

VIII. PALESTINE

GENERAL REVIEW

By LOTTA LEVENSOHN¹

It was inevitable that, once the war was over, the political issue should overshadow everything else in Palestine. The White Paper promulgated by the British Mandatory Power in May 1939 had been flatly rejected as soon as its contents were known. No other course was possible when an attempt was made to impose upon the Jewish National Home a policy designed to crystallize it with a final quota of 75,000 immigrants and to confine it within the rigid territorial barriers of five per cent of the area of Palestine as far as future settlement was concerned. Not only that, but it was proposed in ten years' time to set up a Palestine State where the Jews would be a permanent minority,—a minority that would grow proportionately smaller from year to year because the Arab birthrate is double that of the Jews and more.

But, when war broke out, the struggle was left in abeyance and the Yishuv became one of His Majesty's Government's most loyal allies. Now that struggle has been resumed with all the greater intensity in view of the plight of the survivors of Nazism and Fascism in the liberated areas of Europe. And now annulment of the White Paper is not enough. Since the Mandatory Administration's policy eventuated in the White Paper after twenty-six years, the time has come for a definitive status wherein the National Home can develop and flourish according to its own potentialities, without artificial restrictions.

The first post-war conference of the World Zionist Organization, which was held in London in August 1945, endorsed the Jewish Agency's request, which had been submitted to the Mandatory Government three months previously, for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. The basic

¹ Writer and journalist, Jerusalem.

conditions for the State were laid down as full equality for all inhabitants of the country without distinction of religion or race; autonomy for all communities in religious and cultural matters; and official recognition of the Arabic language and the Arab schools.

After months of tense waiting for an official definition of policy, the apprehensions aroused by persistently pessimistic rumors were confirmed when the new Foreign Secretary, Mr. Ernest Bevin, made a statement on November 13, 1945. The new policy limited immigration to an insignificant monthly quota of 1,500, and made even that number contingent upon the consent of the Arabs, which was certain to be withheld. But a comprehensive solution of the problem was left to be worked out by an Anglo-American Inquiry Committee which was to "examine political, economic and social conditons in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and settlement . . . and the well-being of the peoples now living therein." Furthermore, the Committee was instructed to examine the position of the Jews in Europe who had been victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution; and, after obtaining the views of competent witnesses and consulting representative Arabs and Jews in Palestine, was to make recommendations to the British and American Governments for *ad interim* handling of the problems as well as for their permanent solution.

The Bevin statement was characterized by the Jewish Agency as tearing the age-old Jewish question out of its historic context and reducing it, in time, to the period of Nazi persecution; in space, to liberated Europe; and in substance to the relief of displaced individuals at a time when outbreaks in Tripoli and elsewhere had shown the position of the Jews in many countries to be more precarious than ever. The attitude of the British Government, added the Agency statement, was such as to pre-judge the findings of the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee. But for that attitude, the "more direct" participation of the United States in the solution of the Palestine problem would have been welcomed by the Jews.

Before coming to Palestine the Committee held hearings in Washington and London, and visited many of the liberated European countries in order to investigate the position of

the Jews there. After touring Europe for three weeks, the Committee decided not to submit *ad interim* recommendations because it found the problem of the European Jews and that of Palestine too closely interrelated to permit of half-way measures. In other words, almost every Jew questioned by them had asked to be sent to Palestine and only to Palestine.

The Committee spent three weeks in Palestine (March 7-28). The Jewish case was submitted by the President of the Agency, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, and his associates. The Agency's presentation was supplemented, from various angles, by numerous organizations and individuals.

Despite many forecasts to the contrary, the report of the Committee was unanimous. In view of the urgency of the problem, the Committee had been instructed to submit its report within 120 days. Publication on May 1 came well within the allotted period.

The Yishuv received the Report with mixed feelings. The rejection of the Jewish State was profoundly disappointing to the great majority, but the anti-Biltmore elements solaced themselves with the hope that the "no-Jewish, no-Arab State" dictum might pave the way eventually for a bi-national government in one form or another.

The recommendation that 100,000 refugees should be admitted to Palestine immediately was received with the utmost appreciation, though it was pointed out that this did no more than touch the fringe of the problem of the refugees. If the Mandatory still lacked the will to implement the provision for immigration, it would remain a dead letter, as under the White Paper. As for other countries of refuge, the Committee itself realized how little could be expected in that direction.

No sooner was the Report published than broad hints were thrown out in the press that it would probably be "still born," though President Truman hastened to welcome the recommendations, and in particular that applying to the admission of 100,000 refugees, which he himself had asked for the previous August. On the very day of publication, the Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Clement Attlee, declared that the 100,000 would not be admitted unless the "illegal armies," Jewish and Arab, were disbanded and their

arms surrendered. It is incomprehensible why the Arabs should be expected to disarm in order to facilitate the immigration of Jews, when they profess to be so strongly opposed to any further immigration. No reaction came from the Arab side on this point, but the Jewish Resistance Movement lost no time in giving an assurance that the peace would be kept for the admission of the 100,000, but that it was impossible to give up arms that had been used in defending Jewish settlements against recurring attacks and were still needed for the protection of the Jewish community. It has since been revealed by two American members of the Committee that it had very carefully considered whether the disbandment of the illegal armies should be made a "precondition" for the entry of 100,000 refugees, but that the proposal had been finally turned down not only because it could not be carried out, but also because it would enormously increase the risk it was intended to minimize. Mr. Attlee could not have been unaware of that discussion when he made his statement in the House of Commons.

On May 16 the British Foreign Office stated that the British Government would announce their attitude on the recommendations of the Inquiry Committee only after they had completed their consultations with the United States Government and heard the views of both Arabs and Jews. The American Government had previously made it known that their own decision would not be taken before the Jews and Arabs had been consulted.

On May 20 the Jewish Agency and the Arab Higher Committee were asked by the High Commissioner for Palestine to submit their views not later than June 20 on each of the Inquiry Committee's ten recommendations. Both parties received a similar request from the American Government through its Consul-General in Jerusalem.

At the time of writing the Jewish Agency has not yet submitted its comments, but has announced that it will soon do so. The Arab High Committee has demanded the abrogation of the Mandate, the end of Jewish immigration and land sales to Jews, the dissolution of the Jewish Agency, the establishment of an Arab democratic state in Palestine which will be a member of the Arab League, and the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Palestine.

A conference of Arab rulers called at the end of May by King Farouk of Egypt issued a communique in which it was asserted that "Palestine is an Arab country, and all Arab countries should struggle to maintain it as such." This assertion is followed by a threat (in the form of a hope) that Britain and the U. S. A. will not compel the Arab world to "retaliate," as this would imperil world peace.

So matters stand at the end of May 1946. On every hand suspicions are being voiced that further pretexts will be found for putting off the final decision. Else, why was there a delay of three weeks in asking the Jews and the Arabs for their views, and why was a whole month allowed for the submission of those views?

The Arab Boycott

On January 1, 1946 the Arab League proclaimed a boycott against "Zionist goods" made in Palestine. Though Jewish shops were cleared of their stocks and Jewish factories were kept working overtime for weeks in advance of that date by Arab customers, the authorities did nothing whatever to forestall the boycott. In fact, when the Chief Secretary was questioned at a press conference on January 2, he declared that as the government had had no official intimation of a boycott, no special action was considered necessary. By January 11, the "official intimation" had been received. The government then issued a communiqué stating its awareness of the action taken by certain States in the Middle East to exclude from their territories imports from Palestine. Since under the Mandate the Administration was responsible for the well-being of all peoples in Palestine, the High Commissioner was consulting "in regard to steps to be taken" with the Colonial Secretary. No steps whatever have been taken up to the end of May, five months after the boycott was proclaimed, though it was obviously designed to undermine the economic well-being of the Yishuv and to render it incapable of absorbing further immigration. The Yishuv has so far taken no steps to institute a counterboycott, preferring government action to its own, if in the right direction. Then, too, certain action can be taken only by the government, since violation of trade treaties is involved.

In Palestine itself the boycott seems to have been more or less reluctantly undertaken. At all events it is not being carried out very vigorously.

Transjordan

With its population of 300,000 (largely composed of Bedouin nomads) in an area about twice as large as that of Western Palestine, Transjordan became a sovereign independent State on May 25, 1946, when the Emir Abdullah was crowned king. The coronation followed the conclusion of a treaty between the United Kingdom and Transjordan whereby the latter became a British military base.

Before the treaty was signed the Jewish Agency made strong representations against the severance from Palestine of Transjordan, which was within the Mandated area though the provisions of the Jewish National Home had so far been withheld from that area. The future of Transjordan, the Agency urged, should be decided within the framework of a settlement for Palestine as a whole, especially since the severance of Transjordan might interfere with the large-scale power and irrigation schemes planned for the Jordan Valley.

Now that Transjordan is an independent State, the Arabs will have seven seats in the United Nations while the Jewish people has not a single one.

Jerusalem Mayoralty

The vexed issue of the Jerusalem Mayoralty is still unsettled. It will be recalled that the issue arose when the Arab councillors dropped out of the municipal council because after the Arab mayor died, the Jewish vice-mayor took over as acting mayor and was continuing in office. They demanded the appointment of an Arab mayor, while the Jews claimed that they were entitled, as a two-thirds majority of the population of the city, to a Jewish mayor. The government then proposed a triple rotating mayoralty, with a Christian, Moslem, and Jew holding office for one-year terms. The Arabs flatly rejected the proposal, while the

Jews accepted it with the modification that the first of the three mayors should be a Jew and that the term be prolonged to two years. Nevertheless, the government dissolved the municipal council on the ground that its proposal had been rejected by both parties, and appointed a commission of five British members in July 1945.

At the same time the Chief Justice, Sir William Fitzgerald, who commands the confidence of all sections of the population, was appointed a one-man committee of inquiry. It was understood that the British commission was a stop-gap, pending the report of the committee. The report, which is known to have been submitted months ago, has not been implemented or even published, but when two members of the municipal commission withdrew, in March, two other Britishers were appointed and also—this was an innovation—a Jewish and an Arab district officer. When pressed to publish the Chief Justice's report, the government replied that the time was not opportune for a consideration of the matter. Demands for early municipal elections were submitted to the government by the Vaad Leumi after the reconstitution of the British commission. In the meantime adequate representation of the Jewish community on the present municipal body was asked for.

Jewish-Arab Relations

The acute political tension in Palestine is hardly reflected at all in the daily contacts between Jews and Arabs. As Moshe Shertok, Head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, put it when testifying on the subject before the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee: "The first question that arises is whether the Palestinian Jew and the Palestinian Arab can live together in peace, as neighbors of equal standing, respecting each other. From this point of view the experience of Arab-Jewish relations in the Arab world is irrelevant. Jews in Arab countries are on sufferance. They accept with humility a position of subjection imposed upon them by objective circumstances. This is not the case of the Jews in Palestine. . . Experience has proved that the Palestinian Jew and the Palestinian Arab are not oil and water which will not mix; they do mix and they get along

well together, and there can be and often is good fellowship between them.

