1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 IN RE: CV-96-4849 (ERK) HOLOCAUST VICTIM ASSETS 5 November 29, 1999 6 Brooklyn, New York 10 TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR FAIRNESS HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. KORMAN 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12 APPEARANCES: 13 For the Plaintiff: ELIZABETH CABRASER, ESO. MORRIS RATNER, ESQ. 14 LISA LEEBOW, ESQ. IRWIN LEVIN, ESQ. 15 RICHARD SHEVITZ, ESQ. WILLIAM MARKS, ESQ. 16 BARRY FISHER, ESQ. ROBERT SWIFT, ESQ. 17 DENIS SHIELDS, ESQ. STEPHEN WHINSTON, ESQ. 18 MELVYN WEISS, ESQ. DEBORAH STRENAM, ESQ. 19 STANELY CHESLEY, ESQ. PAUL DEMARCO, ESQ. 20 JEANNE GEOPPINGER, ESQ. MARTIN MENDELSOHN, ESQ. 21 MICHAEL HAUSFELD, ESQ. MEL URBACH, ESQ. 22 EDWARD FAGAN, ESQ. 23 For the Defendant: ROGER WITTEN, ESQ. CAROL CLAYTON, ESQ. PETER CALAMARI, ESQ. PETER WIDMER, ESQ.

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK					
2						
3						
4						
5		or .				
6	Audio	Operator:	43	LOURDES VAZ	OUEZ	
7	Indus	oporacor.		BENARDETTE DAWN WITKOW	McEVOY	
8			e e	JANET HAMIL		,
9				1.3		
10	Court	Transcriber:		ROSALIE LOMBARDI		
11				2348 83rd S Brooklyn, N	treet	11214
12				(718) 266-1	590	
13				*		
14		*				
15						
16						
17						
18						
19			, .			
20		¥				
21			*			
22						
23						
24						
25	Procee	edings recorde cript produced	d by elec	ctronic soun scription se	d record	ding,



THE CLERK: In Re: Holocaust Victim Assets, fairness hearing.

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. When I usually preside over proceedings in this courtroom, it's full of immigrants who are about to take the oath of citizenship, and I always begin by saying that it's an honor and privilege to be able to preside over such a ceremony.

It is equally an honor, and privilege for me to have participated in this case and to be here this morning to listen to you and to hear your views about the settlement of what has been known as the Swiss Bank cases.

The settlement is for approximately 1.25 billion dollars, in addition to a 250-million-dollar humanitarian fund that was created by the Swiss banks, in addition to hundreds of millions of dollars that have been expended so far to locate the bank accounts in Switzerland.

We're going to first hear opening statements from Counsel, and then I will listen to everyone who has signed up to speak. We'll give everyone ten minutes. We'll continue for as long as we can and if need be, we'll continue tomorrow.

Mr. Ratner?

MR. RATNER: Your Honor, Special Master Gribetz, class members, may it please the Court. I am Morris Ratner from Lief, Cabraser, Hemen and Bernstein (ph), one of settlement class counsel for plaintiffs in this case.

With me are many settlement class counsel, who have worked on this case for years, who are ceding their time this morning and not speaking in opening comments, so that class members, yourselves, who have traveled from all over the world to be here today and speak to the Court, can have an opportunity to be heard.

Included among those settlement class counsel are my partner Elizabeth Cabraser, Mel Weiss from Milberg, Weiss, Michael Hausfeld from Cohen, Milstein in Washington, D.C., Steven Winston from Berger and Monteig (ph) in Philadelphia, Mel Urbach, attorney Ed Fagan from Fagan and Devino (ph), Irwin Levin and Richard Schevitz from Cohen and Malad (ph), Barry Fisher, an attorney from California, and Martin Mendelsohn from Washington D.C.

Other settlement class counsel will be speaking today, including Burt Neuborne, lead settlement class counsel, who will actually wait, and Bob Swift, who is another one of settlement class



counsel.

This litigation was commenced in 1996. It was a hard fight. In March of 1999, a 1.25-billion-dollar settlement agreement was reached and preliminarily approved by this Court. The Court approved a worldwide notice program of unprecedented scope in May of this year. That program commenced in June.

With us here today are the four courtappointed notice administrators who ran the notice program, including Jane Menard (ph) from Poorman Douglas (ph) Corporation, Todd Hilsey (ph) from Hilsoft (ph), Kathy Concella (ph) from Concella Communications and Jerry Benjamin from AB Data.

We had a five-pronged notice program, in which we reached millions of class members worldwide. First we published notice in more than 25 languages, in publications throughout the world. The notice described the terms of the settlement agreement and also contained an initial questionnaire for interested class members to complete, to provide information about themselves and their claims.

Second, we mailed notice to more than 1.5 million persons, many of whom requested the notice after reading the published notice in newspapers

worldwide. Notice was published and mailed in more than 48 countries.

Third, we ran an earned media campaign.

That is, we attempted to generate free media and get newspaper stories in local publications and national publications worldwide. We have counted more than 1,300 such stories since the notice program commenced.

Fourth, we had an internet site, at which the settlement agreement could be accessed, and which was visited more than 330,000 times.

Fifth, and perhaps most uniquely in this case, we had a worldwide community outreach program, in which more than 3,900 organizations worldwide participated, actively going out to people's homes and places of worship, to reach the class members directly where they lived, to tell them about the proposed settlement, to give them an opportunity to comment and to give them initial questionnaires to complete.

On October 22, 1999, all persons who had comments or objections to the settlement were to have submitted written comments. Initial questionnaires completed by class members were not due on that date, but many were received by that date.



The Court is familiar with many of these statistics because of reports that we have filed. I am presenting this morning updated statistics, since we continue to receive comments and initial questionnaires.

To date, more than 450,000 initial questionnaires have been received from class members worldwide, indicating an interest in the settlement. And although several or some portion that we have yet to calculate of those persons are not class members, but merely people who wish to be class members but are not in the definition of the settlement classes, it indicates a widespread, worldwide interest in the proposed settlement.

In contrast, we have received to date only approximately 200 comments and objections in writing on the proposed settlement. Roughly half of those are from persons who are not settlement class members, not covered by the settlement, but wish that the settlement classes be expanded to include them. In addition, approximately 360 persons have asked to be excluded from the settlement classes. And again, many of those are not settlement class members. The statistics speak for themselves; support for the settlement is widespread.

I will now defer to my co-counsel, Bob Swift, after which we will hear from additional speakers, who will be using plaintiff's counsel's time slot.

MR. SWIFT: Your Honor, I apologize for having my back to you, and good morning, guests.

Messers Fagan, Witty (ph), Marks and myself together represent over 50,000 survivors and heirs, most of whom are class members in this litigation. They wholeheartedly support and endorse this settlement, with the exception of three persons who are objectors. From the tremendous response and the return of questionnaires, we see the overwhelming support for the settlement and the great good that this settlement can accomplish.

Of course, this settlement was not intended to and cannot be the sole source of compensation for financial abuses that occurred during World War II. 1.25 billion dollars is a substantial amount of money, but it can't approach the totality of financial harm that was visited during World War II.

Other litigation may provide that additional compensation for some class members and mostly non-class members. The Austrian Bank



2.2

settlement will provide some. More likely, the negotiations currently ongoing with Germany may provide fuller compensation for slave-enforced labors.

Had we not settled this case, survivors and their heirs were in jeopardy of receiving nothing. The central issue in the litigation was whether these Swiss banks had aided and abetted German financial abuses during World War II. As a quasi-human rights case, it presented many issues of first impression through our courts. And make no mistake: the human rights jurisprudence in this country and the world is still in its incipiency.

Swiss banking secrecy and Swiss court aversion to U.S. discovery methods posed enormous obstacles to obtaining sufficient evidence. The destruction of documents during the war and the dislocation and loss of life prevent many survivors and heirs from coming forward today with very specific information.

This settlement was highly difficult and at times tortuous. There are widely divergent views on the quantification of damages and the settlement amount between the plaintiffs and the defendants.

The settlement terms took 14 months of hard

2.4

bargaining, but fortunately there was the act of intervention of the United States, through Stuart Eisenstadt, then Deputy Secretary of State, the U.S. Congress, through Senator D'Amato, and finally this Court.

Though adversarial, the defendants and their counsel are to be commended for their professionalism and an enlightened approach to resolving this case.

Your Honor, on behalf of my clients and as a participant in this process, I commend this settlement to you as fair, reasonable and adequate.

MR. RATNER: Your Honor, if I may, the next speaker will be Stan Chesley, who is one of settlement class counsel.

MR. CHESLEY: May it please the Court,

Counsel, ladies and gentlemen. I am very honored to

be here today. My name is Stanley Chesley of the

firm of Wade, Schneider, Belos and Chesley (ph), in

Cincinnati, Ohio. Members of my firm who are with me

today and who have been working on this are Paul

Demarco and Jeanne Geoppinger.

We have been honored to represent the World Jewish Restitution Organization, which is an umbrella organization consisting of the following



2.1

organizations, who are supportive of this settlement.

The WJRO was founded in 1992 and the founding constituent organizations include the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, which is known as the Claims Conference, and the Executive Director is here, Gideon Taylor, who you will hear from.

Jewish Agency for Israel. Most of you are familiar with the Jewish Agency, which is the quasi-government agency that is involved in the total wellbeing, safety, education and welfare and human services for the citizens of the State of Israel.

The World Zionist Organization, the World Jewish Congress and the Secretary General of the World Jewish Congress, Israel Singer, is here today and you will hear from him, and he is also the Executive Director of the WJRO.

The American Jewish Joint Distribution

Committee. Many of you here in the audience know of them as The Joint. There isn't anybody in the Jewish world who has not heard of The Joint.

Bene B'rith (ph) International, American

Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, and we are

honored that Roman Kent, Chairman of the Board of the

American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors is

here today and will speak to you for a few moments, in support of the settlement.

Center of Organizations of Holocaust
Survivors in Israel, a good Israel organization which
has joined and you will hear. They are a party in
the Israel government and you will hear from Benjamin
Fischoff, who is the Chairman of the World Haggudeth
(ph) Israel, who will speak to you.

Additionally, the European Jewish communities are part of the WJRO and you will also hear from Wolf Factor, Chairman of the Board, Foundation for Benefit of Holocaust victims in Israel, who is here, who has just come from Israel.

