mind and endeavour to propose such a solution as may put an end to the present unrest and ensure the triumph of justice and the establishment of peace. They feel sure that this solution could only be inspired by the democratic principles on which the United Nations is founded.

The first of these principles establishes respect for the independence of the peoples and their right of self-determination.

The Arab people of Palestine demand above all their recognized liberty and sovereign independence. The Arab States unanimously grant their unreserved support in the achievement of these claims. They have already submitted definite proposals in this sense and today wish to stress once more one of these proposals because they attach the greatest importance to it and because it constitutes a basic condition which will not admit of any compromise.

This proposal consists of the necessity of stopping immediately all Jewish immigration into Palestine, of maintaining the regulations now in force with regard to land transfer and of creating, without delay, an independent Arab Government based on democratic principles.

The Governments of the Arab States are of the opinion that any plan involving partition, far from solving the Palestine dispute, would only aggravate it. Any Jewish State established in Palestine would inevitably become a centre of intrigue and a rallying-point for the Zionist forces, which are to be hurled against the Arab countries. The Governments of the Arab States will not under any circumstances agree to permit the establishment of Zionism as an autonomous State on Arab territory, towards which hundreds of thousands of foreign immigrants would stream.

They wish to state that they feel certain that the partition of Palestine and the creation of a Jewish State would result only in bloodshed and unrest throughout the entire Middle East. The proposal which the Royal Commission made in 1937 with regard to partition sufficed to provoke a national revolution which went on until the outbreak of the war. Moreover, in view of the country's geographical, economic and social conditions, no plan for partition can be feasible. This little country cannot be divided into two or three States which would feel only suspicion and hostility towards one another.

The only possible solution and the only one which would, in the opinion of the Governments of the Arab States, be capable of settling the dispute, would, as indicated in the draft submitted by the Arab delegation to the London Conference on Palestine in September 1946, be to form a free Government on the basis of proportional

representation and to grant all the Jews who have acquired Palestinian nationality through legal channels the same rights as are recognized to Arab citizens. The Arabs, who have always felt that the Jewish immigrants who had settled in Palestine since the beginning of the Mandate could not be considered Palestinian citizens, wish by these proposals to show proof of the conciliatory spirit by which they are motivated and their ardent desire to smooth out the difficulties.

The result of this arrangement could not, as certain Zionist leaders claim, be that the Jewish citizens of Palestine would fail to enjoy their full rights because of the fact that they would remain a minority. The Jewish minority in the Arab countries have never been maltreated. On the contrary, they live in perfect harmony with the majority and enjoy equal rights. From earliest times, the Arabs have never practised any discrimination between their citizens as regards race or religion, and to the Jewish community in particular they have always shown fair treatment based on the principles of justice and equality. Far from oppressing them, they have offered a refuge to those fleeing from persecution in other countries and some of them, benefiting by their recognized rights to liberty and equality have even attained the highest positions in the world of politics, administration, finance and science.

The Zionists try to justify their claims by saying that they wish to save their fellow Jews from the persecution to which they are at present subjected. Nevertheless, thanks to the victory of the democracies, there is no longer any hotbed of anti-semitism anywhere in the world. The minorities have regained their full rights and are exercising them everywhere.

As far as the problem of refugees and displaced persons is concerned, it should be dealt with apart from the Palestine problem and settled on the basis of international co-operation and solidarity. There cannot be any question of transferring these refugees to Palestine en masse. The alleviation of the sufferings of one nation must not and cannot be sought in the aggravation of the sufferings of another nation and in its annihilation.

The Governments of the Arab States could not bring this statement to a close without again expressing the hope that your Committee, taking into consideration the views we have expressed herein, will adopt the only just solution to the problem, *viz.*, recognition of the sovereign independence of Palestine and immediate discontinuation of immigration, which threatens to change

the face of the country. For any solution which does not take into account the atmosphere of Palestine, i.e., the attitude of the peoples and of the Governments of the Arab States, would be doomed to certain failure. Moreover, it would only increase the dangers which now exist and hold dire threats for the future.

CHAIRMAN: We have before us an English translation. I wonder therefore whether it is necessary to have an oral translation of this speech. Does anyone wish that it be translated?

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): No, it is not necessary for me.

CHAIRMAN: We shall dispense with the translation.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Arising out of your remark, I would like to enquire as to the exact status of these two texts. I notice at first glance that there are substantial differences between the two. Possibly we can have information as to which is to be regarded as the authentic text. May I just mention one example? In the English text I see the statement that the White Paper has, to all intents and purposes, been scrapped. So far as I can see, that statement does not reappear in the French text. That is one example.

Mr. HAMID FRANGIE (Lebanon): We apologize. We did not have time to do that very carefully, and therefore we would like to ask the Committee to consider that the French text is the correct one.