“The second question is whether Jewish growth in Palestine, i.e., their increase in numbers and spread in area precludes such peaceful relations in day-to-day life. Again the answer is, it does not.

“The third question is whether the Jewish influx on the whole, on balance, is detrimental or beneficial to the Arabs as individuals and to the Arab community as a social unit. Here there is an overwhelming balance of evidence to the credit of Jewish development.

“Jewish-Arab relations proceed on two different planes simultaneously. There is the first plane of day-to-day relations in economic and social affairs. There is, secondly, the high political plane, the plane on which the country’s ultimate future is being fought out and decided. On the first plane there is a great deal of peaceful collaboration; among orange growers, workers, settlers and villagers, even in municipalities, in mixed cities, when political conflicts do not supervene to complicate matters.”

Efforts were being constantly made on the Jewish side, Mr. Shertok pointed out, to foster the study of Arabic and of the Arab world. Arabic is taught in all Jewish secondary schools, but not a single Arab or Government school in Palestine has introduced the teaching of Hebrew. Regular courses are given for the headmen and hospitality officers of the Jewish settlements in order to facilitate intercourse with the Arab villages. A Hebrew magazine is published to acquaint the Jews with developments in the Arab world and a bulletin in Arabic to acquaint the Arabs with events in Jewish life.

An outstanding example of Jewish-Arab collaboration was seen in April 1946, when 20,000 Arab and Jewish government workers carried out a long and successful strike for higher pay and better working conditions in complete unanimity and harmony.

Appreciation of Jewish achievement in Palestine came from an unexpected source when the Emir (now King) Abdullah of Transjordan wrote the following passage in his recently published memoirs: “I was amazed when during my journey from Jenin to Lydda I saw the Jewish settle-

ments. The whole plain from Haifa to Jaffa is in their hands. They built up these sand dunes, extracted water from them, redeemed this deadly solitude, and turned it into a paradise.”

New High Commissioner

The resignation of the late Lord Gort, after only a year in office, on grounds of ill health, was met with widespread expressions of sincere regret on the part of the Yishuv. Though the general policy of the Mandatory remained unchanged during his term of office, he enjoyed great personal popularity and was believed to be out of sympathy with the views of the Middle Eastern experts whose advice weighs heavily when policy is laid down for Palestine.

Lord Gort was succeeded by Lt.-Gen. Sir Alan Cunningham, K.C.B., D.S.C., who served with distinction on the African front in the second world war. The appointment of a soldier to the post of High Commissioner was regarded as an obvious measure in the present situation, but it was recalled that some of the most popular High Commissioners (the late Lord Plumer, Sir Arthur Wauchope, and the late Lord Gort) had been soldiers.

Immigration, Authorized and Unauthorized

At the end of the war in Europe only a few thousand immigration certificates remained from the “final” White Paper quota. The Jewish Agency then applied for 100,000 new certificates, which were required for the most urgent needs of the survivors in the liberated areas. (If granted, this new allocation was to be envisaged as the beginning of the large post-war immigration). The Agency’s request was countered with an offer of 1,500 certificates from the loss of the White Paper quota,—an offer that was indignantly refused in the light of the enormous needs.

In December, when not a single certificate remained, the Agency repeated its request for 100,000 certificates. Just then 250 “illegal” immigrants who were caught when landing created a dilemma for the authorities. In previous cases of the kind, the number of certificates required had been deducted from the current quota. But now there was no

quota. The Administration admitted that an "urgent situation" had arisen, but declared that no further permits could be issued unless or until His Majesty's Government decided to continue Jewish immigration during the sessions of the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee. Soon afterwards the Palestine Administration asked the Arab Higher Committee and the Arab League to agree, on humanitarian grounds and in the interest of public security, to Jewish immigration at the rate of 1,500 a month during the Inquiry Committee's sessions. The Arabs refused in no uncertain terms, while the Jews felt bitterly outraged that the Arabs should be consulted on this vital matter.

The Government, however, overrode the Arab refusal and on January 30 announced that for "cogent reasons," Jewish immigration would be permitted to continue provisionally at the rate of 1,500 a month. As compared to the pressing need, this was a very slight concession, but it was realized that, nevertheless, a distinct breach had been made in the White Paper policy of making Jewish immigration contingent upon Arab consent. All told, 12,700 authorized Jewish immigrants entered Palestine in 1944-45. Most of the newcomers were survivors from death camps, ex-partisan fighters, men, women and children who had been in hiding, and displaced persons. A certain proportion—not a small one—was constituted of young people trained for the pioneer life and of children transferred by the Youth Aliyah.

In tragic contrast to the orderly routine of the fortunate holders of certificates was the "gate-crashing" of the unauthorized immigrants. Coming in obsolete, barely seaworthy craft of a few hundred tons, they were subject to intolerable crowding and other hardships on the journeys. Some of the groups landed without being caught by the police and military patrols, but this feat became increasingly difficult to accomplish during the year because the coasts, territorial waters, and in fact the whole Eastern Mediterranean were now patrolled by destroyers of the Royal Navy and planes of the R. A. F., all aided by a radar service. The practice of trying to stop the immigrants "at source" led to a crisis when, early in April, a shipload of 1,000 refugees was taken into police custody at the Italian port of Spezia under orders, it was reported, from the Allied Control Com-

mission. The refugees went on a hunger strike and threatened that if an attempt were made to remove them to a camp, they would scuttle the ship and commit mass suicide. They discontinued their hunger strike after five days, when Professor Harold Laski, who was in Italy at the time, promised to intercede on their behalf.

In Palestine the whole Yishuv observed April 14 as a fast day and fifteen of its leading personalities went on an indefinite hunger strike subject to permission to the Spezia refugees to sail for Palestine. Several days later the Jewish Agency was informed that "in view of the special importance attached to the case," it would be permitted to allocate certificates from the next monthly quota for the refugees at Spezia. The hunger strike was then called off, after 101 hours.

Sabotage

The many violent acts of sabotage committed by armed Jewish groups during the past year seem to fall into three categories: protests against the continuance of the White Paper policy; protection for the landing of unauthorized immigrants when interfered with by the police or the military; and raids for arms and money. There would be no point in attempting here to trace the source of the various acts to the country-wide Haganah, or to the two small extremist groups (the National Military Organization and the Stern group).

As an example of sabotage for protest purposes may be cited the blowing up of the Palestine-Egypt railway line in about 100 places on the night of October 31, which was understood to be a warning (the Bevin statement was then expected) that any pronouncement of a policy unfavorable to the Jewish cause would be met with resistance. The next day the Jewish Agency issued a statement repudiating violence as an instrument of the political struggle, but asserting that its capacity to impose restraint was being severely tried by the maintenance of a policy regarded as fatal to the future of the Jews. On November 14, the day after the Bevin statement, serious rioting broke out in Tel

Aviv, though the Yishuv as a whole was observing a day of fasting and prayer that the "evil decree" might be averted.

On December 27, the police headquarters in the heart of Jerusalem was almost wrecked by a series of heavy explosions, which involved a number of casualties. The next morning, when David Ben Gurion and Moshe Shertok, Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive and Head of its Political Department, respectively, were summoned by the High Commissioner, they dissociated the Agency completely from the murderous attacks and expressed their profound sorrow at the loss of life incurred. But, they insisted, it was difficult to appeal to the Yishuv to observe the law at a time when the Mandatory was consistently violating the law of the country embodied in the Palestine Mandate. The Anglo-American Inquiry Committee later made the following comment on that statement: "We recognize that until comparatively recently efforts were made by the Jewish Agency to curb attacks; we regret that these efforts appear to have ceased."

Among the measures taken to ensure the landing of unauthorized immigrants by sabotage were the following: blowing up of coastguard stations that had been built for the express purpose of intercepting "illegals"; the burning of many military planes in several airfields to prevent them from shadowing certain ships expected at the time; and attacks upon the radar station which kept the coastal patrols informed of the movements of the refugees' craft.

Efforts on the part of Jewish settlements to shield or shelter unauthorized immigrants gave rise to serious clashes. For example, in October 1945 several settlers were injured while trying to break through a police cordon at Kfar Giladi in Upper Galilee, where some 50 Jews had taken shelter after eluding the frontier patrols of the Lebanon. Another serious incident occurred when over 200 immigrants at the Athlit Clearance Camp were released by night by a party of armed Jews because it was understood that all or some of them were to be deported. While they were leading the refugees through the hills to Jewish settlements, there was a clash because police patrols tried to interfere.

Late in November, when two coastguard stations were blown up, attempts to trace the perpetrators were made by

a force of some ten to fifteen thousand troops, equipped with tanks and planes, who surrounded three Jewish settlements in the coastal plain. Thousands of men, women and children from the whole countryside thronged to the aid of the besieged villages to help in any way they could. At Givath Haim, when the oncoming crowd (all unarmed) disobeyed the order to halt outside the settlement, the troops opened fire. Seven young people, including a Youth Aliyah girl, fell dead, and some seventy-five others were wounded. Official communiqués alleged that the troops had opened fire only after they had been shot at. This allegation was vigorously refuted by the settlers of Givath Haim, who insisted that the crowd had not even carried sticks, and pointed out that there had been no casualties among the troops.

When the *S. S. Wingate* was expected to land some refugees on the beach near Tel Aviv last March, four young Jews were killed in an attack upon a mobile police unit so as to prevent it from intercepting the refugees. The next day the funeral of the four boys was turned into a great public demonstration in Tel Aviv. Fifty thousand people marched in a heavy downpour in the procession, which was headed by the Chairman of the Vaad Leumi, representatives of the Chief Rabbinate, the Jewish Labor Federation, and other important public bodies.

Attempts to secure money and arms by violence took the form of raids upon military camps and installations, robbery of bank messengers carrying payrolls, holdup of a train known to carry Government funds, etc. The most recent of such incidents occurred one night in May when a military camp was raided for arms by terrorists. Seven British soldiers were shot dead in their beds. This was denounced everywhere in the Yishuv as an unpardonable outrage. Several nights after the raid on the camp British troops broke into the villages of Nathanya and Beer Tuvia in reprisal, injuring civilians and damaging property. The authorities apologized for their behavior but declared that they had hitherto shown much forbearance.