World Jewish Restitution Organization, your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, was founded in 1992, the organizations I've read to you. The purpose was to centralize and coordinate efforts to recover Jewish assets of individuals, communities and organizations who became victims of national socialist rule and of the Holocaust.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, your Honor, that I am here today in support of this settlement, and I appreciate, your Honor, the opportunity to be one of the class counsel. I compliment everybody that has been involved in this



case and I join with Mr. Swift in complimenting the defendants.

In every litigation that I've ever been in, some almost 40 years, there is very, very strong adversity and fighting and conflict, and the issue is to try and resolve. Once a settlement is resolved, after hard bargaining, then we work together with the defendants. And I compliment the counsel for the defendants and the defendants in this endeavor.

Your Honor, I submit to you that this settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate and is a very, very important step forward in the issue of reparations. Your Honor, at this time, I would introduce Gideon Taylor and Israel Singer. Thank you, your Honor -- and the three persons I mentioned.

MR. TAYLOR: Judge Korman, Special Master Gribetz and members of the class and class counsel. We just felt it would be important for the record to mention a few words of the history of the involvement of the organized Jewish community in the negotiations leading to the settlement, for the record, for this Court and for the information and knowledge of class members.

The current round of negotiations involving the World Jewish Restitution Organization

were initiated between the Swiss Bankers Association and the WJRO, as it's known, in September of 1995.

At the urging of the WJRO, Senator Alfonse D'Amato called a hearing of the Senate Banking Committee in April of 1996, following on a report that was originally released by the Swiss Bankers Association regarding dormant accounts.

Over the period of these discussions and negotiations, the WJRO released numerous historical documents to the press and for the information of the public. Letters of support and encouragement were received from the President of the United States and from many members of the administration and Congress of the United States.

Following on the Senate hearings, on May 2nd, 1996, the Swiss Bankers Association and the WJRO established what became known as the Volker Commission, which was charged with the auditing of dormant Swiss bank accounts.

Thereafter, in November of 1996, at the request of WJRO, the Chairman of the House Banking Committee, Congressman James Leech (ph), held additional hearings on the question of Jewish assets deposited in Swiss banks. Subsequent discussions with the Swiss side led, in February of 1997, to the



17.

establishment of the Swiss humanitarian fund for victims of the Holocaust.

In early 1997, representatives of WJRO met once again with Alan Hevessey (ph), Controller of the City of New York, who subsequently established an ad hoc committee, composed of approximately 800 public finance officers from across the country, to assess and to monitor progress by the Swiss banks on these issues.

In addition, the report of the task force of the United States government shared by current Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Stuart Eisenstadt, in May, 1997, at the international conference on Nazi gold held in London in December of that year, with the involvement of WJRO, highlighted the issue of gold from Nazi victims that was transferred through Switzerland.

Finally, in the lead-up to the conclusion of the discussions of this settlement, at the request of the President of WJRO, the Hevessey Committee agreed to place a moratorium on sanctions that had been planned at that time. This led to a series of negotiations, first chaired by Deputy Secretary Stuart Eisenstadt and then under the auspices of Judge Korman in this Court.

Thank you.

This finally led to the settlement that is before the Court, and following the settlement, the WJRO sought and received the endorsement for the settlement of the many Jewish organizations who subsequently endorsed the settlement and whose signatures are appended to the settlement agreement.

MR. CHESLEY: Your Honor, I think I mentioned that Israel Singer is the Executive Director of the Claims Conference. If I omitted that, I meant to.

MR. SINGER: May it please the Court, ladies and gentlemen, your Honor, my name is Israel Singer. Thank you very much pro bono Counsel Chesley.

Colleagues, Holocaust survivors, friends,
I speak here today in support of the settlement, with
a heavy heart and with concern. There is no
settlement which is sufficient. That has already
been said. And the settlement which is not
sufficient morally is not one which we are dealing
with at this moment. We're dealing with the monetary
aspects, the material aspects of the settlement that
we are dealing with here today.

I'd like to thank particularly Judge



Korman and the Master Mr. Gribetz for making it possible today to deal with a specific aspect of a very, very difficult case.

We asked from the very outset that two issues be resolved here; moral and material restitution. We cannot resolve the issue of moral restitution in a courtroom. The issue of moral restitution cannot be fair because it's too late; it's 55 years late, and it's important to note that.

Every one of the people who worked on this case, Professor Neuborne, Mel Weiss, at every juncture made this a clear point. This was a moral case, not a material case. 1.25 billion dollars is a lot of money, there's no question about it. But the people who deserve to get it are not sitting in this courtroom, in very, very many cases, and that is why I rise with concern before we close this portion of the hearing, to say that moral restitution is not being concluded in this courtroom.

Where is it being concluded and why do I rise at this point to mention these points? I think that 55 years ago, a judicial hearing would have been a forum through which we could have raised some of the issues that we're dealing with, but there would have been other areas as well. Those areas were open

5 .

to us today, political avenues, judicial avenues, as well as the areas of public action.

We've changed the world, because some see the world as it is or as it was and they accept it, and others don't; they want to see it as it might be. Frankly, there is a group of persons sitting around this table, sitting in this room that didn't accept the world as it was.

Your Honor, we thank you for joining us. We thank you for making this possible. It's not just 1.25 billion dollars that we're getting in this settlement for the people. It's not just 55,000 accounts in Swiss banks that are being returned. It's not just, your Honor, that you participated in helping us get that back, but it's the neutrality of so many people in this country and in other countries, not merely in Switzerland, that didn't give us the opportunity to deal with this question 55 years ago.

Switzerland is not in the dock in this case; it's the world. And I'm sorry to abuse this courtroom for another minute or so to take the opportunity to tell you that this is a case that has a moral basis, not only a material basis. We haven't gathered here today to discuss only whether the



1.3

amount of money is enough.

It's a very large amount of money. We can't judge whether it's enough, because the persons who can judge are dead. The persons who can judge aren't here. They placed their money in Swiss banks to try and protect themselves from ogres far worse than neutrality. They're not here today. They would tell us.

I would like to suggest to you that the other cases which we are trying to settle or trying to find another resolution to, in other courtrooms, in other bars of public opinion, before other political and other judicial places like this one, are as important or more important for the moral record.

Let me raise one point and with that I'll close. I ask you to consider one fact and one fact above all. As a result of this case, 5.4 million names of persons who died in the Holocaust came to light, names of the people, the places which they were killed in. This has changed history, because people can no longer claim that people didn't die. Holocaust revisionists can no longer claim that people didn't pass from the scene.

This historic point changes the way the

picture of history plays out and the way the future will play itself out. We did that as a result of the efforts of this trial, which turned out to be a settlement, because we found those names as a result of the fact that we wanted to know which people had accounts. We changed history through the Volker Commission. We changed history through the Bergier (ph) Commission. All of those were aspects of this case.

Yes, as a result of that, this case can be judged as having resulted in a fair resolution, because all those pieces together have changed the way the history of that period can be looked at. People died, people were killed, people were murdered. People had money, people placed money in those accounts. 55,000 accounts were found. Those people had heirs. Those heirs may receive that money back. This is the way history is adjudicated, not the way justice alone is adjudicated. And that's the way history in the future should be treated.

Thank you, your Honor, for your part.

Thank you, Mr. Gribetz, for your part.

Thank you, Counsels, for having worked together with us.

If this situation would have applied 55



years ago and this courtroom would have been available to us, the situation might have been different. Thank you.

MR. CHESLEY: Your Honor, at this time I have Roman Kent, who is Chairman of the Board of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors. He will address the Court and for the record.

Also, I might mention that the motto, which I think is so significant, of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors is "together from Holocaust to new life."

MR. KENT: Good morning, your Honor. It is difficult for me, number one, to speak in the courthouse. And then, number two, your Honor, it's very difficult for me to speak to you, not facing you, but I will try.

Just for the record, I'd like to state that I have received some special degrees in the large ghetto and Auschwitz and a few other concentration camps.

It is very important, not just for this Court alone, but for the history to show that even after 50 years, some justice, some morality can be restored to mankind. For me, as a Holocaust survivor, what we are doing here, it is not a

question of money.

It's a question that history had proven right now that Switzerland will no longer be known as a country of cuckoo clocks, skiing and neutrality. It finally came to light what was going on during the war, and it came to light that with proper investigation, certain facts can be uncovered, even 50 or 60 years ago.

It is a fairness hearing. To tell your Honor that this is a fair settlement, I would be not telling the truth. But on the other hand, as Israel Singer before said, the people that should get the settlement, most of them are not alive.

We also have to understand, and I realize it, that we are not living in a perfect world. And therefore, in this imperfect world, I would say that this particular settlement, under the circumstances, is fair, because it gives the survivors who are old the ability to better their life in the last years of their existence.

I would, however, and I want to strongly emphasize that maybe it's one man's opinion, but I don't think so. I would like to say that this particular settlement would never be reached had it not been the work of Edgar Braufman (ph), Stu



Eisenstadt, Senator D'Amato, Alan Hevessey and his creation of the membership controllers society that said point blank that they will not do business here in the United States, the bank, if a proper settlement will not be arranged. So I must give credit where the credit is due.

I also would like to say to you, your

Honor, that under no circumstances this settlement
should give what I call a one-way, street to heaven to
the insurance companies. The insurance companies are
subject to the International Committee of Insurances,
which is chaired by former Secretary of State Stanley
Egelberger (ph), and they should not get a blank,
what you can call maybe legal closure, whatever it
is, because they should be subject to the
international insurance claims.

I would also be remiss if I would not say

-- and I heard here statistics about 550 responses

and it reminds me of an old story by Mark Twain, who
said that there are three kinds of lies. There is a

lie, a big lie and then there is statistics.

I know that from hundreds of people that I spoke to, they did not reply to the questionnaires, because they were so complicated, so many pages, that they didn't want to bother with it. So the statistic

-

•

here which I heard --

So finally I would like to say, I would like to really thank Stanley Chesley, who just told me we have to move along, but he deserves all the credit. He and his staff did very well.

Finally, I also must say that if the settlement is to be a settlement, and I hear it from many survivors, I have to say that there are many lawyers who were never exposed to life in concentration camps, but they write briefs about it. They are very eager to represent us and to make millions of dollars in the process.