Sir ABDUR RAHMAN (India): Would it be possible for them to give us the differences so that we may correct our English copies?

CHAIRMAN: We have just been promised a modified English translation.

Mr. GARCÍA GRANADOS (Guatemala): I just noticed that there are certain differences between the French text which has been distributed to us and the text which has been read. I would therefore be very grateful if the exact text could be given to us.

CHAIRMAN: There may be certain typographical mistakes which will be corrected.

We shall do without an oral translation and shall wait until we get the correct translation into English.

Before closing this meeting I should like to say that if we find it necessary that another meeting should take place between this Committee and the representatives of the Arab States, we shall say so and we shall also say under what conditions this meeting should take place.

The meeting is closed.

*The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.*

# LIST OF HEARINGS IN PUBLIC MEETINGS BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PALESTINE

Meeting No.	Place and date of meeting	Governments and Organizations	Representatives
8	Jerusalem, 17 June	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. M. Shertok
8	Jerusalem, 17 June	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. D. Horowitz
16	Jerusalem, 4 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. D. Ben Gurion
16	Jerusalem, 4 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Rabbi J. L. Fishman
16	Jerusalem, 4 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Hr. D. Horowitz
17	Jerusalem, 6 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. F. Bernstein
17	Jerusalem, 6 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. E. Kaplan
19	Jerusalem, 7 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. D. Ben Gurion
21	Jerusalem, 8 July	—	Dr. Chaim Weizmann
21	Jerusalem, 8 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. D. Ben Gurion
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. E. Kaplan
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. D. Horowitz
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. F. Bernstein
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Rabbi J. L. Fishman
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Vaad Leumi	Mr. I. Ben-Zevie
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Vaad Leumi	Dr. M. Eliash
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Vaad Leumi	Dr. A. Katznelson
24	Jerusalem, 9 July	Vaad Leumi	Mr. D. Remez
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Vaad Leumi	Dr. M. Eliash
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Vaad Leumi	Dr. A. Katznelson
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Chief Rabbinate	Chief Rabbi Dr. I. Herzog
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Chief Rabbinate	Rabbi Ben Zion Ouziel
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Agudath Israel	Rabbi I. M. Lewin
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Agudath Israel	Rabbi A. I. Klein
26	Jerusalem, 10 July	Agudath Israel	Rabbi M. Glikman-Porush
27	Jerusalem, 11 July	Church of England	The Right Rev. W. H. Stewart
27	Jerusalem, 11 July	Church of Scotland	The Rev. W. Clark-Kerr
27	Jerusalem, 11 July	Jewish Women's Organizations of Palestine	Mrs. R. Katznelson-Rubatchov
27	Jerusalem, 11 July	Jewish Women's Organizations of Palestine	Mrs. R. Sieff
29	Jerusalem, 13 July	Communist Party of Palestine	Mr. S. Mikunis
29	Jerusalem, 13 July	Communist Party of Palestine	Dr. W. Ehrlich

Meeting No.	Place and date of meeting	Governments and Organizations	Representatives
29	Jerusalem, 13 July	Communist Party of Palestine	Mr. M. Vilner
30	Jerusalem, 14 July	Ihud (Union) Association	Dr. J. L. Magnes
30	Jerusalem, 14 July	Ihud (Union) Association	Dr. M. Rainer
32	Jerusalem, 15 July	Communist Party of Palestine	Mr. S. Mikunis
32	Jerusalem, 15 July	Communist Party of Palestine	Mr. M. Vilner
32	Jerusalem, 15 July	League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation	Dr. E. Simon
32	Jerusalem, 15 July	League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation	Mr. A. Cohen
33	Jerusalem, 16 July	Ashkenazai Jewish Community	Chief Rabbi J. H. Duschinsky
33	Jerusalem, 16 July	Ashkenazai Jewish Community	Rabbi Selig Reuben Bengis
33	Jerusalem, 16 July	General Federation of Jewish Labour (Histaerut)	Mr. Z. Rubashov
33	Jerusalem, 16 July	General Federation of Jewish Labour (Histaerut)	Mr. Lubianiker
33	Jerusalem, 16 July	General Federation of Jewish Labour (Histaerut)	Mr. Levy Shkolnik
33	Jerusalem, 16 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. M. Shertok
35	Jerusalem, 17 July	Jewish Agency for Palestine	Mr. M. Shertok
35	Jerusalem, 17 July	Palestine Communist Union	Mr. E. Preminger
38	Beirut, 22 July	Governments of Arab States	M. Riad Bey Solh (Lebanon)
38	Beirut, 22 July	Governments of Arab States	M. Hamid Frangie (Lebanon)