The steps taken by the authorities to deal with acts of sabotage at times took forms that were the equivalent of collective punishment. Prolonged curfews of two weeks or

more inflicted serious hardships on whole communities, disrupting business, transport, social activities and cultural life. Suspects were taken into custody by the hundred and held for months without trial. Some were deported this year, as in other years, to Eritrea, though it had been ruled by the supreme court that deportation of Palestinian citizens was not legal. Emergency Defense Regulations were enacted of such severity that they were characterized by the Jewish Bar Association of Palestine as depriving the public of the fundamental rights of human beings.

Land

During the past year the restrictive land ordinances were applied with greater rigor than ever. In the zone where land may be bought subject to the approval of the High Commissioner, all applications were refused, even those supported by owners eager to sell. In the small unrestricted zone, which is the most densely settled in the country, prices rose higher and higher.

Despite all these handicaps, however, the Jewish National Fund was able to acquire 65,000 dunams, bringing its total holdings up to 813,000 dunams, or 51% of all the Jewish land in the country (1,765,000 dunams). Though the Jews form 32% of the population, they own only 6.7% of the 26,200,000 dunams of the whole area of Palestine.

A new Arab association designed to prevent sales of land to Jews was organized in 1945. This is a rival to the older Umma Fund, which was founded several years ago, and claims to have thwarted several large sales of land to Jews and to have bought 56,000 dunams that would otherwise have fallen into Jewish hands.

Agricultural Settlement

Between October 1945 and May 1946 nine new agricultural settlements were founded in Upper Galilee, the Plain of Sharon, and the Jerusalem hills, making a total of over 300, of which about two-thirds are situated on Jewish National Fund land. Some of the new points were founded by or for returning veterans and refugees. Large-scale plans

have been drawn up for the settlement of ex-servicemen and women as well as of refugees.

In connection with the cultivation of Jewish land an incident occurred at the end of February which is unprecedented in the history of Jewish colonization in Palestine. A group of twenty-four men in the new settlement of Birya in Upper Galilee were arrested en masse on suspicion of having fired at an Arab Legion camp in the neighborhood. The military occupied the compound, but nothing was done to keep the farm going. Several nights later, the roads being under curfew, 4,000 settlers and young people from the cities marched through the mountains in a storm in order to reach Birya at dawn. A camp was set up bearing streamers in English and Hebrew to the effect that their mission was work and peace. Saplings that had been uprooted were replanted, and other farm work was begun by a group of twenty left to carry on. Though the authorities had at first raised no objections, the occupation group was forcibly removed later in the day by the military. The mass trek to Birya was then repeated and another occupation group placed in charge of the farm. This time permission was given them to remain. The military occupation lasted three months. The original settlers, all very young men, were sentenced to prison terms when they admitted ownership of caches of arms found in their neighborhood, but pleaded that the weapons were intended for self-defense in an exposed area where Jewish villages had often been attacked.

Economic Developments

In presenting the report of the Anglo-Palestine Bank, Ltd. for 1945, the Chairman of its Board of Directors, Mr. L. Braudo, stated that the reconversion of Palestinian industry to a peacetime basis had been achieved more rapidly and efficiently than had been expected. Imports had been stimulated by the gradual removal of restrictions and the increasing quantities of supplies available. The rehabilitation of the citrus groves was progressing. Mixed farming continued to expand. Not only was there no unemployment in Palestine, but there was definitely a shortage of hands. But wage and price levels were still high, and the adjustment of

local prices to world levels was proceeding more slowly than had been anticipated. The economy of Palestine, however, was so resilient that the difficulties would no doubt be overcome before long.

The Anglo-Palestine Bank, which is the largest Jewish bank in Palestine, had a net profit of LP.152,000 in 1945, and increased its annual dividend from 5% to 6%. Loans and advances were doubled in 1945, according to the report.

In January 1946 about LP.90,000,000 worth of demand and time deposits were being held by the banks and credit cooperatives, an advance of LP.11,000,000 over the previous half-year, and an all-time record. (These figures are taken from the General Monthly Bulletin of Current Statistics of the Palestine Government for April 1946).

In the second half of 1945 about LP.6,580,000 of Jewish capital was brought into Palestine. A considerable part of this sum was in public funds, which can and do take greater risks for the development of the country than private capital.

In the course of the year which ended on September 30, 1945, the Jewish Agency and its chief financial organ, Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund), spent a total of LP.3,874,478 on a variety of purposes connected with the developments of the Jewish National Home. The bulk of the disbursements, LP.2,615,000, went for immigration and agricultural settlement (including provision for 12,881 immigrants and the establishment of ten new settlements, together with various loans and grants). Assistance to refugees involved an expenditure of LP.882,401 for such items as rescue and relief, training before coming to Palestine and immigrants' hostels. For the Agency's Political Department, auxiliary police, aid to soldiers and their families, recruiting, and grants to religious institutions, the expenditure amounted to LP.958,812. Over LP.250,000 was spent on housing, including LP.188,559 for loans and investments for accommodations for new immigrants. The educational system of the Yishuv received a grant of LP.116,760.

When the Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund) celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary last summer, the announcement was made that the Fund had collected over LP.18,000,000, of which 46% came from the United States. About two-thirds of the amount was spent on immigration

and settlement, and the remaining third on education, health and social services, political activities, religious needs and security arrangements.

The semi-official *Palestine Economic Review* reports the Jewish factories to be fully employed in May 1946 despite the Arab boycott, and as working on numerous overseas orders. Considerable quantities of Jewish goods were percolating through to Arab countries which officially were trying hard to keep them out.

Numerous contacts were made for the resumption of trade relations with foreign countries, and Palestine was visited by delegations of Jewish business men from Britain, the United States and other countries wishing to establish closer commercial ties with the Yishuv.

Palestine is on the eve of an industrial revolution, according to the well-informed *Palestine and Middle East*. Its factories will soon be re-equipped with new machinery, and new buildings are planned for more efficient production. Industrial areas will be developed where complementary industries will be grouped together. An investment of over LP.2,000,000 is expected to be made in industrial plants during the coming year, with new factories covering about 100,000 square meters. Striking developments are expected when the Palestine Rayon Company establishes its plant with a capital of LP.1,750,000, which will be financed equally by American Jewish interests and Jewish industrialists in Palestine and Egypt. With the arrival of many thousands of spindles ordered in the U. S. and England, the production of cotton yarn will be speeded up very considerably.

One of the major difficulties in the reconversion of industry to a peacetime footing has been the shortage of manpower. The shortage is most keenly felt in the building industry, and that just at a time where there is an acute shortage of housing. Though wages are very high, construction is expanding rapidly.

In 1945 exports from Palestine were valued at LP.20,400,000 as compared to LP.14,600,000 in 1944, an increase of 39%. The largest items were LP.6,500,000 for refined oil products, nearly LP.6,000,000 for diamonds, over LP.2,000,000 for citrus fruits, about LP.1,500,000 for potash, phosphates, chemical fertilizers and other chemicals, and

LP.1,000,000 for fashion goods and wearing apparel generally. Imports were increased by about 12%: from LP.36,000,000 to LP.40,700,000. It is believed that the adverse trade balance will be somewhat alleviated by next season's citrus exports, which are estimated at 10,000,000 cases, or double the figure for 1945-46.

A recent statistical report issued by the Histadruth (General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine) shows that out of a total body of Jewish laborers of 152,000, 113,000 were affiliated with the Histadruth at the beginning of 1945. At that time the Histadruth operated 185 industrial units. In the course of 1945 several large factories were added to its industrial sector, while some of its other enterprises were enlarged. Solel Boneh, the public works department, Tenuvah, the agricultural marketing cooperative, and Hamashbir, the central purchasing and sales cooperative, of the Histadruth, operated on an increasingly large scale.

Peace has not brought any appreciable reduction in the cost of living, which is from 250% to 300% above the pre-war levels. Wages and salaries were still tending upward in the early summer of 1946, but real earnings remained far behind nominal earnings owing to the high prices of essential commodities.

Plans are being drawn up for a Jewish mercantile marine to carry passengers and freight. (Very few craft remain from the pre-war Jewish shipping, most of which was lost in war operations). The Jewish Agency and the Histadruth have jointly formed the Tsim Palestine Navigation Company with a registered share capital of LP.500,000 which will cooperate with private interests.

A deep-sea harbor is being planned for the port of Tel Aviv, which was reopened after the war only in November last.

About 1,500 Jews are engaged in fishing, shipping, shipping repairs and as dock workers.

Fisheries have become an important source of income. Last year's Jewish catch was valued at LP.600,000. About two-thirds of the catch came from artificial ponds in some of the newer settlements where carp are bred. During the past winter great numbers of the carp died from a mysterious disease, and almost half of the 8,000 dunams of pond area had to be dried out. The economic stability of the settle-

ments involved was seriously threatened, but Hebrew University scientists were fortunately able to trace the source of the disease and to indicate an efficacious remedy.

If a scheme proposed by the Government Department of Civil Aviation is implemented, the two Jewish aviation companies, which were pioneers in this field in Palestine, will be absorbed into a company controlled or operated by the government. The Arab aviation company, which was incorporated about a year ago, but has never done any flying, is to be included in the scheme.

Education

At the suggestion of the Vaad Leumi, a Jewish Education Commission was sent to Palestine in October 1945 by the British Colonial Office. Composed of five members, the Commission was headed by Sir Arnold McNair, a noted educationalist and vice-chancellor of the University of Liverpool. There was one Jewish member, Sir Leon Simon, a leading English Zionist and Hebrew scholar. Over two months were spent on the inquiry, during which the Commission gave close study to the legal status of the Jewish educational system in the light of the Jewish demands for greater autonomy in this sphere. The Commission also studied the financial position, which is difficult because the government grant amounts to only 20% of the whole cost of maintenance, and the status of the teachers. The unusual structure of the system, with its three-party (General Zionists, Labor and Mizrahi) set-up came in for a good deal of investigation and analysis.

In 1944-45 there were over 80,000 pupils in the Jewish school system, which comprises 65 institutions. Owing to the stoppage of immigration the shortage of teachers was so acute that senior students were taken out of the teachers' colleges and sent to the classrooms.

Plans for the establishment of an undergraduate medical school in the University-Hadassah Medical Centre in Jerusalem were drawn up during the past year, and a joint campaign was launched for \$4,000,000 by Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America and the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

A French pavilion is to be built at the Hebrew University with a grant of about \$100,000 received from the French Government, which has maintained the University's Department of French Civilization since 1938.

The University was invited to send a representative to the new Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies (an official body). Professor Norman Bentwich, who holds the Weizmann Chair of International Relations at the University, was delegated for the purpose.

Cultural Activities

In the year 1944-45, 870 Hebrew books were published in Palestine, making a total since 1940 of 3,122. Original poetry looms large among the belles-lettres, and new poets frequently come to the fore. More and more scientific books were published in recent years as the requisite Hebrew terminology was developed for sciences like medicine, physics, chemistry, meteorology, navigation and geology.