This cannot happen, this must not happen. It must not happen that the lawyers are ashamed or unwilling or do not want even to show the timetable to the survivors or to the public, so that it could be transparent what they did, how they did. This must not happen.

I hope that this Court will see to it and I appreciate your time, your Honor, which you gave to it. I apologize if I spoke too long. Thank you.

MR. CHESLEY: Thank you very much, Mr.

Kent.

At this time, Benjamin Fischoff, Chairman of the World Haguda (ph) of Israel.



MR. FISCHOFF: My name is Benjamin

Fischoff. I'm also a survivor, from the same town as

Mr. Kent. Unfortunately, I lost my entire family,

but I was one of the fortunate ones, that I survived

by running away to Shanghai. I spent five years

during the war.

Your Honor, I am a businessman, but I represent the World Haggadas Israel, which is the largest orthodox community in the world, here in the United States as well as Israel. I am a member of the WJRO and from the beginning I've been active, trying to help to come to some sort of settlement on this very painful subject.

I would like to thank the attorneys who worked so hard on this particular settlement. I confirm and I believe we have no other choice but to accept the fair settlement as swiftly as possible, because while we are here discussing the subject, unfortunately, since last year, we have lost 30,000 - 40,000 of the survivors. The longer it will take, there will be no-one, unfortunately, to accept it.

Your Honor, in addition to the settlement, money settlement, we believe, the orthodox community believes that a large part of it is going to go and we hope it will go towards Jewish education, to

rebuild all these institutions and the communities that we have lost during the war, in addition to the six million people.

Your Honor, we urge you to please accept the settlement as swiftly as possible. Thank you very much.

MR. CHESLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Fischoff.

At this time, your Honor, Mr. Wolf Factor from Israel, Chairman of the Board, Foundation for Benefit of Holocaust Victims in Israel.

MR. FACTOR: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Wolf Factor. I am a survivor from the concentration camps Auschwitz, Buchenwald and Grossrosen (ph).

Beside my name, there is another mark, B-7594, here on my wrist, which was embossed on me by the Nazi Germans. Today I am the Chairman of a foundation for Holocaust survivors and I am talking in their name and using my experience concerning the needs and how urgent those needs should be provided.

Considering the present situation of the Holocaust survivors, we are all for this agreement, when we are not talking about the fairness of it. If things might be postponed, all the help will be



brought to our graveyards.

Thousands of people in their wheelchairs are waiting. They are absolutely helpless. And if something should be done so time is life, it should be done here and now. Thank you.

MR. RATNER: Your Honor, we have one last speaker who will be using time for the plaintiff's counsel, who have moved for final approval of this proposed settlement. At the last minute, on Wednesday, the United States Department of Justice filed papers in support of the proposed settlement.

Mr. James Gilligan will make a short presentation and then we would be happy to open the floor.

MR. GILLIGAN: Ladies and gentlemen,

Counsel and may it please the Court, my name is James

Gilligan. I'm an attorney with the Department of

Justice, today representing the United States. I've

been asked to appear today to express the United

States's unqualified support for the parties' class

action settlement.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS)

MR. GILLIGAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the United States endorses the parties' proposed settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate and unquestionably in the public interest.

_

Some two years ago, when the parties to this case asked Secretary Eisenstadt to facilitate their settlement efforts, he assumed that role with enthusiasm. For nearly four years, the U.S. government has spearheaded an international cooperative effort among world governments, foreign companies and non-governmental organizations, to document the Nazi confiscation of gold and other individual and communal property from persecuted religious and racial groups.

The United States has also acted to provide restitution for the targets of Nazi persecution who were deprived of their family assets, compelled to toil as slave-enforced laborers and otherwise victimized by the Nazi regime and its collaborators.

This U.S. government policy arises from the conviction that the international community can no longer fail to acknowledge or to act on its legal, moral and humanitarian obligations to the victims of the Holocaust whose family assets and communal properties were never returned or accounted for, and who otherwise have been denied a measure of justice for their suffering for more than 50 years.

The government's efforts also reflect the



belief that matters of Holocaust-era restitution, including matters of litigation, are best resolved through dialogue, negotiation and cooperation, rather than prolonging conflict and controversy, so that the survivors of Nazi atrocities might enjoy the fruits of any recovery in their remaining lifetimes.

The United States also has a foreign policy interest in the cooperative resolution of these matters, as many of the nations involved today are close friends and allies of our country.

In pursuit of these goals, therefore, the United States government has documented the role of wartime neutral countries in disposing of looted Nazi assets, has urged nations of central and eastern Europe to return Jewish and other communal property to its rightful owners and organized international conferences that have helped lead to the establishment of historical commissions in 17 countries, to study their roles in connection with looted Nazi property, as well as the return of that property.

In cooperation with foreign governments, companies and non-governmental organizations, the United States has also helped form the international commission on Holocaust-era insurance claims and

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

arranged for the transfer of assets held by the Tripartite Gold Commission to the Nazi Persecutee Relief Fund.

In addition, the U.S. government has been deeply engaged in talks with the German and Israeli governments, as well as the governments of five central European nations, together with leading German companies, world Jewish organizations and class action attorneys, to resolve lawsuits seeking restitution for slave-enforced labor during the Nazi era.

All of these efforts and accomplishments have been the result of dialogue and cooperation that the U.S. government believes will bring a meaningful degree of justice more quickly and to more victims of Nazi atrocities than would prolonging litigation, conflict and controversy.

And so it was, when the parties to these Swiss bank cases sought assistance with their settlement talks, that the government welcomed the parties' request as a further opportunity to promote the goal of negotiated resolution to which the government has dedicated itself for the past four years.

To that end, Secretary Eisenstadt brought



21.

2.2

the parties together for eight months of settlement discussions, discussions that established a framework for the resolution of this dispute. With the critical assistance of this Court, absent which no agreement might have been possible, that initial framework evolved into the proposed settlement now before the Court.

The United States supports approval of the settlement the parties have reached. It is fair and just and promotes the public interest, as expressed in the policy that the United States government has pursued for the past four years. Because the parties reached for common ground rather than prolong their difference, the elderly victims of the Holocaust will receive the benefits of this settlement in their lifetime and much more quickly than would have been possible had the litigation continued.

But of equal importance, the United States regards this settlement as an excellent example of how cooperation and the will to fulfil a moral obligation can lead to voluntary resolution of disputes over Holocaust-era claims.

The government anticipates that the settlement here, by force of its example, will promote the U.S. policy of negotiated settlement in

other cases and countries where Holocaust victims' claims for restitution have not yet been resolved. In particular, the United States is hopeful that this settlement will add a sense of urgency and possibility to resolving the pending class action claims of slave-enforced laborers who can no longer wait for years for justice to be done.

For these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, and your Honor, the United States respectfully requests that the Court approve the parties' proposed class action settlement.

MR. RATNER: Thank you, your Honor. We are done.

MR. NEUBORNE: Your Honor, my name is Burt Neuborne. I am one of the settlement counsel and counsel for the plaintiffs in this case.

I wanted to say just a very, very brief few words about the extraordinary dedication and commitment that I have observed in this case on the part of counsel for the plaintiffs and on the part of the World Jewish Restitution Organization, working together to try to achieve the best possible resolution.

Plaintiff's counsel supports this settlement, not because it's perfect, but because we



believe that it is the best that humans could do, working with institutions of human frailty, 55 years after the event.

The lawyers in this case worked so intensely for three years to try to bring this about, and again, not because we think it is the optimum solution. It is a compromise, but it is a compromise that we believe is in the best interests of the plaintiff class, because as you've heard, delay in these cases is simply unthinkable.

With the age of the class and the difficulty of the legal issues, we believe that a settlement, a negotiated settlement was the best possible way to deal with what is after all a lawsuit, not a moral question. The moral question is going to be dealt with outside of this courtroom. We did the best we could, dealing with the legal claims.

We're here today to hear from you. We would like to know from your criticisms your sense of the appropriateness of the settlement, so that before the settlement is approved, we can hear the voice of individuals who will be affected by it.

I should say, as a matter of the legal issues that are before the Court today, there are four questions: Were there serious legal questions

raised by this case?

2.3

And the answer is, of course. No-one can look at the complaint, no-one can look at the briefs and fail to be impressed at the power and legal significance of plaintiff's claims to be compensated by Swiss banks for activities that both deprived them of assets that had been deposited and prolonged suffering during the war. Plaintiff's legal claims are unquestionably powerful and unquestionably the type that should be dealt with in a court.

Second, were there serious defenses? The answer is, of course there were serious defenses; that's why we settled. The defenses ranged from legal defenses about whether or not some of the legal theories could be won and certainly won in a short period of time, and more importantly, factual defenses.

The difficulty of getting at the facts was extraordinary. The passage of time, the destruction of documents, the difficulty with dealing with Swiss law, making it hard to discover, forced the lawyers to operate, in a sense, with one hand tied behind our back in these factual questions. So the factual defenses to the legal theories forced us to take seriously the question that we had to settle,



1.4

especially given the age of the plaintiff class.

Third, was there arm's-length and adversary bargaining? I have bruises on my body that will demonstrate the arm's-length and adversarial bargaining that went on in this case. We bargained for 18 months, as vigorously as I have ever seen negotiations carried out. Secretary Eisenstadt assisted us. At the end, it was Judge Korman who finally found a formula that brought us together. But it is impossible to suggest that this was not the result of arm's-length bargaining.

The fourth question is, is the settlement structurally fair? We have attempted to design a settlement that is a model of structural fairness.

It has four important components that assure structural fairness.

First, anyone who didn't like it could leave it. It had what is called exit. People could opt out. Very few did, and that is in some sense a vote of confidence in the settlement, by the large numbers of people who elected to participate, to send in questionnaires and the very, very small number of people who opted out.

Secondly, we provided for a voice, for participation. Before a dime is dispensed in this

· 24

case, the community, the beneficiaries of the settlement will be invited to present their ideas on distribution to a Special Master who is committed to attempting to evolve the fairest possible resolution of the distribution issues. Counsel are committed to assist in that process, with no preconception as to who should get what. It will be the fairest mechanism that we can put together.

Finally, loyalty. Counsel are intensely loyal to the class, with no self-interest, no contradictions. This is not the place to talk about fees. There will be a separate fee hearing, but you should know that the bulk of counsel in this case have chosen to accept no fees and are working without fee, in an effort to ensure that the class obtains the best possible result.

And finally, fair procedures. We could not have developed fairer procedures than we have worked in these cases. So on that basis, on the basis of their being a genuine lawsuit that had to be settled, settled quickly by arm's-length bargaining and has been the subject of a fair and open process, I urge the Court to accept the settlement as fair and reasonable.

I make one final observation, because I



2.0

2.2

think it's an observation that we shouldn't lose sight of. The Nazi evil was one of the great human catastrophes of history, and its effect on the Jewish people is one of the stories of dread that will be repeated for as long as there is history. But it was a universal evil that harmed others than Jews. And class counsel, in order to recognize that, insisted that Jehova's Witnesses, the disabled, gays and the Romany will share in the settlement as well.

And as we discuss the fairness of the settlement for the rest of this day, I hope that what we receive are constructive criticisms, because if you have ways to make it better, we want to hear it. If you have suggestions that we should have considered, we would like to hear it. But this is now your forum to tell us what you think of the settlement.

Thank you, your Honor.

MR. WITTEN: Good morning, your Honor.

May it please the Court, fellow counsel, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Roger Witten. I'm with the law firm of Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering in Washington D.C. and I represent the defendant Swiss banks in this case and speak in favor of approval of this settlement.

Your Honor, I have three main points, but before I turn to them, I want to thank my colleagues Mr. Swift and Mr. Chesley for their kind comments about the defense of this case, and I wish to say to them and to all of their colleagues, you have presented a very able, skillful and vigorous representation of the class members.

And I want to say to the class members in this audience that the combination of these lawyers and the WJRO and its lawyers have given you a set of champions that could not be matched in any other courtroom, in any other case.

My three main points, your Honor, are as follows. My first point is that many able and concerned people have stood a careful watch over this case and over the settlement of this case. They have unanimously agreed that this settlement is fair and should bring about what the settlement document calls for, complete closure and an end to confrontation with respect to the issues dealt with in the settlement.

I want to list those whom I have said have stood a careful watch over these proceedings. First of course is the Honorable Court. Judge Korman participated actively in the settlement negotiations



and was tremendously helpful and skillful in helping the parties overcome their differences.

Second, as you have heard, the United
States government, through now Deputy Treasury
Secretary Eisenstadt, participated actively in
settlement discussions, over a period of many months.
The U.S. government has advised this Court that the
policy of the United States government is to pursue
restitution for those who were victimized by the
Nazis.

With that government policy in mind, the U.S. has formally advised this Court that "the settlement here will directly promote the public interest" and is "the very sort of outcome that U.S. policy seeks to achieve in matters of unresolved Holocaust-era claims."

Third, as has been mentioned, Senator
D'Amato participated in the settlement negotiations
as a champion for Holocaust victims, as reflected in
his comments to the Court on August 12, 1998, when we
reached an agreement in principal, and in his
comments to the public outside the courthouse that
day. Senator D'Amato has concluded that the
settlement is eminently fair and brings closure to
the questions raised about the role of Switzerland

during World War II.

Fourth, New York City Controller Alan
Hevessey, whose representative Mr. Walman (ph) is in
the audience, led a group of state and local public
finance officials that monitored these negotiations.
And on their behalf, he has publicly stated that the
settlement is fully fair and reasonable.

Fifth and very, very importantly, the organized Jewish community and the organized survivor community, groups from all over the world, have formally and in writing endorsed this settlement as fair, adequate and reasonable, and have said in these documents that the settlement brings about complete closure and an end to confrontation with respect to the issues dealt with in the settlement.

Because of the importance and significance of their endorsements, I would like to take a moment of the Court's time to list those from whom endorsements have been received. Haggadeth Israel Organization, the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the Anti-defamation League, the Bene B'rith International, the Center of Organizations of Holocaust Survivors in Israel, the Conference of



Jewish Material Claims against Germany.

I'm listing organizations that have formally endorsed this settlement. The Council of Jews from Germany, the European Council of Jewish Communities, the European Jewish Congress, the Jewish Agency for Israel, the Simon Wesenthal Center, the World Jewish Congress, the World Jewish Restitution Organization, the World Zionist Organization, the Holocaust Educational Trust, the American Zionist Movement, the Anglo-Jewish Association, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Canadian Jewish Congress.

And I'm still listing organizations that have formally endorsed this settlement. The Central British Fund for World Jewish Relief, the Concer Representative des Institution Jewive de France (ph), the Delegacion Associones Israelites Argentinas (ph), and easier to pronounce, the Executive Council of Australian Jury.

In addition, these plaintiff lawyers who represent the classes, many of whom are not accepting fees and who therefore have no direct financial interest in the outcome, all support the settlement.

In addition, class members have overwhelmingly endorsed the settlements. With all due respect to

Mr. Kent and to Mark Twain, the statistics here are overwhelming in support of the settlement. Out of over 400,000 responses, a total of fewer than 500 from class members have either opted out from or filed objections to this settlement.

Seldom have so many stood such a vigilant guard over the resolution of a lawsuit and seldom have the watchmen been so well-informed and so aggressive in their efforts to advance the interests of the settlement of classes.

It was in this very public arena that very vigorous, arm's-length bargaining has produced a settlement that has been acclaimed by all as fair, that serves the general judicial policy favoring settlements and that serves the specific United States domestic and foreign policy of resolving disputes like these involving claims of Holocaust victims, without confrontation and without litigation, but in cooperation. This settlement, your Honor, can and should be approved under Rule 23(e) on this basis.

My second point, your Honor, is that the fairness, the adequacy and the reasonableness of this settlement must be measured against the practical alternatives to the settlement, in the real world.



2.1

The practical alternative to this settlement, I have to say, was prolonged, complex and difficult litigation, where the plaintiff's chance of success as a class was at best highly uncertain.

As the Court is aware, significant legal hurdles confronted the plaintiffs, particularly with regard to the so-called looted asset and slave labor allegations. The legal grounds for dismissal before any trial were presented to the Court in 1997. They spell out the grounds and the hurdles that were confronting the plaintiffs, and I don't need to burden the record today by repeating them.

But as Mr. Neuborne said, in addition to the significant legal hurdles concerning whether the case could proceed and claims were stated, there were significant issues about whether these classes could be certified for trial purposes. There were significant legal issues concerning whether discovery, and if so to what extent discovery could be taken to assemble the proof necessary to build this case.

In addition to these formidable legal hurdles, many plaintiffs confronted potentially insuperable obstacles with respect to the proof that is needed in a court proceeding, as opposed to in a

moral discussion, the proof needed in a court proceeding to prevail in this case.

It would not be enough to prove here in court injury at the hands of the Nazis. It would be required to trace that injury to a particular Swiss bank defendant. For many, for the reasons that have been stated by others, that would have been difficult at the end of this century to do.

Thus, the outcome of the litigation would have been quite uncertain and while the outcome would have been uncertain, one thing would have been quite certain, as others have said. The case would have taken years to litigate, and because it involves many unique legal issues, as Mr. Swift has said, appeals certainly would have been taken of many questions.

So at the end, it is far from clear that even if the plaintiffs succeeded in overcoming all these hurdles, their actual recovery would have been timely, and it's also unclear whether the recovery would have been as high as 1.25 billion dollars, the amount of the settlement.

It is possible that a win by the plaintiffs in court would have produced a judgment whose amount was less than the settlement amount.

There are no guarantees in court. There are no

teams to assist with the search and the costs associated with those teams are at least as large as the external costs they have paid. The banks have devoted a lot of money and resources and time and effort to this cooperative search with the WJRO for evidence of accounts dating from World War II.

One expense that has been noted, interestingly enough, and that I plan to mention so I will mention it, was the agreement by the banks to contribute to the funding of the computerization of the Yad Vashem (ph) victim list. Mr. Singer mentioned this, which will provide a lasting benefit to all of us over time.

In addition, the Swiss government established something called the Bergier Committee in 1997. They did that through a statute that assembled a group of prominent historians to study and report to the public on the role of Switzerland during World War II. Thus far, the Bergier Committee has filed reports on looted gold. It will file other reports in the future and I think all concerned view the reports that have been filed as extremely searching and extremely candid and a contribution to the public and historians as well.

I should also add that the banks have

2

10

1/

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Banking Department. That department has been

3 | conducting investigations into accounts in the United

communicated very openly with the New York State

4 States in Swiss banks that could conceivably have

5 been related to Holocaust victims. The banks have

6 spent a considerable amount of money and devoted a

7 | considerable amount of time and resources to those

8 efforts, and the banks have also cooperated fully

9 with the New York Holocaust Claims Processing Office

in searching for evidence of accounts in response to

11 claims sent to that office.

For all of these reasons, we submit, your Honor, that the settlement fully meets the standards of Rule 23(e) and should be promptly approved. The settlement, as I began by saying, recites the belief of the plaintiffs, of the organizations that have endorsed the settlement, of the defendants and of others that the settlement does and should bring about complete closure with respect to the concerns and allegations relating to Switzerland's role in World War II, and thereby bring an end to all confrontation, here in court and elsewhere, relating to these issues.

We trust that the Court's prompt approval of the settlement will make this joint aspiration a



guarantees of victory and there are no guarantees of ability to recover a particular amount.

This is not an abstract thought. Just recently, in two other Holocaust cases, federal district judges in New Jersey have thrown the cases out before trial, and those decisions are quite consistent with earlier decisions by federal courts in cases called <u>Prince</u> and <u>Kelbereen</u> (ph) and <u>Fishel</u> (ph), dismissing cases brought on grounds similar to these.

By contrast, there is no risk to the class associated with this settlement. The amount is guaranteed. The fact that it will be paid on a timely basis is guaranteed, and that is so important given, as others have mentioned, the age of the survivors.

As a third and final point, your Honor, I want to comment on other important and forthcoming steps that the Swiss have taken outside of the court that bear in many ways on the fairness, the adequacy and the reasonableness of this settlement.

First, in early 1997, the defendant banks took the initiative of setting up what's been called the Swiss Humanitarian Fund. They and other Swiss entities, including the Swiss National Bank,

contributed 200 million dollars to this fund in early 1997.

The idea was to provide funds that would help survivors who were in need and to do that promptly, so that they would not have to wait until the end of the Volker audit of Swiss banks and so they would not have to wait until the end of these proceedings.