Among the outstanding publications of the past year were the thirteenth volume of Ben Jehuda's monumental dictionary; the first volume of a report on the excavations at Beth She'arim, once the seat of the Sanhedrin, where a remarkable Jewish necropolis was discovered in 1939; and a Hebrew translation from the English original of *Chaim Weizmann: Builder of Zion, Statesman and Scientist*, edited by M. W. Weisgal in honor of Dr. Weizmann's seventieth birthday.

Many Hebrew translations were made from English originals, and also from the German and the Russian. Translations from the English have taken the lead since the beginning of the war.

The Palestine Symphony Orchestra had the benefit of a number of distinguished guest conductors and artists during the 1945-46 season, the most prominent of whom were the Italian conductor Molinari and the French pianist Loyonnet.

Developed by a group of young musicians during the past five years, the Palestine Folk Opera this year was greatly aided and stimulated by the American singer, Edis de Phillippe, who spent six months with them. Very successful performances, with Mme. de Phillippe participating, were given of *The Bartered Bride* and *La Bohème*.

A notable event of the season was a festival of classical music given at Kibbutz Afkim by the Jordan Valley Symphony Orchestra, which is composed of farmers, chauffeurs, teachers, and other settlers.

Shakespeare was much in evidence on the Hebrew stage during the past year. *Hamlet* in the poet Shlonsky's translation was performed by the Habima with sensational success for the first time in May, Finkel winning high praise for his interpretation of the title role. Habima also gave the première of Gogol's *Marriages* this year.

The labor troupe, Ohel, presented *The Merry Wives of Windsor* in a Hebrew performance that enjoyed very favorable criticism. Ohel also produced Shaw's *Doctor's Dilemma* as a new feature in its repertoire.

Art exhibitions were as numerous and varied as ever this year. At an all-Palestine exhibition held in Tel Aviv over 100 local painters and sculptors were represented. The Association of Painters and Sculptors is planning to build a center of its own in Tel Aviv.

The New Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts celebrated its tenth anniversary with an impressive exhibit of drawings, sculptures, metal work, graphic arts, photography, textiles and embroideries.

The Palestine Broadcasting Service, which was largely expanded under its new director, the Hon. Edwin Samuel, also celebrated its tenth anniversary this year. It is a fact worth noting that out of 60,000 receiving sets in Palestine, 45,000 are owned by Jews.

Health

With the end of the war large health projects were initiated in which provision for the care of new immigrants and tubercular cases was very marked.

The Rothschild-Hadassah-University Hospital in Jerusalem built a new wing with 70 beds for new immigrants. The Immigrant Medical Service is being reorganized and enlarged in view of imminent needs. An agreement was recently arrived at between the Jewish Agency and the

Hadassah Medical Organization, whereby Hadassah took over the administrative responsibility for the Service, and each party will contribute half of the annual budget, which for the coming year will amount to LP.40,000.

In view of the nursing shortage Hadassah will soon build an annex to the Henrietta Szold School of Nursing on Mount Scopus for 75 additional nurses. New nurses' training schools were opened in 1945 by Kuppath Holim (Workers Sick Fund) and by the Municipal-Hadassah Hospital of Tel Aviv.

Large-scale provision will finally be made for the hospitalization of tubercular patients, whose number has greatly increased with the refugee immigration. Hadassah will build a 200-bed tuberculosis hospital on Mount Scopus, and another 200-bed hospital will be built by Kuppath Holim and the Anti-Tuberculosis League of Palestine near a village in the coastal plain. Hadassah is also to inaugurate mass tuberculosis screening tests, for which four mobile X-ray units will be sent from America.

Last November a district health center for Jews and Arabs was opened at Kibbutz Amir in the malarial Huleh area by Hadassah and Kuppath Holim. The center is dedicated to the memory of the late Professor I. J. Kligler, who was Palestine's foremost malaria expert.

Social Service

The network of varied activities conducted by the Social Service Department of the Vaad Leumi in 1944-45 included nearly fifty local social service bureaus in the towns and villages. The Department's budget for central activities amounted to LP.160,000, of which LP.67,200 was contributed by the Government for relief and child feeding. The Vaad Leumi-Hadassah Child Feeding Scheme was extended to nearly 29,000 children at a cost of about LP.250,000, of which half was covered by the payments of the parents.

The Training School for Social Workers commemorated its tenth anniversary with a large conference to discuss the various problems in this field, many of them unique owing to special Palestinian conditions.

Women's International Zionist Organization

Meeting in Tel Aviv last November, the World Executive of WIZO, the Women's International Zionist Organization, adopted a budget of LP.380,000 for 1945-46 for agricultural and other vocational training for women, child welfare, rehabilitation of ex-service women and adjustment of refugees. A special building budget of LP.320,000 was approved for a children's village, hostels for women immigrants, and new housing for WIZO institutions.

The cornerstone for new and larger premises for the WIZO Baby Home was laid on December 13 in the Beth Hakerem suburb of Jerusalem by Mrs. Miriam Sacher of London, a veteran WIZO leader. The Home, to which a training school for children's nurses will be attached, will shelter 250 infants.

In retrospect it appears that, though conditions were unsettled, the Yishuv in this year as in every other, proceeded with its work and its plans as though the political problem of Palestine could not be solved otherwise than satisfactorily to its vital interests. There was no sign of a "wait and see" attitude in any sphere of activity, whether it was agriculture, industry, construction, transport, health, social service, education, or cultural aims. Expansion was envisaged for future as well as for present needs. The Anglo-American Inquiry Committee caught something of the prevailing spirit when it said: "The National Home is there. Its roots are deep in the soil of Palestine. It cannot be argued out of existence; neither can the achievements of its pioneers."

ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

By HENRY W. LEVY¹

THE publication of the Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on April 30, 1946 was the beginning of a new chapter in the long history of efforts to establish in Palestine a Jewish National Home. The present chapter begins with the ending of World War II, the liberation of some half million Jews in Europe, the findings of Earl Harrison and the request to Prime Minister Attlee by President Truman that 100,000 displaced Jews be allowed to enter Palestine at the earliest possible moment.

With the end of the war in Europe, and the liberation of the comparatively few Jews who survived Nazism, the Jewish Agency for Palestine again presented its demands to the British government for unrestricted immigration to Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state. Although the great majority of the displaced Jews expressed a desire to go to Palestine, only one thousand immigration certificates remained under the White Paper quota. With no other apparent immigration possibility, and the world's humanitarian instincts stirred by the long suffering of the European Jews, public opinion—with the exception of the Arabs—was most favorable.

On August 16, at a press conference, President Truman revealed that at the Big Three conference at Potsdam he had discussed with British—but not Russian—leaders the question of Palestine and had advocated free and open settlement of Palestine, in effect an American dissent against the British White Paper. It was the first break in the "military expediency" explanation that the State Department had used during the war whenever it was approached on the subject of Palestine. To this American policy, the Arabs threatened a "holy war" if Jewish immigration was opened.

¹ Publicity Director, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

On September 29, President Truman released the Earl Harrison report on the displaced Jews of Europe, a report that had been lying on his desk for quite some time. Along with it, he released the text of a letter written to General Eisenhower on August 30, which revealed that the President had written to Prime Minister Attlee asking Britain to open the doors of Palestine to 100,000 displaced Jews in the occupied zone, an action also urged by Earl Harrison in his report. On the same day, the President met separately with committees from both the American Jewish Committee and the Zionist Emergency Council on the subject of Palestine immigration. The Zionists declined to tell reporters what had transpired at the meeting which had been arranged for the day prior to a monster mass meeting on Palestine in New York at Madison Square Garden. The Committee delegation, urging that political considerations of Zionism not be considered at the moment, said that "the tragic events of the summer" have sharply accented the absolute need for opening the doors of Palestine to substantial further immigration. The mass meeting praised President Truman for his letters to Prime Minister Attlee and informed the British Prime Minister that "unless you act quickly and justly, an irreparable damage will be done to Britain's name and prestige in the world."

On October 18, President Truman revealed to the press that his request for Jewish immigration to Palestine was not acceptable to Prime Minister Attlee, but that the matter was still under consideration by the British government. On October 31, the President said he was still exchanging messages with Mr. Attlee. At the same time there came rumors from London of a joint Anglo-American investigation of Palestine that was finally announced on November 13 when President Truman stated that the United States had accepted Great Britain's proposal to participate in naming an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry to investigate the situation of European Jewry, and to review the Palestine problem in the light of the investigation.

In accepting the British invitation for a joint committee on November 13, the President expressed his hope of "find-

ing a solution which will be both human and just The situation faced by displaced Jews during the coming winter allows no delay in this matter.”

Appointment of Committee

In announcing the joint committee in England, Foreign Secretary Bevin outlined the terms of reference of the Inquiry Committee as follows:

To examine political, economic and social conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and settlement therein and the well-being of the peoples now living therein.

To examine the position of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution, and the practical measures taken in those countries to enable them to live free from discrimination and oppression and to make estimates of those who wish or will be impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine or other countries outside Europe.

To hear the views of competent witnesses and to consult representative Arabs and Jews on the problems of Palestine, and to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States for ad interim handling of these problems as well as for their permanent solution.

To make such other recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States as may be necessary to meet the immediate needs by remedial action in the European countries in question or by the provision of facilities for emigration to and settlement in countries outside Europe.

On the basis of his statement in the House of Commons, and in his press interview, Bevin was charged with prejudging the issue. Jewish reaction was particularly bitter to his statement that Britain never undertook to establish a

Jewish state but did undertake to establish a Jewish home, and to these words: "I am very anxious that Jews shall not in Europe overemphasize their racial position. I want the suppression of racial warfare, and therefore if the Jews, with all their sufferings, want to get too much at the head of the queue you have the danger of another anti-Semitic reaction through it all."

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the Jewish Agency, attacked the British policy as a repudiation of Great Britain's pledge to the Jewish people and condemned Secretary Bevin for his remarks about Jews getting at the head of the queue, and for drawing a distinction between a Jewish state and a Jewish home.

David Ben Gurion, chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency, charged Secretary Bevin with prejudging the issues. The Board of Deputies of British Jews expressed disappointment, while the Anglo-Jewish Association, although expressing regret that the statement fell short of promising the "speedy drastic action" required, at the same time conveyed its appreciation to the Government for its endeavors. The British Zionist Federation adopted a resolution scoring the British failure to abrogate the White Paper, and stated that it would not acquiesce in a policy which "submits the Jewish national home to racial discrimination."

The British press generally expressed approval of Bevin's statement and of the creation of an Anglo-American Inquiry Committee, although some newspapers expressed doubts on the possibility of helping displaced Jews, pointing out that their need is immediate and that the inquiry procedure would entail delay.