A foundation was established in Switzerland. It includes leadership from the World Jewish Restitution Organization and was headed by Mr. Rolf Bloch (ph), who is a very prominent Swiss Jew. That foundation has largely distributed the 200 million dollars over the past couple of years to needy Holocaust victims, without regard to whether they had proof of an account in Switzerland and without seeking any legal release of any kind.

Secondly, in mid-1966, before there was any litigation filed, the Swiss Bankers Association voluntarily offered to enter into an agreement with the WJRO to conduct a forensic audit of Swiss banks, to get to the bottom of the concern that Swiss banks had retained funds of Holocaust survivors.

The result was the formation of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons, which is



2.1

chaired by Paul Volker and which many know as the Volker Committee. That committee has employed hundreds, literally hundreds of auditors from five leading accounting firms, who have performed an audit of almost every bank in Switzerland.

The work, as Mr. Singer said, is just being completed. We understand that the ICEP will issue its report in the next week or so. In the meantime, I caution all to view with skepticism some of the rumors and speculation that have been reported in the newspaper concerning the likely results of that report. We expect the report will be fair and balanced, and I am confident that there will be nothing in it that will raise any question about the fairness, the adequacy or the reasonableness of the settlement here.

It also bears mentioning, as Judge Korman has, that the Swiss banks paid for this entire audit. The amounts paid to the auditors and to the ICEP itself is in the order of 200 million dollars to perform the search and the evaluation of the many existing records relating to accounts from the wartime era.

In addition to paying the committee and the auditors, the banks assembled large internal



reality. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. WEISS: Your Honor, can I just add my name for a few minutes?

I wasn't going to say anything, but some of the comments from Mr. Witten compel me to say something. My name is Mel Weiss and I'm one of the class counsel. Mr. Hausfeld, Mr. Swift and myself were the lead negotiators, with Mr. Neuborne and Mr. Mendelsohn and the other counsel here working with us throughout this arduous negotiation.

Let there be no mistake about this. The Swiss government did not assist in getting this resolution. Indeed, the Swiss government fought against it. Don't let this settlement be a moral victory for the Swiss government. The banks put up this money against the will of the Swiss government, and there was a commission appointed by the Swiss government to look into the historical aspects of this that was disbanded as soon as the settlement was announced.

That doesn't diminish this settlement and it doesn't diminish the need to approve it as being fair, reasonable and adequate as a financial resolution, so that we can get the money to the victims before they die. But don't ever let the



Swiss government get away with saying that they are absolved as a result of this. Thank you.

THE COURT: The first speaker is Greta Beer. Each speaker will have ten minutes.

MS. BEER: Good morning, your Honor,
Counsel, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Greta
Georgia Beer. I'm a little bit overcome, I'm awfully
sorry.

Those who know me know that I started the ball rolling in 1995, when Peter Gumble (ph) of the Wall Street Journal called me. He knew that my mother and I had investigated in the 1960s in Switzerland, when Switzerland put up -- the banks of Switzerland put up an office in 11 Mignon (ph) Street in Bern, where they said they would open accounts, so-called Schaeffer (ph) numbered accounts.

At that time, in the 1960s, we went from bank to bank, to the official office, investigating. In 1995, Peter Gumble called me. He knew that I investigated with my mother and wrote them up about it. At the risk of being repetitious, my father owned the biggest textile mill in Romania, called Hurculus, Inc. (ph), 1,600 workers and 40 branch stores all over the country.

My father traveled and bought machinery in

the 1930s, Schubert and Solzer (ph) in Germany. It was a (ui) machine for thirty-some-thousand dollars, which he paid for. He could have never gotten the money out of Romania. It was under penalty of death.

He traveled to Egypt, bought Egyptian (ui) many, many times, all over Europe, and invariably he would go to Switzerland. He deposited money -- he was one of the first -- in so-called number, secret accounts, where you have a number, 12345, and behind that is a name. It was my father's name.

When we investigated and snooped around, of course many banks -- nobody was breathing down their neck. Many banks after that -- we were told, we are investigating and we will see, Mrs. Deviktish (ph) -- my father's name, Deviktish -- we will see and let you know, either in -- my mother lived at that time in (ui), Switzerland -- either in (ui) or in New York. We never heard from anybody. Then they closed up.

In 1995, I testified and the article in the <u>Wall Street Journal</u> made waves all over. I must say, I was the first one to start the whole thing. I testified under Senator D'Amato and there were no lawyers at the time, no organizations, nobody. I was just alone, under the aegis of the Jewish Congress,



and Senator D'Amato behaved very, very humanely and beautifully towards me.

I testified. I told the whole story, the way I know it, from my heart, without (ui), like today. It made waves. Behind me, Mr. Hans Beer (ph) was the representative of the Swiss banks, he himself of the Jewish faith, if that has any meaning or not, and he invited me to come to Switzerland. I came to Switzerland in the company of a lawyer assigned to me by Senator D'Amato and the Consul General of the United States, Sheldon Krepps (ph), who now resides in Washington D.C. We became great friends.

We went from bank to bank. How could I have a number? Impossible. My father was very, very sick. Those who know my story, I don't want to repeat it. I approached my father. We asked for a power of attorney for my mother. In my hand, he signed it. He couldn't remember the numbers.

A few days later, my city where I was born, (ui) Romania, was taken, first by the Russians, then (ui) to the Germans (ui). On the second day, Eisenstadt knows, it's Ukraine. We lost real estate, but the money was never in Romania. It was in Swiss banks, in a so-called numbered Schaeffer account, which actually made the Swiss banks what they are

)

today, because people could deposit money from anyplace in the world. It was secret. Of course, the higher-ups knew about it.

Today, where do we stand? I raise my voice not only for me, for those behind me. May I just say, Judge Korman, when I started the whole thing, it was only in connection with numbered accounts, nothing else. Today, thanks to all those here and Counsel, there is some money. A billion sounds very high, very, very much to me, who lives today in Boston, in subsidized housing.

But how is it going to be distributed?

Who is going to think about the human beings who are here, who have been fighting for years? It's coming up now Hanukkah and Christmas, and Jesus Christ sort of straddled both. I hope some justice will be done for us. We have fought for many, many years and as Mr. Singer said before, 55 years is a long time. In the name of my father, I do hope that (ui). Thank you.

THE COURT: Rabbi Morris Schmidman.

RABBI SCHMIDMAN: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, good people all. Thank you firstly for the opportunity for facing you. My apologies (ui).

This is the most awesome and perhaps



frightening experience that one can have, endeavoring to represent Holocaust victims and Holocaust survivors and survivor communities. It requires a great deal of personal humility, as well as prayer that one's words be appropriate to this particular occasion and to the cause that brings us all together.

on behalf of our organization, the World Council of Orthodox Jewish Communities, our appreciation to Judge Korman. I know many have said it, but as many as will continue to say it, it will still not be enough to express our appreciation to him, to Judah Gribetz, the court-appointed Special Master, for the very unique role he has in this historic mission, and overwhelmingly, to express our appreciation to the distinguished panel of attorneys that have represented the plaintiffs in this case.

There are not enough words to express our profound gratitude and appreciation to them, to the attorneys that represent our organization, Steve Whinston and Mel Urbach, for the phenomenal job they have done in our behalf, and for each one of these distinguished members of the Bar, who have given so much of their time and their energy and their

resources, and without them we would not be here today.

It is therefore exceedingly painful and distressing that I have read the comments of a spokesman for a Jewish organization, referring to this distinguished group as part of a feeding frenzy of fee grabbers and to demean them in the most vicious, malicious, false statements that could ever be heard, which dishonors both the survivors and the memory of the victims.

I am tempted to repeat the words of a distinguished Boston attorney in a memorable U.S. Senate hearing: "Have you no shame?" If there are comments to be made on this issue, then they should have been made in this forum, before this Court and not in the media.

This was the place to raise objections or will be the place to raise objections, but not to create an atmosphere of the public mind, as this distinguished and self-sacrificing group is outside the (ui) of what is proper professional and ethical conduct.

Your Honor, I represent the World Council of Orthodox Jewish Communities, which is here to state its endorsement of the proposal that is under

3,500



2.2

consideration. The World Council of Orthodox Jewish
Communities was founded 50 years ago, by the
congregational and communal leaders of a large number
of the successors of prewar Jewish communities.

Currently, several hundred congregational and communal organizations are constituent members of and represented by the World Council, which in addition represents hundreds of constituent communities worldwide and tens of thousands of Holocaust survivors.

The World Council's broad mandate includes providing educational, financial, cultural and human services support to its constituents and the rebuilding of Jewish communal life as it existed throughout Europe before the Holocaust. It is also charged with the reclamation of assets belonging to its constituent members that lost during the Holocaust and to the pursuit of various restitution claims against various entities.

The answer to Hitler's plan to destroy the Jewish people and every trace of its religion and culture is effectively being given by survivor communities and organizations that are rebuilding in synagogues, schools and communal institutions in the United States and abroad, perpetuating the heritage

and traditions of their destroyed towns and communities.

aging and sorrowfully diminishing survivor population and to support the rebuilding of the Jewish heritage and Jewish communal life as it existed throughout Europe before the Holocaust should be the mission of

To bring a small measure of comfort to an

Europe before the Holocaust should be the mission of all those involved with restitution problems.

We have become a party to this lawsuit.

We are a plaintiff and by designation of the Court a class representative. We have become a party to this lawsuit because for a long time, the orthodox Jewish community that we represent was disenfranchised from

restitution settlements. It was not given the

opportunity to participate in, nor was the work of

its congregational community adequately supported.

Therefore, we were pleased to be able, through this lawsuit, to raise the issue of the communal property of the towns that were destroyed, of the synagogues that were burned and looted. In the beginning of the Nazi era, the first attack was against the synagogues and the religious way of life. Of those that have lost all of their properties, their religious objects and all of their institutions, and to find through this medium of this



2.0

Court an opportunity to find restitution for this communal property.

We have been involved in this litigation a long time. We have been involved in it by our own monitoring committee from the inceptions, by the testimony that we've given at Congressional hearings, by monitoring all phases of this case, by the findings, the motions to dismiss the negotiations, the settlement, the notices, et cetera, and we're here to support the settlement with a certainty.

As a Holocaust survivor who came to my office said, and I've spoken to thousands of them in the past few months, came to my office and, as is the desire of so many, to reveal their personal story. He came to one point and he raised the sleeve of his arm. He showed me his tattooed, death camp number. He said to me, you see that number? That represents oblivion. But every day, I put tfillen (ph) on my hand and I wrap the straps of the tfillen on my arm and it covers that number, and my tfillen represents eternal existence.

It is these people with these concepts whose needs we must speedily address, and we therefore think that what is proposed is appropriate. The words fair, just, reasonable, equitable have no

1

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

real meaning when applied to the Holocaust. needs to be a new terminology, a new set of words, a new definition that could adequately comport to what the Holocaust meant to our time and to the history of mankind. But until that is created, having to live with the terminology that exists, we endorse this proposal as being real, even if it is not the ideal.

Your Honor, let me just read one thing to you and those who are here assembled. Listen to the haunting words of Eli Wiesel (ph). "Teachers and their pupils, mothers and their infants, rabbis and their followers, rich and poor, learned and illiterate, prince and beggar, all pushed inexorably toward death. Father, a young boy asks, is it painful to die? It is painful to die? The father replies, think of something else, my son; think of tomorrow."

We, those here and those similar to the people here, we are that tomorrow. In our hands and in our lifetime has been entrusted a precious mission, and we hope that as we close and participate collectively in closing this one page of this tragic history, we will open a new page, in which this generation rebuilds the heritage, the culture, the faith, the perdition, the language that some thought



would be obliterated and marked for oblivion. But we will continue and through our institutions will be the representatives of eternal existence. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Sam Dubbin.

MR. DUBBIN: May it please the Court.

Your Honor, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to address this hearing. Other guests, ladies and gentlemen --

THE COURT: Try and speak up.

MR. DUBBIN: My name is Sam Dubbin. I'm an attorney with the law firm of Greenberg, Traurig (ph). I represent fifteen Holocaust survivor organizations in the State of Florida, comprising in the neighborhood of 10,000 individuals; depending on the time of year, possibly even more. I also represent Dr. Thomas Weiss, a Miami Beach ophthalmologist who was a child Holocaust survivor, in claims against Swiss banks as well as insurance companies.

I wanted to begin by commending the Court and the parties for at least one important aspect of the settlement, which is the extent to which you have reached out to the Holocaust survivor community directly. That has been a very refreshing aspect, although as has been mentioned, much of the

documentation required is somewhat complicated. But

I have specifically had communications with Mr.

Gribetz and look forward to working with him on

behalf of the survivor community in South Florida on

the overall question of restitution and division of

the money that would result from this settlement.

I only want to add, on behalf of the survivors in the State of Florida, who specifically recruited me to be their representative with regard primarily to the insurance question, but when the bank issue came forth and the notices started going out, made a point of making sure that we had an opportunity to at least weigh in here, that the number 1.25 billion we would be more comfortable with characterizing as perhaps necessary and pragmatic and would be reluctant to really use the term fair, under the circumstances.

My specific point today is to address one aspect of the settlement in particular, and that is the extent to which the settlement purports to release an infinite number of unnamed Swiss companies, particularly insurance companies, other than those which are enumerated in the settlement agreement as being involved with the International Commission on Insurance Claims.



2.4

In the process of researching the whole question of Holocaust-era insurance, my client Dr.

Weiss, who has done a lot of this research on his own account -- much of this has been recently discovered.

We have found some very disturbing information about the extent to which the major Nazi-supportive insurance companies, Alliance (ph) and Munichre (ph), used a variety of dummy companies or real companies to cloak their real assets and resources, which is now documented in the U.S. archives, and which we have documentation for, again recently discovered, which I would be more than happy to submit.

They used a variety of insurers and reinsurers, including many Swiss companies, many Swiss insurers and reinsurers, to cloak their actual financial holdings and interests. If I may, I'm going to quote from a report of the Office of Military Government for Germany, from September of 1946. It noted the following with respect to Munichre and just one example of the Union Reinsurance Company of Zurich.

Munichre had been accused and tried of failing to disclose its actual interest in at least 24 different non-German businesses. Here is what the Office of Military Government said with respect to

2

3

6

7

8

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

just one of the cases that was brought to their attention, because what Munichre did was fail to disclose their actual holdings in a variety of these companies.

In rejecting Munichre's defense, which was that those were only security interests, in effect, to protect them against potential future reinsurance claims, the government said, "The most important reason for rejecting Munichre's lay in an analysis of its alleged savings clause. The shares of Elfenix (ph) it claims, as well as the shares of many other subsidiaries, were deposited with the Union Reinsurance Company of Zurich, which was 100% owned by Munichre, supposedly as security for Munichre's obligations toward the Swiss company.

"All of the contracts and correspondence in the company's files related to these shares, however, indicate that Munichre has divested itself from record ownership merely for the purpose of cloaking its ownership." Then Munichre again admits that the shares were not so transferred until a much later date.

Then it goes on to say that the infamous Dr. Schmidt, who we know to have been a Nazi official as well as president of many of these business





entities, then went and supposedly made disclosure of these claims. Then the government goes on to mention that when Dr. Schmidt submitted that schedule of claims and obligations toward union reinsurance, the values entered were generally too low and also included as an obligation Munichre's liability to pay a certain amount of shares, while no offsetting entries were made to the claims made.

In conclusion, the military government concluded that the overall considerations which called for Munichre to be convicted of these financial lies, which we now contend permeate or possibly permeate -- the problem with the settlement is we really don't know -- permeate the business, status, wealth and obligations of many of the entities that would be released under the present plan.

It says that the transfer of ownership rights of Munichre to the subsidiaries, particularly to Union Reinsurance, severely reduce the values that these other companies were credited with or held accountable for having with regard to Munichre's interests.

So the question presented by this, and I have other documents here that come to the same basic

-

conclusion, is why a blanket release of unnamed and unidentified companies, which we know from evidence in the archives may well have been beneficiaries of looted Jewish assets through the access in Nazi insurance trusts, without being even identified or held to account in any way, shape or form for what their responsibilities are.

I know that Commissioner Simm (ph) in the State of Washington and Chairman Egelberger (ph) have brought this question to the Court's attention. But particularly in light of some of the documents we have found, we felt on behalf of the Florida survivor community and Dr. Weiss in particular, we would urge you -- and I know Mr. Neuborne said if we have any problems with the settlement, please bring them to his attention.

I don't know what benefit accrues to survivors from what may be a big surprise at the end of the road, when we find out some of the companies not even identified today being released could well be as culpable as some of the ones who we've been talking about all these years. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Sid Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Good morning, your Honor.

I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to



present our situation. We are concerned with the ambiguousness of this settlement relating to our own particular case, which is not defined, the case of the looted art and furnishings.

If I read the class action of item 4, it is so broad it states nothing. My father-in-law, who was one of the leading art dealers in the world market, whose goods were taken, documented by the Einsatz (ph) group Rosenberg. In addition, the OSS, in a safe haven report, notified and made statement 90% of all looted art and antiques were laundered in Switzerland for cash.

Most of this art, it's well-known and documented, was always through Swiss banks, where the buyers could see the goods. So as I stand here today, we have tried to settle here and have hit a blank wall. I'm asking the Court, can they define where would art claims come in? Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Does anybody want to respond to that?

Ms. Anne Weber.

MS. WEBER: Your Honor, my name is Anne
Weber and I'm here as Chair of the Commission of (ui)
in Europe, which is the expert representative body in
Europe dealing with all matters relating to Nazi-

looted art and other cultural property, if I may be given an opportunity to respond to the comments of the last speaker.

The commission represents individual claimants from all over the world, Jewish and non-Jewish alike. We're trying to recover cultural property looted in Europe. We also, on behalf of the European Council of Jewish Communities, represent the 35 countries of Europe on these matters.

The Commission for Looted Art in Europe is the sole representative organization to pursue restitution claims and to assist claimants in the recover of looted cultural property. As a result, we've built up a considerable body of expertise through our work in this complex and relatively new field.

I speak to you today, therefore, on behalf of all individuals whose cultural property, art, books, silver, statuary and Judaica was looted by the Nazis and who have still to recover it or even to discover what happened to it.

Our understanding, confirmed by consultation with lawyers in Switzerland, Israel, Britain and the United States, is that the settlement agreement will act to terminate all legal claims for





the return of art, looted art held by any Swiss entity, including for instance museums and art dealerships.

Professor Neuborne told us that it was not the intention of the settlement to insulate the current holder of a specific item of looted property from an otherwise existing legal duty to return it to its rightful owner, but he has acknowledged that his fellow counsel also believe that this will be the effect.

The settlement agreement as it currently stands will therefore, we believe, unconstitutionally and without their knowledge, forever deprive claimants for looted art and other cultural property of their legal rights to recover any of that property held by Swiss entities. We appear here today, therefore, on behalf of the claimants, to express our opposition to the settlement agreement and to ask that for these and the other reasons we shall be setting out, that cultural property be excluded from the agreement.

Before stating our legal objections, I would like to put the issue into a context and explain why, for reasons of history and justice, we are all so concerned about the impact of the

agreement.

It is only now, 55 years after the end of the war, that the process of recovery of looted art and other cultural property is really beginning. For all these years scattered survivors attempted, with little success and no institutional support, to find and recover their looted property. They were met with bureaucratic obstacles of every kind and with wilful obstruction from governments, museums and members of the art trade, many of whom actively concealed the location of the looted works.

But today a new climate prevails.

Families have been heartened by the international commitments to justice endorsed by 45 nations, including Switzerland, at a conference hosted in Washington last year by the State Department. Those 45 nations, including Switzerland, committed to identifying looted works in their possession and to working to reunite them with their rightful owners or their heirs.

As a result, each week brings forth new claimants, filled with renewed hope of recovery, though with an awareness that the twin processes of finding looted works and then recovering them will necessarily take some time.



International commitments were also made at Washington to establish the post-war fate of the looted property. This, too, will aid the efforts of recovery. We know that the trade in looted art and other cultural property did not stop with the end of the war, particularly in Switzerland, but has continued to the present day. No barriers were ever put in its way, with a result that looted works can be found throughout Switzerland and other countries, in the world's most reputable museums, galleries, private collections, sale rooms and auction houses.