Leading American newspapers questioned the need for an investigation, pointing out that under the new British policy the average European Jew's chance of getting to Palestine would be slight, and interpreted the new policy as a blow to Zionist aspirations. The American Zionist Emergency Council charged that the United States had fallen into a "carefully prepared trap" by accepting the British proposal, and criticized President Truman for receding from his original position. The World Jewish Congress took exception to Secretary Bevin for drawing a distinction between Jews and

Zionists, emphasizing that the Jewish Agency has the support of all Jews. The Zionist Organization of America, at its convention in Atlantic City, Nov. 16-20, issued a declaration accusing the British Labor Government of violation of its own party pledges, charged that they were attempting to reduce Jewish Palestine to "another ghetto," and called upon the U. S. Government to insist upon the immediate entry of 100,000 Jews into Palestine and to repudiate the White Paper as delay would mean "doom" for these people. The American Council for Judaism endorsed the joint Anglo-American program, as well as Secretary Bevin's statement.

In Palestine, the new policy was sharply criticized by all segments of the Yishuv and the Hebrew press. A policy of non-cooperation with the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee on Palestine was announced, on November 30, by the World Mizrahi Organization, which at the same time asked for the resignation of Dr. Chaim Weizmann as head of the Jewish Agency, in protest against the new British policy.

On November 28, Secretary of State Byrnes announced that the Committee of Inquiry would be instructed to report within 120 days of the inception of its hearings. On the following day, President Truman announced that, in view of the new development, he no longer favored the passage of the pro-Palestine Wagner-Taft resolution in the U. S. Congress, a resolution nevertheless passed by the Senate on December 17, and the House on December 19.

On December 4, President Truman restated his stand on Palestine. He declared that although he now opposed establishment of a Jewish state, or any other sovereign state based on "religion, race or creed," he favored creation of a "democratic state" in Palestine, and still favored large scale immigration of European Jews to Palestine. The President's change of position was condemned by the Zionist Emergency Council, by the Jewish press and by the American Jewish Conference which charged him with retreating from the Democratic party's pledges.

President Truman named a six-member group on December 10 to represent the United States on the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, including Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson of Houston, Texas, chairman; Frank Aydelotte, director of the Institute for Advanced

Study at Princeton and former president of Swarthmore College; Frank W. Buxton, editor of the Boston *Herald*; O. Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina; James G. McDonald, former chairman of the Foreign Policy Association and High Commissioner of German Refugees for the League of Nations; and William Phillips, former Undersecretary of State and former Ambassador to Italy. Mr. Gardner was replaced on December 19 by Bartley C. Crum of San Francisco, formerly campaign manager for Wendell Willkie and head of the "Republicans for Roosevelt" in 1944. British appointees announced by Secretary Bevin included: Sir John E. Singleton, judge of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, chairman of the British delegation; Wilfred P. Crick, economic adviser of the Midland Bank; Richard S. Crossman, Labor member of Parliament and former assistant editor of the *New Statesman and Nation*; Sir Frederick Leggett, former deputy secretary of the Ministry of Labor and National Services; Maj. Reginald Manningham-Buller, Conservative member of Parliament, and Lord Morrison (Robert Creigmyle), Labor member of Parliament. The chairmanship of the Committee was to rotate between the British and American chairmen.

The Jewish Agency, at an extraordinary meeting of its full executive, including members from Great Britain and the United States, convened December 2 in Jerusalem, declared and reaffirmed its "uncompromising opposition to the White Paper policy whether in its original or in any other modified form." The Agency charged that the Bevin statement maintains the White Paper which "was condemned by a competent international authority as a violation of the Palestine mandate and repudiated by the British Labor Party as a breach of faith." Contending that it limits Jewish immigration into Palestine for an indefinite period and provides for consultation with "parties which have no lawful competence in the matter and which have pledged themselves to oppose any Jewish immigration," the Agency condemned the new policy as "irreconcilable" with the Balfour Declaration and the obligations imposed on the British Government by the mandate. Insisting that every Jew "impelled by material or spiritual urge to settle in Palestine" may do so

“as of right,” the Agency emphasized that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is compatible with “the full protection and the promotion of the interests of its Arab inhabitants and with the development of friendly relations with neighboring states.”

The proposed Anglo-American investigation was condemned as “unjustified” by the Arab League which contended that the Arab right to Palestine and the desire of the Palestine Arabs for self-determination and independence was beyond question. Welcoming Mr. Bevin’s assurances that the Arabs would be consulted on Palestine and for the distinction he drew between Zionists and Jews, the League insisted that with the halting of persecution of Jews in Europe, there was no reason for further admission of Jews to Palestine. The Palestine Arab Higher Committee took a more extreme stand, not only declaring that there was no necessity for an inquiry but demanding that the policy which determined it be withdrawn.

Hearings in Washington

The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine held its Washington hearings January 7–14. Principal witnesses and a digest of their testimony follows:

Earl G. Harrison, American representative on the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees who studied the position of the displaced Jews in Europe as special representative of President Truman, testified that the main solution for the Jewish survivors in the displaced persons camps lies in their quick repatriation to Palestine. He charged the Intergovernmental Committee with doing as little as possible to resettle displaced persons.

Dr. Joseph Schwartz, European director of the J. D. C., declared that the great majority of the displaced Jews in Germany and Austria must be removed at once and warned of rapidly growing demoralization if they are not evacuated. The only country which has offered quick opportunity for removal, he stated, was Palestine.

The official Zionist case was presented by Stephen S. Wise, chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council and Emanuel Neumann, vice-president of the Zion-

ist Organization of America, both of whom emphasized the political rights of the Jews to Palestine and the urgent need for mass admission of Jews from Europe. Dr. Wise underscored that the Jews are asking for 10,000 square miles in Palestine as compared with millions of square miles held by the Arab states. The Christian world, he declared, which permitted six million Jews to perish, owes the Jews a great measure of reparation.

Dr. Neumann attacking the "philanthropic" approach to the Palestine problem, declared the fundamental question to be whether the established rights of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine shall be honored. If they are, the refugee problem can be solved; if not, it remains "hopelessly insoluble," he said. He proposed—as an interim measure—the establishment of an international commission, backed by the United Nations Organization, for early large scale transfer of Jews to Palestine.

Henry Monsky, co-chairman of the American Jewish Conference, called for abrogation of the White Paper and proposed a four-point program: immediate announcement by the responsible powers of their intention to reconstruct Palestine as a "free and democratic Jewish commonwealth"; immediate abrogation of restrictions on free Jewish immigration and land purchase; vesting the Jewish Agency with full authority over immigration into Palestine and with necessary powers to upbuild the country; extension to the Agency of facilities on an intergovernmental basis to expedite large scale Jewish immigration and settlement.

Robert Szold, vice-president of the Zionist Organization of America, testified that American Jews had invested a total of \$155,000,000 in Palestine. Given proper political conditions, he said, Palestine faces a period of tremendous economic development with production for world markets.

Hayim Greenberg, leader of the American Labor Zionists, emphasized that the Histadruth, unlike most other workers organizations, would welcome an unrestricted movement of Jewish immigrants and stressed that no political entity is contemplated in which any fragment of the population of Palestine would be subjected to disabilities.

Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, president of the American

Jewish Committee, pointing out the plight of the displaced Jews, urged the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine, as recommended by President Truman. Opposing the White Paper, he emphasized its inadmissibility on the grounds: "One of the great vices in that White Paper was not that it forbade immigration into Palestine, or land acquisition; it forbade Jewish immigration and land acquisition." In line with a memorandum submitted by the American Jewish Committee, Judge Proskauer urged the Inquiry Committee to recommend the recognition of the validity of the principles of the Balfour Declaration; and to recommend establishment of a United Nations trusteeship over Palestine for the purpose of "safeguarding the Jewish settlement in and Jewish immigration into Palestine, as well as to help in preparing Palestine to become a self governing independent and democratic commonwealth."

Lessing J. Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism, opposed the demand of the Zionists for a Jewish state as well as the recommendation of other groups for large scale immigration. He asked that each of the United Nations accept a number of the total of those desiring to emigrate and that the United States admit up to the number of immigrants that were prevented from coming because of the war. He declared that Palestine would not answer the immediate needs of the Jews who desire to emigrate from Europe even if the "complex political problems were solved."

Professor Albert Einstein testified against a Jewish state, but urged that the bulk of the Jewish refugees in Europe be brought to Palestine. He charged Britain with violating the basic responsibilities undertaken in the Balfour Declaration, and stated that the administration of Palestine should be international. Difficulties between Jews and Arabs, he charged, were largely artificially created by the British whose colonial policy he alleged to be based on the principle of "divide and rule." In reply to questioning, Dr. Einstein stated that Arabs would not resist Jewish immigration if they were not incited.

Professor Philip Hitti and Dr. Khalil Totah of the Institute of Arab American Affairs maintained that Arabs fear Zionist aims and that Zionism has prevented the granting of demo-

cratic government in Palestine. A member of the British delegation replied to Dr. Totah's threat of Arab cooperation with other powers, if not satisfied by the British, as blackmail. Dr. Hitti declared that Arabs would never agree to establishment of a Jewish commonwealth and that the Zionist point of view could only be imposed on the Arabs by force. Asked if the conception of a Jewish state disappeared, whether the Arabs would oppose "the great humanitarian purpose of aiding refugees from Europe" and if the Arabs would extend a generous reception to the 100,000 displaced Jews, Prof. Hitti termed the question "hypothetical" and declared so much emotion had been stirred up, blood spilled and tension created, that "no matter how much you tell the Arabs you cannot override that background." Asked what the Arabs would consider evidence of Zionist surrender of their political ambitions in Palestine, Hitti replied, if they declared themselves as willing to be citizens of a democratic state based on the existing population with allowance for natural reproduction.

Robert Nathan, economist who conducted an economic survey in Palestine for the American Palestine Institute, claimed that Palestine can absorb 615,000 to 1,125,000 displaced Jews within the next ten years, 100,000 of them almost immediately. He attacked present governmental policy in Palestine and the lack of aggressive promotion of the country's economic life. Dr. Frank Notestein, director of the Office of Population Research at Princeton University, contradicted Nathan's claim that Palestine could absorb an immigration of 1,125,000. Stating that the Jewish "rate of fertility" is the lowest in the world, the Arab the highest, he attributed the high Arab population partly to Jewish health measures which have caused a drop in Arab mortality.

Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, assistant chief of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, testified that Palestine needs a larger population for a constructive effort from which both Jews and Arabs would benefit. Through application of modern technology, he stated, the Jewish colonies in Palestine increased their productivity per acre and per man, thus enlarging the world food supply and improving standards throughout the Middle East.

Dr. Abel Wohlman, professor of sanitary engineering at

Johns Hopkins University and chairman of the Palestine Economic Board, stated that the present 100,000 irrigated acres in Palestine, could, through the Jordan Valley Authority, be increased by 650,000 acres at a cost of less than \$200,000,000.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, representing the Christian Council on Palestine, said that Jews have a logical right to a homeland in Palestine. Emphasizing that the Jews are the only ethnic minority without a homeland, he declared that non-Jews should try to understand the increased impulse of Jews toward the security of a national home. He favored a Palestine state with a Jewish majority and maintained that a binational state could not exist without friction.

Hearings in London

The Anglo-American Committee held its London hearings from January 25 to February 1. Principal witnesses and their testimony follow:

Prof. Selig Brodetsky, president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, recommended that the Committee immediately issue an interim recommendation that all displaced Jews who wish to go to Palestine be assisted to do so and that a broader policy on Palestine be defined later. He asked that 1,000,000 Jews be admitted within the next ten years to create a numerical majority necessary for a Jewish state.

Leonard Stein, president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, stressed that Palestine is the only place to which Jews from Europe can go and that the Jews have created conditions in Palestine enabling the admission of more immigrants. He emphasized that the White Paper contradicts the Palestine mandate, and cited the fact that Palestine was promised to the Jews as a national home.

Samuel Silverman, Dr. H. Baron and Alex Easterman, testifying on behalf of the World Jewish Congress, declared that the future of the Jewish people was "greatly imperiled" by a further dispersal of Jewish survivors. The only opportunity for a revival of Jewish culture and life, they stated, "lies in the establishment of a self-governing homeland."

Sir Simon Marks, of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, testified that there are certain vital

practical problems of Jewish life with which "only a Jewish state can deal."

Leonord Montefiore, chairman of the Jewish Colonization Association, stressed that Palestine is the only country which could take in displaced Jews in large numbers.

Rabbi I. Grunfeld, speaking on behalf of the rabbinate of Great Britain, cited Jewry's historical claims to Palestine.

Rabbi Leo Baeck, former chief rabbi of Germany, stated that the Jewish state is not one of "narrow nationalistic sovereignty, but a significant human task, a moral task."

Harold Greenberg, of the Jewish Dominion League of Palestine, maintained that Palestine as a dominion would be a stabilizing factor in the Middle East.

Viscount Herbert Samuel, first High Commissioner of Palestine, urged the admission of 50,000 Jews annually; opposed partition of Palestine; urged abolition of the White Paper; and stated that there should not be any Arab immigration to Palestine. There is no antipathy, he contended, between Arab and Jew, and "if you get a political settlement at the top, the bottom people do not want to quarrel." He declared that geographical partition was impracticable and that it must be recognized that "people are first of all in Palestine as members of particular religions" and so long as that fact existed, it should be reflected in the political institutions. He advocated that the United States should share responsibility for implementing any action decided upon by the British as a result of the Committee's report.

Sir Herbert Emerson, chairman of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, testified that most of the displaced Jews want to go to Palestine. He warned against the danger of mass migrations of Jews from Poland, Rumania and Hungary unless conditions in those countries improve and more security is provided for the Jewish populations. He suggested the establishment of a restitution fund made up of unclaimed Jewish property and urged reparations rather than restitution of property.

Sir Ronald Storrs, former governor of Jerusalem, was against partition. Once "fear" of a Jewish state is eliminated, he said, Arabs and Jews will get along.

Col. Louis H. Gluckstein, of the (anti-Zionist) Jewish

Fellowship charged that the Board of Deputies of British Jews was not representative of British Jewry since it had been "captured by a Zionist caucus." He admitted that the Fellowship has only some 1,500 members.

Sir Hubert Young, former Chief of the Middle East Colonial Office, suggested a division into Arab and Jewish regions, each region to be self-governing, with representatives coming together to form a central administration.

Leopold Amery, former Colonial Secretary, suggested partition into separate Jewish and Arab states, and criticized the White Paper as a complete reversal of the pledges given by the British Government.

Major General Edward Spears, former British minister in Syria, charged that he had been forced to maintain troops in Palestine during the war, to prevent trouble from the Jews. He stated that "Zionist policy was in many cases similar to Nazism," and that the entire Arab world would "go up in flames" if a pro-Jewish solution of the Palestine problem were decided upon. In reply to questioning from an American member who said that he understood more Jews than Arabs had enlisted in the British forces, from Palestine, Spears stated that he regretted he was not in a position to say. He admitted that an anti-Jewish solution might also cause trouble, and that there were tendencies toward Nazism among the Arabs.

Thomas Reid, Labor M.P., maintained that the pro-Zionist resolutions adopted by the Labor Party are not too binding. Contending that partition was economically, militarily and morally unsound, he called for establishment before 1949 of a Palestine state with an Arab majority. Questioned regarding the possibility of a massacre of the Jewish minority in such a state, Reid stated: "You cannot prevent massacres. A small British or UNO garrison could be maintained to protect the Jews, but in any case Palestine should get its independence, and certain risks must be taken."

Philip Piratin, Communist member of Parliament, recommended termination of the Palestine mandate and establishment of an independent Palestine, but not of a Jewish state. He submitted a memorandum on behalf of the Communist Party stressing that Palestine is not a free country and therefore cannot be one of the countries to admit refugees and

declaring that the Communist Party does not believe that it would be in the interest of refugees to change their citizenship from that of a free country to that of a country with a colonial status. "We reject Zionism because it denies the possibility of solving the Jewish problem on the basis of equal rights in countries where Jews live."

Faris el Khoury, president of the Syrian state, stated that even if other countries of the world open their doors to Jewish refugees, Palestine should still refuse to admit them. "We have taken enough of them," he said. Asked whether he would oppose Jewish immigration to Palestine even if large scale improvements were made there, including the carrying out of the Lowdermilk Plan, and economic developments which would increase Arab well being, he replied, "Definitely yes. I wish to state again that we absolutely refuse Jewish immigration."

Hamid Bey Frangie, testifying for Lebanon, said that his country had been living in a state of anxiety in view of Jewish aspirations in Palestine and he said that if Palestine is made a Jewish state, his country's security will be menaced.

Emir Feisal, son of the ruler of Saudi Arabia, emphasized that there never had been difficulties between Jews and Arabs "until a religion was converted into a political movement."

Other Arab witnesses interpolated observations, including Jawat Al Ayabi, Iraq Minister at Washington; and Hamid Badami Pasha, Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Taking the stand together, and with el Khoury as spokesman, the Arab bloc rejected any solution which would favor Zionism, as well as any development of Palestine or the Middle East which would be undertaken by the Jews or on behalf of the Jews.

On January 30, with the hearings in session, High Commissioner Sir Alan Cunningham announced that the government had decided to admit 1,500 Jews to Palestine monthly for the four month period beginning January 1. The decision came despite the refusal of the Arabs to agree to further Jewish immigration. It was announced that illegal immigrants would be deducted from the quotas.

The Committee was denied permission to visit Hungary and Rumania by the Allied Control Councils in those coun-

tries. British Minister of State Philip Noel Baker stated in the House of Commons February 27 that the Soviet Union had said that the refusal of its representatives on the Allied Councils in the Balkans to allow the inquiry committee to visit those countries was motivated by the fact that the armistice terms in each case forbade religious discrimination, and that the Control Councils make certain that this rule is observed. A request made by the Committee for permission to tour the Russian zone in Germany was likewise rejected on the ground that there "was no problem."

From London to Jerusalem

The subcommittees heard testimony in Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, and Poland and received memoranda or delegations from Belgium, Hungary, Italy and Rumania. Everywhere the testimony was the same: the Jews wanted to leave, they wanted to go to Palestine, they had no stomach for the lands in which they had suffered from anti-Semitism and in most of which prejudice and suffering was still their lot. We mention only the testimony of Judge Simon H. Rifkind, advisor on Jewish affairs to Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, who urged the immediate opening of Palestine to 100,000 displaced Jews on the basis of his studies. He said that the displaced camps offered no solution; that the only thing that prevented complete demoralization was the hope of Palestine inasmuch as dispersion through Europe was impossible and nations outside of Europe could absorb only relatively few Jews.

At this time rumors began to emerge of dissension among the members of the Inquiry Committee. Don Cook, New York *Herald Tribune* correspondent reported an attitude of "arrogance and downright impoliteness" on the part of some of the members of the committee towards witnesses during the hearings in London. On February 19, a rigid censorship was clamped down on the proceedings of the committee after British co-chairman Sir John Singleton publicly rebuked Bartley Crum and Sir Frederick Leggett for views they had expressed to the press.

On February 13, the Jewish Agency announced that it had

decided to appear before the Inquiry Committee. The Arab League announced that it had abandoned its intention to boycott the Inquiry Committee, and the Palestine Arab Higher Committee that it would testify, reserving the right not to accept the Committee's findings. In a message sent to the United Nations Organization meeting in London, the Higher Committee recommended that the Inquiry Committee be broadened to include Russia, France, China and the Arab states. Their cooperation in appearing before the Inquiry Committee, the Arabs announced, carried the proviso that all exiled Palestine Arab leaders including the ex-Mufti be repatriated.

On February 26 the Arab League announced it had formed a committee to represent the Arab States in connection with the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee. Charging that the Inquiry Committee had no official character, the League maintained that by testifying before it, its viewpoint would receive wide publicity and serve as useful propaganda.

At the hearings in Cairo during the first week of March, Abdul Rahman Azzam Bey, secretary of the Arab League, testified that Arabs are opposed to the establishment of a Jewish state and to further Jewish immigration into Palestine. In a nine page memorandum, the League asked for abrogation of the British mandate over Palestine and the setting up of an independent Arab state. Opposition to Zionism was not based on religious prejudices, they maintained, but it was unjust to force the Arabs to accept into "their country" foreign people whose avowed intention is to wrest the country from its owners and occupants. Azzam Bey stated that Jews were welcome in Arab countries as long as they remained a minority. He justified the Arab boycott of Jewish made goods as part of the struggle against Jewish immigration and stated that it would be lifted only if the Zionists give up their political aspirations in Palestine. He stressed that "our Jewish cousins" have never been persecuted in Arab states, but that they "turned into something else when they went west and returned with imperialistic ideas, foreign support and pretensions of superiority."

Dr. Fedl el Jemali of the Iraq Foreign Office, delivered an attack on the principles of Zionism which he charged was

similar to Nazism in content and technique and warned that Zionism was causing increased anti-Semitism in Iraq.

The Arab Higher Committee presented a 200,000 word memorandum rejecting a bi-national state and offering "full citizenship" to the over 500,000 Jews in Palestine, provided an Arab state is established and that further immigration to Palestine is barred. The Arab Committee declared that they would refuse to consent to the continuation of limited Jewish immigration while the proposed state was being set up on the grounds that even limited immigration would encourage Zionists to believe that if they exerted more pressure they would obtain further concessions.