The scale of the problem is huge. I sit on the British government committee supervising the work of our national museums and galleries in dealing with this issue. Approximately 25% of relevant works have question marks over their histories, and unlike Switzerland, Britain was not a major conduit for looted works.

For the individual claimants, paintings and other cultural property are quite different from other Holocaust-era assets and they cannot easily be computed in simple financial terms, as this settlement agreement would intend. They are unique items, a fact recognized legally by the British and American law.

)

One of our claimants, a woman in her eighties, living alone in Italy, whose parents were murdered by the Nazis for their art, has been trying since May, 1945 to find and recover her parents' looted works. She would like the paintings back, she told me, so that she could at least have something to remind her of the life of her parents. Paintings are the last tangible reminders of a family's taste, personality and character, the lost landscape of lives that were utterly destroyed by the Nazis.

The claimants are usually not wealthy people. Most of these families owned just one or two pictures. In one of our cases, a grandfather had given to each of his two daughters in Vienna a painting on their wedding day. One daughter was transported into Poland with her seven-year-old son, never to be seen again. The other daughter managed to survive, and until she died in 1983, never gave up looking for the painting her father gave to her murdered sister.

A few weeks ago, a surviving family approached us for help. Last week, sixty years after it was taken by the Nazis, we discovered the location of a painting. It is hanging in Switzerland, in a public collection.



Under the terms of this settlement agreement, the family will, without their agreement or knowledge, be prevented from taking any legal steps to recover this painting, which means so much to them and which is so imbued with their tragic history, and which we believe it should be their legal right to claim. Yet, if we were to have found the painting in Germany or Austria or France, the family would be able to pursue such a claim.

This can be neither just nor fair, and as each week goes by, as more claimants come forward, and if the terms of the settlement agreement remain unchanged, more and more families will be discovering that their rights to recover their looted property that may at some later date turn out to be in Switzerland will have been lost, without their knowledge or consent.

We submit that the settlement agreement as it stands is invalid and (ui). It is a requirement that reasonable notice be given to people with a potential claim (ui), and we believe that the settlement agreement has failed to do this in relation to cultural property.

The notices distributed throughout the world, which set out information about the agreement,

do not and have not alerted claimants for cultural property that this agreement will affect them.

Firstly, the notices consistently refer, and I quote, "to claims that people may have against the Swiss banks."

But, your Honor, you yourself began the proceedings today by referring to this as the Swiss banks case. The defendants throughout are referred to as Credit Suisse, UBS and SCC and so on. No art or art-related institution is ever mentioned. As a result, claimants generally and justifiably understand the settlement agreement to refer to financial claims against Swiss banks and other financial institutions.

We submit no claimant could possibly know from the settlement agreement and the notices that those released by it would include museums, art dealers and government agencies, either in the past or not in possession of looted art or other cultural property.

Until we alerted them, none of the other representative organizations in this cultural property field understood the impact of the settlement on cultural property claims, despite the worldwide publicity, nor, I might add, did Professor

Neuborne, who graciously acknowledged that he, too, was unaware of its implications until we wrote to him.

If the experts were not aware, nor those who drafted this agreement, how could the claimants know of the imminent loss of their rights, and therefore what validity can this aspect of the settlement have?

Secondly, we also believe the settlement provides no clear and adequate definition of the relevant settlement class, i.e. those who may have claims against the entities relating to assets looted or taken by the Nazi regime. Only once, in one subclause of the 37-page agreement is the word art mentioned. Nowhere are other types of cultural property referred to. In no part of the settlement agreement is there any clear definition of cultural property.

Compared to the other settlement classes, this class, which relates to looted assets, is most indistinct. It is therefore scarcely surprising that the settlement agreement should have failed to alert these claimants of the situation facing them.

Even if, as Professor Neuborne has told us, the agreement was intended to deal solely with

claims for damages for the looting of property that
can no longer be recovered because it no longer
exists or is not readily identifiable, we would still
oppose the agreement, firstly for the same reason
that claimants for looted art and other cultural
property are unaware of this and have not been made
aware of it; secondly, because there is no
specification of those entities who are release from
liability by this agreement; and thirdly and perhaps
most importantly, because there is yet no
determination of the facts (ui) such property. It is
therefore impossible at this point to make any
reasoned or reasonable claim or to be sure that any
claimant would receive a reasonable sum from the
settlement agreement in relation to such a claim.

In another case we have, where there is another painting in Switzerland, its value is about ten million dollars. There are hundreds of other cases, hundreds more to come, and thousands of looted art works that may be in Switzerland.

THE COURT: You can continue.

MS. WEBER: 125 such cases would eat up the settlement monies, were they to be available or give primacy to these claimants, which they do not.

The settlement agreement makes no provision for such



2.3

sizable or numerous claims or to the qualitative difference of looted art claims, involving as they do unique objects, each with a unique history, issues of provenance, good faith (ui), statutes of limitations and so on.

In relation to the role of Switzerland, it has become known recently that Switzerland was a major conduit for Nazi looted art during the war, and it has remained one of the key locations for trading and acquiring looted art, until the present day. But the details, the true historical record is not known. However, as I speak here today, the Swiss government's Bergier Commission is continuing the research begun over a year ago, into this very issue. So significant is the scale of what it is uncovering, so extensive the material and the findings that its report will run to five volumes when it is published, but that will not be until the end of 2001, two whole years from now.

It cannot surely be fair or just for a New York court to preempt the findings of this official Swiss government investigation that brings closure to the subject before any of the facts are established and opportunities for redress and restitution made available, as the Swiss Federal Office of Culture,

for example, has additionally committed to doing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Further, the settlement agreement states that the counsel for the settling plaintiffs have conducted a thorough investigation of (ui) relating to the claims, have analyzed available information, have reviewed public information, have researched applicable law and have consulted with experts in order to establish the best possible relief, consistent with the interests of the settlement class.

In the case of cultural property in Switzerland, review of available information in consultation with experts does not appear to have taken place, and this must constitute further reason to invalidate the inclusion of cultural property in this settlement.

Your Honor, to summarize, if the Court is to decide that the 1.25 billion dollars is fair, reasonable and adequate and in the best interests of the class before the publication of the Bergier Commission's report, without the opportunity to evaluate the facts or quantify the claims, we believe that it is not possible to make this judgment in relation to cultural property, nor, as we have said, do we believe it to be constitutional or fair to cut



off the rights of those potential claimants who do not know and have not been aware that they have such rights.

If this settlement agreement prevails, unnamed people, unaware of their ownership rights, will in the future be forced to drop claims against other unnamed entities. Up to now, there has never been a sufficient remedy or protection, and claims cannot be asserted until looted works are found, and that could run for many years from now.

The settlement agreement also runs counter to the international understanding agreed at
Washington last December, when the Swiss included agreed that all solutions in this area be, and I quote, "just and fair." It is ironic perhaps to say that this agreement was being reached at just the time that finishing touches were being put to a settlement agreement which is in effect doing exactly the opposite.

The United States's own Holocaust Victims

Redress Act of 1998 states, and I quote, "that all

governments should undertake good faith efforts to

facilitate the return of private and public property,

such as works of art, to the rightful owners, in

cases where assets were confiscated from the claimant

during the period of Nazi rule."

The settlement agreement also stands in direct opposition to the Council of Europe's own position, whose member states, including Switzerland, just three weeks ago passed a unanimous resolution on the restitution of all looted cultural property to its rightful owners or their heirs.

Finally, as an organization of Europe, we submit that some parties most affected by this aspect of the settlement agreement are not able to be present here and will not therefore be able to be heard by the Court. We find it a matter of some concern that there will be a fairness hearing here in New York and there will be one in Jerusalem, but none in Europe, where there are many claimants and where the events under consideration took place.

We further object to the settlement agreement as attempting to limit the rights of potential (ui) claimants, not within the personal subject matter jurisdiction of the Court. Most of these potential claimants have no connection to New York. We contend that the Court should not act, therefore, to cut off such claimants.

For all these reasons and for the sake of the claimants who have been denied justice for all

these years, we ask that you act to prevent this new injustice being visited upon them, at just the time their hopes of recovery are being revived. We ask that art and other cultural property be definitively excluded from the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: I thank you for your statement and I'm going to give careful thought to the remarks that you made. I just wanted to ask you one question, so I can be sure of your position.

In terms of your criticism of the notice,

I take it that you would be here voicing the same
objections even if the notice were adequate. That
is, we could do another notice and extend the opt-out
date. If we did another notice and it was clear and
we extended the opt-out date so that anybody who
wished could opt out, from what I understood from the
last part of your statement, you would still object.
That wouldn't solve your objection.

MS. WEBER: You're right; it wouldn't solve the problem, because cases come forward every week. New cases come forward. It takes weeks, months, years in some cases to establish the whereabouts of looted works.

THE COURT: And to whom they belong.

MS. WEBER: And to whom they belong;

.

that's right. Governments throughout the world -for instance, in Britain and it's happening in the
States (ui), that all the museums are checking their
collections to establish how many of these works they
have in them. This work began at the end of last
year and will continue well into next year, and it
will take many years after that to establish, as you
say, to whom these works belong.

In Switzerland, the work is only just beginning. There are only two or three museums which have begun this process of identifying these works. Indeed, there is a meeting in Switzerland convened by the Federal Office of Culture next week, where all the museums are being asked to begin to carry out this work. So it shows that the work has not even begun there yet, so we have no idea what the state of the problem will be in Switzerland. That, combined with the Bergier Commission's research, which will be continuing well into the middle or towards the end of next year, which up to now (ui).

THE COURT: And the specific focus of your concern, as I understand it, is works of art or other property which will be a specific claim.

MS. WEBER: There may well also be communities, of course, because we represent



communities and there are communities where many works of art that belonged to the communities, Judaica, silver, whatever was taken from them. We're also trying to recover those. So it also would affect -- if one considers communities to be claimants, it also could affect communities like that.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MS. WEBER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mark Dunaevsky.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Good day, your Honor, Mr. Gribetz, Counsel. My name is Mark Dunaevsky. I'm an attorney from Chicago. Together with my co-counsel, Mr. Donald Staffland (ph), I represent Irving Wolf, Abraham Geller and Deena Geller (ph).