King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia in a written statement warned Great Britain and the United States that if they sponsored Jewish immigration into Palestine, they would risk incurring the enmity, not only of the Arabs, but of all Moslems of India and China.

A representative of the Syrian Government supported the claims of the Palestine Arabs, declaring that Syrians are in agreement with Palestine Arabs in opposing "the danger of Zionism." In Baghdad, the press was barred from the hearings. In Lebanon, Premier Riad es Solh agreed with the general Arab case. A dissenting view was expressed by Monsignor Ignatz Moubar, Archbishop of the Maronite Church in Beirut, who maintained that the Anglo-American Committee had not heard the "true voice of Lebanese public opinion" and that the Christian majority in Lebanon supports the Jewish reconstruction in Palestine but is not represented in the present Government. Sami Taha, representing Arab labor, charged that Zionism is an instrument of imperialism. Completing the Arab case, Albert Hourani and Achmed Shukeri of the Jerusalem Arab office admitted that the establishment of an Arab state in Palestine would involve "great risks" but expressed uncompromising opposition to any other solution." No solution, they maintained, was possible without the use of force. An Arab state, they contended, could be maintained with the aid of the Arab League, despite Jewish Agency or Hagana opposition. They rejected partition, creation of a bi-national state, and immediate entry of 100,000 with the future of Palestine left unsettled.

Hearings in Palestine

The Committee spent three weeks in Palestine (March 7-28). The Jewish case was presented in a sixty-page memorandum of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and by its President, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, and his associates, David Ben Gurion, chairman of the Agency Executive, and Moshe Shertok, political chief of the Agency.

The Jewish Agency asked for the establishment of a self-governing Jewish State in which all citizens, regardless of race or creed, would enjoy equal rights and all communities would control their own internal affairs. In addition to insuring the welfare of all its inhabitants, the State would have the special function of serving as the Jewish National Home and providing refuge for oppressed Jews. For these ends a Jewish majority was essential, as self-government based on an Arab majority would prevent further Jewish immigration and wreck the country's chances of rapid development. On a long view, it was suggested, the Jewish Commonwealth offered the surest basis for a stable relationship between Jewish Palestine and the Arab world.

Of the several Jewish minority groups which favor a bi-national Jewish-Arab State having some federative connection with other Middle Eastern States, only the Ihud organization gave testimony before the Inquiry Committee. Represented by Dr. J. L. Magnes and Professor Martin Buber, Ihud proposed a bi-national state based on immediate political parity and eventual numerical parity. Hashomer Hatzair (left-wing Socialist party) and Aliyah Hadesha (Central European Settler's Association), which also have alternative plans to that of the Jewish State, published their programs while the Committee was in Palestine. Though differing on the ultimate form of the Palestinian State, all the Jewish groups stood united against the White Paper policy and in demanding unhindered growth and development for the Yishuv.

The plan for a Jordan Valley Authority, which is based on the proposals of Dr. Lowdermilk, was submitted to the Inquiry Committee on behalf of the Commission on Palestine Surveys, an American body. Under this plan, the present irrigated area of 100,000 acres could be increased by over

600,000 acres at a cost, over ten years, of LP.60,000,000, to be amortized in fifty years at 3% annual interest.

In Palestine, as elsewhere, the Arab case was presented to the Inquiry Committee in a spirit hostile not only to the Jews but to the British as well. The principal Arab witness, Jemal Husseini, an extremist leader recently returned from many years' exile and head of the newly reconstituted Arab Higher Committee, threatened that there would be no peace in the Holy Land unless the attempt to set up a Jewish National Home was abandoned, the British Mandate abrogated, and a sovereign Arab State set up. Demanding that all Jewish immigration and sales of land to Jews be stopped, Husseini promised that the position of the Jews in an independent Arab Palestine would be the same as in other Arab countries. (The anti-Jewish excesses in Iraq, Tripoli and Egypt gave a point to the speaker's professions which he obviously did not intend to make at least before the Inquiry Committee). Husseini created a sensation when he told the Inquiry Committee that the Arabs of Palestine still regarded the exiled Grand Mufti of Jerusalem as their leader, even though he had collaborated with Hitler in Germany. The Arabs of Palestine, Husseini added, in order to drive the point home, had had no particular stake in the war, and the Grand Mufti had only acted in the interests of his people in the event of a German victory.

Representatives of the Anglican Church and the Arab-Christian Church testified in a decidedly anti-Zionist spirit. The Greek Catholic Bishop of Galilee, an Arab, alleged that the claim of Zionism to Palestine, which was based on the Old Testament, had become invalid because the Old Testament had been abrogated by the New and annulled by the advent of Jesus of Nazareth.

As the evidence of the government witnesses was given only *in camera*, no report on that part of the hearings is available. However, a summary of the principal political events in Palestine between 1917 and 1946, which was included in a *Survey of Palestine* prepared by the Palestine Government for the information of the Committee, was criticized by the Jewish Agency as containing numerous revealing misstatements and omissions which distorted the picture to the detriment of the Jewish case. A revised edition

of the *Survey* has since been published, but without altering the contents as a whole. The Government also submitted to the Committee a memorandum in which the proposed Jordan Valley Authority is declared to be impracticable and not of "immediate relevance to the problem of development in Palestine." These comments drew a spirited rebuttal from the American engineers who had drafted and submitted the plan.

Unexpected support for the Jewish cause came when the Kurdish and Assyrian minorities of Iraq urged favorable consideration of the Jewish claims when they submitted their own demands for independence to the Committee.

That Arab hostility to Zionism was as strong in Syria, the Lebanon, Transjordan, Iraq and Saudi Arabia as in Palestine itself, was reported by members of the Inquiry Committee who visited those countries. Though they made no public comment on the status of the Jews in Arab countries, they could not have missed the significance of the fact that representatives of the Egyptian Jews did not appear before the Inquiry Committee, or failed to note the embarrassment of the Jewish representatives in Damascus, Aleppo, and Baghdad when they gave stilted assurances that they were happy and prosperous and when they pretended to disavow Zionism.

Recommendations of Report

The 40,000 word report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, unanimously signed in Lausanne, Switzerland, on April 20, 1946, was made public in London and Washington on April 30.

The report urged that 100,000 displaced Jews of Europe be admitted to Palestine as far as possible in 1946. Although pointing out that no country, other than Palestine, was available for immediate large scale Jewish immigration, it called on the various governments to find additional homes for other uprooted Jews.

It rejected the idea of a Jewish state, declaring that Palestine should be "neither a Jewish state nor an Arab state." The report, however, denounced the White Paper policy which forbade the sale of real property to Jews as well

as the "view that there shall be no further Jewish immigration into Palestine without Arab acquiescence."

The Report declared that Christian interest in the Holy Land must be safeguarded; and recommended that Great Britain's present League of Nations mandate over Palestine be continued pending the establishment of a United Nations trusteeship. It further stated that the Committee assumed that the British government will draft a trusteeship agreement in the near future.

Regarding the position of the Jews in Europe, the Committee pointed out that as many as 500,000 "may wish or be impelled to emigrate from Europe" and in addition to the granting of 100,000 certificates for emigration to Palestine, recommended relaxation of immigration laws generally. The report asked for universal observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

The Jewish Agency, the Committee alleged, has become so powerful that its "firm refusal to cooperate in carrying out the White Paper has caused the Government now to regard it as a distinctly dangerous influence and as a force for disunity." The Hagana's strength was estimated at over 60,000. The Jewish community in Palestine was charged with not facing the problem of cooperation with the Arabs. The proposals of Hashomer Hatzair and Ihud for cooperation with the Arabs were cited as hopeful signs, however, although such examples of cooperation were said to be rare.

The Committee pointed out that Palestine has been ruled by the British Colonial Office rather than by the High Commissioner, and suggested that an effective solution cannot be accomplished by "remote control."

Upon publication of the report, President Truman expressed satisfaction that his proposal for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine had been accepted by the Committee of Inquiry. He urged that the transfer of the Jews to Palestine be handled with the greatest possible dispatch. He made no comment on the long range political aspects of the report, merely stating that they would require careful study.

Prime Minister Attlee, in a statement in the House of Commons on May 1, was emphatic in his declaration that

Britain's implementation of the report would be contingent on two conditions:

1. That the United States share the responsibility for maintaining peace in Palestine.
2. That the Jewish secret armies in Palestine be disarmed.

Saying that "it would not be possible for the government of Palestine to admit so large a body of immigrants unless and until the Jewish armies in Palestine has been disbanded and their arms surrendered," Mr. Attlee made it plain that Britain would not implement any part of the report separately, including the recommendation for the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine.

Reaction to Report

There was an almost unanimous approval of that phase of the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee report which urged the immediate immigration to Palestine of 100,000 Jews. But there were differences of opinion as to the long range solutions suggested for the future of Palestine.

Speaking for the American Zionist Emergency Council, Rabbis Silver and Wise called the recommendations on immigration "most gratifying." Of the long range recommendations, they said that the report "clearly denies Jewish historic rights and aspirations with respect to Palestine and can never be accepted by the Jewish people."

The American Jewish Committee, in a statement issued by Judge Proskauer, expressed "profound gratitude" on the results of the inquiry and declared the report "a source of satisfaction to all fair-minded and right thinking people. We believe that the recommendation for the immediate treatment of Palestine, which accord with the position consistently taken by the American Jewish Committee, should and will receive the approval of all right thinking Americans. With respect to the ultimate recommendations, there will undoubtedly be differences of opinion."

The American Jewish Conference branded the long-term recommendations as "most unrealistic and unfortunate." These recommendations, the Conference said, struck "a sharp blow" at the Jewish people and the Jewish national home,

since they "brush aside" the international obligations to establish a Jewish state in Palestine.

The American Council for Judaism hailed all the recommendations of the report which, it said, separate the humanitarian problem from the political problem for the future of Palestine. The Council expressed special gratification that the report adopted the viewpoint of the Council that Palestine should be neither a Jewish state nor Arab state.

The American press, with minor exceptions, welcomed the report, particularly the recommendation for the admission to Palestine of 100,000 European Jews. Most newspapers agreed with the Committee that the establishment of a Jewish state would not be a just solution of the problem.

The British press, however, was almost unanimous in expressing apprehension concerning the tasks laid upon the British government by the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. Comment in papers ranging from the liberal pro-Zionist *Manchester Guardian* to the conservative London *Times*, expressed the necessity for the United States to assume some of the Palestine burden. The *Guardian*, urging that "American troops be sent to Palestine," would have liked to see a definite recommendation that the United States, which has gone in for giving advice, should "share in administration as a joint trustee."

Prime Minister Attlee's stipulation in the House of Commons that 100,000 displaced Jews would be admitted to Palestine only if the illegal armies disbanded and surrendered their arms brought a storm of criticism. The entire Jewish press agreed with the *Day* that Attlee's statement was "England's newest treachery against the Jews."

Leading American newspapers were divided on their comment on the Attlee request for the American financial and military aid; some of the papers, including *The New York Times* and the New York *Herald Tribune*, agreed that America must be prepared to take action as well as give advice. Other newspapers urged the transfer of the Palestine issue to the United Nations.

Dr. Wise said that Attlee's statement "cancels in advance the entire report of the Anglo-American Committee." Bartley Crum, one of the American members of the Anglo-American Committee, said he was "deeply shocked."

On May 10, Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, told a Committee of diplomatic representatives of five Arab states that the U.S. will consult with Arab and Jewish leaders before making any definite decision on the Anglo-American report.

On May 14, James G. McDonald, one of the American members of the Inquiry Committee, said that the immigration of 100,000 Jews to Palestine must be effected promptly "if grave developments in occupied Europe and Palestine are to be forestalled." On the same day, President Truman was urged by the American Council for Judaism, in a memorandum submitted by its president, Lessing Rosenwald, to act upon the report of the Anglo-American Committee "as a whole." The Council statement said "to urge their transfer to Palestine without regard for the other recommendations would be only to give the appearance of solving the problems without actually considering the fate of the human beings who constitute that problem." Two days later, Herbert H. Lehman, former head of UNNRA, said "it would be most deplorable if there should be any delay in transferring the 100,000 displaced persons from Europe to Palestine Immediate action is called for."

On May 15, the British Government announced that it was continuing its study of the recommendations of the Anglo-American report and that it will make no statement until it has completed consultations with the United States Government and Arab and Jewish representatives. On the following day, the Anglo-Jewish Association of England urged prompt action on the unanimous recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee, particularly on the proposal for the immediate transfer of 100,000 displaced Jews. A third American member of the Anglo-American Committee spoke up against the Attlee conditions to the implementation of the Anglo-American report, when Frank W. Buxton, editor of the *Boston Herald* warned against "the impracticality of trying to disarm either the Jews or the Arabs at this time."

On May 20, the British and American governments invited the Jews and Arabs to submit their views on the Anglo-American Committee's recommendations by June 20. American organizations asked by the State Department for their views on the report were: The American Zionist Emergency Council, The American Jewish Committee, The American

Jewish Conference, The American Council for Judaism, The American Jewish Congress, Agudas Israel of America, The New Zionist Organization of America, The American League For Free Palestine, and the Institute for Arab American Affairs.

On May 24, the Palestine Arab Higher Committee flatly rejected the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee on the grounds that "only the Arabs have a right to decide on Palestine's future."

On May 28, The American Jewish Conference declined the invitation of the State Department to submit its views on the Anglo-American Committee report on the grounds that a discussion of the long-time recommendations would be "premature and harmful" and would delay the transfer of the homeless Jews of Europe to Palestine.

On June 2, the American Council for Judaism informed the State Department that it endorsed all the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, including the provision for the admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine. It stressed the imperative need of adopting the report as a whole, thereby providing a "realistic balance between contending forces."

On the same day, Dr. Silver, speaking for the American Zionist Emergency Council, announced a mass demonstration to be held at Madison Square Garden, New York, on June 12 to "make the facts available to the public and give expression to the feeling of indignation shared by the Jews of America" against the "unconscionable tactics" of the British Government and the U. S. State Department, which he charged were "designed to delay indefinitely" the fulfillment of the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee.

Dr. Judah L. Magnes, president of the Hebrew University, on June 3 while on a visit to the United States, urged immediate implementation of the Inquiry Committee recommendation that 100,000 Jews be transferred to Palestine. Also on June 3, the British Zionist Federation called for the immediate transfer of 100,000 Jews to Palestine. At a luncheon of the Jewish Dominion League on the same day, Labor and Conservative members of both Houses of Parliament united in declaring themselves in favor of Zionist ideals

and in denouncing delay in implementing the Inquiry Committee's immigration proposal.

On June 4, the American Zionist Emergency Council declined the State Department invitation to comment on the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry by declaring that "further consultations and comments appear meaningless, except to produce delay where immediate action is called for, and to confuse where the issue has long been altogether clear. The report was signed by Rabbis Silver and Wise. On June 6, eleven U. S. Senators—Tunnell of Delaware, Taft of Ohio, Wagner of New York, Pepper of Florida, Meade of New York, Wherry of Nebraska, Johnson of Colorado, Guffey of Pennsylvania, Walsh of Massachusetts, Ferguson of Michigan, and Huffman of Ohio,—speaking in the Senate, criticized the failure of the British Government and the U. S. State Department to carry out the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee that 100,000 Jews be admitted to Palestine immediately.

The gradually heightening resentment in Jewish circles against Great Britain's refusal to implement the terms of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry achieved a climatic fervor with the approach of the Madison Square Garden mass meeting on June 12. On the preceding day, the American Zionist Emergency Council and the American Jewish Conference—co-sponsors of the mass meeting—and the American Jewish Committee, in individual statements, telegraphed appeals to President Truman insisting on the immediate and unconditional transfer of 100,000 displaced Jews from Europe to Palestine. All pointed to deteriorating conditions in the assembly centers in Germany and Austria, where displaced Jews have been confined since V-E Day, warned against catastrophe if these first victims of Hitlerism are not permitted to go to Palestine, and urged the United States Government to aid in their transportation and resettlement.

On that very day, President Truman announced the appointment of a Cabinet Committee—composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury and War under the chairmanship of Mr. Byrnes—to deal with high officials of Great Britain in the matter of implementing the terms of the Anglo-American Inquiry report. This announcement of American desire to live up to the terms of the report—issued

just a day before the mass meeting and after the receipt of telegrams from the three organizations representing the majority of American Jews—recalled the fact that the President had similarly issued a major pro-Palestine statement on September 29, 1945, the day before an earlier Madison Square protest meeting and a few hours after the President had been visited by delegations from both the Zionist Emergency Council and the American Jewish Committee discussing the Palestine situation.

Bevin's Bornemouth Statement

This Presidential development, followed in less than twenty-four hours by a complete rejection of the report of the Anglo-American Inquiry by British Foreign Minister Bevin, served to accentuate the criticism of Great Britain voiced both at the mass meeting and in other sectors.

Speaking at the annual Labor party conference, in a speech which outlined British foreign policy, Bevin not only professed his inability to go along with the plans for the immigration of 100,000 Jews, but made a statement which has been generally held anti-Semitic, a statement that many have said might well have come from the mouth of Hitler himself. The British Foreign Minister said:

“Regarding the agitation in the United States, and particularly New York, for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine, I hope it will not be misunderstood in America if I say, with the purest of motives, that that was because they did not want too many of them in New York.”

Bevin advanced two reasons why he could not support the immigration of Jews into Palestine, and why he urged the Labor Conference to withdraw (which they did) a resolution then under consideration which would have placed the Labor Party once again on record as supporting Jewish immigration into Palestine. Bevin said:

In Palestine there are illegal armed forces. If we put 100,000 Jews in Palestine tomorrow, I would have to put another division of British troops there. I am not prepared to do it.

Secondly, the financial issues involved in this business are tremendous, and the British Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot carry them. Taxation in this country is at such a point that we cannot take on expenditure of another \$800,000,000 on Palestine, for that is really what is involved. It is not merely the taking of people and putting them there, . . .

The Bevin remarks were denounced in statements by Jewish organizations, including the Zionist Organization of America, the Zionist Emergency Council, the American Jewish Conference, the American Jewish Committee, and the American Jewish Congress; and by non-Jews, including Bartley C. Crum, one of the American members of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, Mayor William O'Dwyer of New York City, and members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. It was also strongly condemned in the press of New York City and elsewhere. Bevin's reference to New York was regarded as "a coarse bit of anti-Semitic vulgarity" and his statement about the necessity of additional British troops in Palestine was called "utterly misleading." Many pointed to the inhumanity of the policy suggested by the British Foreign Minister, if carried out.

The Bevin statement had the effect of dramatically focusing anew world attention on the Palestine problem. On June 14, at a press conference, President Truman announced that the United States is still urging admission into Palestine of the 100,000 homeless, displaced Jews of Europe. When asked about Foreign Minister Bevin's statement, the President declined to comment on it.

Meanwhile in London the British Foreign Office disavowed any British unwillingness to carry out the Anglo-American Committee's recommendations for Palestine despite indications to the contrary by Foreign Minister Bevin. An official communiqué welcomed President Truman's formation of a Cabinet Committee for Palestine and Related Problems. It announced the formation of a similar British committee.

The British Foreign Office spokesman said that Mr. Bevin's remarks should not be construed as indicating any unwillingness to implement the Inquiry Committee's recommendations. He said that the communiqué was "a useful corrective

to suggestions in the United States that Mr. Bevin suggested he did not mean to carry out recommendations of the report." In issuing an official text of Mr. Bevin's address, which did not vary materially from published newspaper versions, the Foreign Office spokesman said that Bevin's remarks about New York were "made jestingly as an aside."

Other developments were a statement made in London by Ben Gurion, Palestinian Zionist leader, and a statement made in Syria by the Council of the Arab League.

Ben Gurion, answering Bevin point by point, called Bevin's request to the Jews to have patience "cruel mockery." He said that Bevin's estimates of financial cost of immigration of Jews was greatly exaggerated and, in any case, "the British taxpayer did not contribute a penny toward the settlement of Jews in Palestine, nor is he asked to spend a farthing now." Answering Bevin's statement that immigration of Jews would necessitate the sending of more British troops to Palestine, Ben Gurion said: "I venture to suggest, on the strength of expert military advice, that more military forces on land, sea and air are used now to prevent Jews from coming to Palestine than may be required in the case of their admission."

In Syria, the Council of the Arab League served notice on the United States that it refused to recognize the right of the United States to intervene in Palestinian affairs and at the same time requested the British to enter into bi-lateral negotiation with the Arabs on the Palestine question. Abdul Rahman Azzam, secretary general of the League, said that if Britain insisted on consulting with the Jews and the United States that the Palestine case would be submitted to the United Nations General Assembly.

It was in this atmosphere of actual tension in Palestine, and diplomatic uncertainties in London and Washington, that the Palestine situation stood on June 15th, 288 days after President Truman first asked Prime Minister Attlee to admit 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine, 214 days after the announcement of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry, and 46 days after the report of the Committee of Inquiry urging the immediate immigration to Palestine of 100,000 displaced Jews.