My clients are Holocaust survivors and members of the settlement class. Mr. Staffland and I have filed objections to the settlement in this case. Time today is short and I will not review all of the objections we filed. But without waiving any of our written objections, I am here today to address several of our most serious objections and to urge the Court not to approve the current settlement as it is currently constituted, unless the settlement is modified to take into account the objections we have

4 5

submitted that I will raise today, and the objections of all the other objectors who have submitted objections.

The first thing I should point out is that
I am not here to object to the amount of the
settlement. Everyone here, I think, wishes the
settlement could have been greater, but every lawyer
who has settled a case could say the same thing.

The first objection I wish to raise today is the participation of two entities, the World Jewish Restitution Organization, the WJRO, and the World Council of Orthodox Jewish Communities, Inc. in the settlement. These organizations add nothing to the representation of the settlement class. They add no credibility to the settlement. Indeed, they may even detract from the credibility of the settlement.

I don't think I am violating any attorney/client privilege by informing the Court that Mr. Wolf, in my conversations with him, has a special name for these organizations, the WJRO, its constituent organization, the Claim Conference and so on, and the World Council. Mr. Wolf calls these organizations, which claim to represent the interests of Holocaust survivors, the Uganot (ph), and I know other survivors share this sentiment.

I respectfully submit that the formal endorsement of the settlement by the various Jewish organizations we have heard from and which were mentioned mean nothing to members of the settlement class.

may mean nothing to the members of the settlement class but they meant something to the defendants. Without those signatures, this case would not have settled. So in a sense what you're saying is not entirely accurate, because if you don't object to the amount of the settlement and the fact of the settlement, then you cannot ignore the role particularly that the World Jewish Congress and the World Jewish Restitution Organization played in bringing it about.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: They do add, however, nothing in terms of the settlement itself.

THE COURT: They may not, but you have to understand who the class representatives are is largely symbolic.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Your Honor, I submit -THE COURT: They're there and they have
the right to be heard, but so do you.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: I will address the Court's

1 | concern in a moment.

We now come to this other organization called the World Council of Orthodox Communities,

Inc. A simple phone call to Albany, to the

Department of State, informed me that the World

Council was incorporated on April 26th, 1999, only

two weeks before the date of the notice and some four

months after the date of the settlement itself, at

least the copy of the settlement that I was provided

with.

They could not have participated in the settlement negotiations. Their aims, goals and purposes are not clearly known, and it has never been explained what they add to the settlement. Indeed, their name does not even appear in the settlement agreement.

Furthermore, and this is where I will address the Court's concerns, my clients fear that funds from the settlement will be diverted away from actual survivors, actual class members, to the coffers of these organizations.

THE COURT: That's a separate question.

We're going to have a separate hearing on the method of allocation. But the fact that anybody here as a class representative or even as a plaintiff doesn't



give them any special status when it comes to the distribution of the money.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Respectfully, your Honor, it does give them access, a privileged access to the allocation process.

THE COURT: It doesn't. Anyone who wishes to speak with the Special Master Judah Gribetz, he's available. He spent countless hours, I don't know how many hours, speaking to whoever wishes to be heard on the question of how the money should be distributed and allocated. Nobody has special access to him. There are people here who already alluded to the fact that they've spoken with him. There's no such thing as special access.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Your Honor, I respectfully submit, and then I will go on, that attorneys for these organizations sat at this table together with attorneys for the plaintiff class.

THE COURT: You should have sued on behalf of your clients. You would have been sitting with them, too. They sued, the case was settled and they're here.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: I respectfully submit that at least in terms of the World Council, they did not sue.

complaint.

settlement fund.

THE COURT: They were a named plaintiff.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Then I do not have the most current copy of -- the final copy of the

The named plaintiffs, however, are perfectly capable to represent the interests of the class, without the assistance of these organizations. We do urge the Court not to approve any settlement that includes the participation of these organizations or without explicit provision that these organizations receive nothing from the

The second objection I wish to address today is the breadth of the settlement. These objections were echoed by Mr. Dubbin representing tens of thousands, he say, survivors in Florida.

They were echoed as well by the representative from the art community and from the Attorney General of Washington State.

The settlement will release, and I quote from the settlement notice, all claims relating in any way to the Holocaust, World War II and its prelude and aftermath. Victims or targets of Nazi persecution, transactions with or actions of the Nazi regime, treatments of refugees fleeing Nazi

N. Industry



persecution or any related cause or other thing,
whatever, including without limitation all claims
relating to the deposited assets, closed assets,
slave labor or any prior or future effort to recover
on such claims.

THE COURT: Swiss (ui).

MR. DUNAEVSKY: It's not that clear, your Honor.

THE COURT: If it's not that clear, we'll make it clear.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Thank you, your Honor. My clients believe that the settlement and release of this great breadth will compromise and jeopardize the future efforts of Holocaust survivors to seek justice. Mr. Stafflin and I are in the process of preparing our own claim on behalf of our own clients, against German and other parties who have not so far been called to justice, either in this case or in the German slave labor cases.

Only last week, we have identified additional European companies which we believe will bear liability from their actions against Jews and others during the Holocaust of World War II. This broad settlement will jeopardize our client's quest for justice.

THE COURT: How?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Your Honor, we're preparing a lawsuit requiring a great deal of historical research against corporations that built the concentration camps and the apparatus of genocide.

THE COURT: They're not covered by this agreement.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: We believe that the release as defined in the notice does cover many of these companies. The notice is far from clear; it is ambiguous and it is extremely broad, as you heard from Mr. Dubbin, from representatives of the art world and as the Attorney General of Washington State (ui).

THE COURT: Notice is separate from the settlement agreement itself. It's the settlement agreement that's the agreement.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Your Honor, despite my efforts, I was not provided with a copy of the settlement agreement until a week and a half ago.

It's in the court file. THE COURT: on the internet. It's all over.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Your Honor, I'm a Power Unit user. I could not download the agreement and



neither could my computer friends.

THE COURT: You can certainly xerox --

MR. DUNAEVSKY: We asked for a xerox. We were not provided a copy until a week and a half ago.

THE COURT: I don't want to argue with you.

MR. DUNAEVSKY: We urge the Court not to approve any settlement, unless the Court limits the release of those parties named in the complaint, and I will include the Swiss Bankers Association identified in the complaint and their affiliates, subsidiaries, assigns, employees and directors, the usual and typical language of release.

I would like to briefly address one further issue. Some have claimed that vigorously objecting to this settlement will delay or perhaps undermine the efforts to get survivors funds. This is not the case. It is not I, it is not my clients who would delay the efforts to get survivors funds. My suggestion, my objections, if taken into account, would not cost the Swiss banks one cent more. We are not objecting to the amount and they could be agreed to today if the Swiss banks would agree to as well.

Finally, in my last few seconds, Mr. Staffland and I, after reading the tardily-provided

.

settlement agreement and the thousands of pages of objections, have concluded that it's necessary, although regrettably, we were hesitant to do this, to ask to file a motion to intervene in this case, a copy of which was provided to the Court and served upon plaintiff's counsel. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: When was it served?

MR. DUNAEVSKY: It was served this morning. I was not sure who would be here today.

MR. WITTEN: Would you serve us as well,

11 please?

MR. DUNAEVSKY: Certainly.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Laura Hoguet.

MS. HOGUET: Good morning, your Honor. My name is Laura Hoguet. My firm, Hoguet (ui), is a law firm in New York. We represent some claimants in art looting cases. I was asked to appear here by Ms.

Weber's organization and on behalf of others who are seeking to recover specific works of art, in support of an exclusion from the class in this case, applicable to claimants who are seeking specific works of cultural property, including art.

We can appreciate that anybody who is struggling to make a big class action settlement on



2.5

both sides wants it to be as inclusive as possible. In this particular case, we think that the exclusion of claimants seeking specific works of art and cultural property would benefit not just the claimants but the administration of the claims process as well, Mr. Gibenz's job.

Art is different from financial claims.

Most people think of this as the Swiss banks case and think of this case as having to do with financial settlement. People who are looking for looted art, are looking for a specific object or objects -- the law has always treated financial claims different from claims that can be the subject of a suit for specific performance or a claim for replevin. People have, in recent years, brought such suits and succeeded in recovering works of art that were stolen 55 or 60 years ago.

To cut that off, to cut those claims off or trade them for some amount of money is not consistent with the legal principles that underlie art law. It's also not fair or equitable, for all of the reasons that Ms. Weber went into, which I will not repeat.

The process of recovering looted art is very active right now. Anybody can talk about the

reasons for it. One reason is probably the computer. The computerizing of descriptions of art and the history of art is resulting in matches of art with owners. People who don't know that they are claimants wake up one day and discover that they are a claimant, because they get a call from the art loss registry in London, saying that some piece of art that they or a relative put in a claim for 50 years ago has been found.

These people ought not be cut off, and the reason that it's such a concern is that most of the art, a great deal of it, who knows what percentage, did pass through Switzerland and somewhere in the chain has been in the hands of a Swiss dealer, will surface in the hands of a Swiss dealer, is in the hands of a Swiss collector, will end up with a Swiss dealer or pass through to the art world internationally.

Therefore, giving the Swiss institutions and dealers and entities an opportunity to cut off their liability in this process is unfair and ought to be carved out of this settlement.

I'm happy to answer any questions the Court may have.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.



1.8

2.1

Margaret Rosskamm.

MS. ROSSKAMM: I'm here as a sole survivor of a cousin who had a dormant account in Switzerland. I tried to settle this claim for a small amount, which I don't believe we're too ready to settle. I would like to have further research on this dormant account. My children and grandchildren (ui) account holder and his parents, and on their behalf I'm speaking. I should get a research on that bank account, I should get some money.

THE COURT: I think you should be aware that --

MS. ROSSKAMM: If you need any information of the account numbers, can I leave it?

THE COURT: You can leave it, but what I wanted to tell you is that research has been done, hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of research. I think on December 6th, the Volker Commission, which has been responsible for overseeing our research, is going to issue its report. I think it would be fair to say that what research can be done at this point has been done.

MS. ROSSKAMM: This cousin and his parents were considered wealthy people in Germany, and I'm sure there's more money at stake than they are

1 claiming there was.

THE COURT: You can leave whatever information you want.

MS. ROSSKAMM: Thank you.

THE COURT: Dr. Norbert Bikales.

DR. BIKALES: Your Honor, Special Master Gribetz, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Norbert Bikales. I live in McClain (ph), Virginia and I am not an attorney; I am a scientist by profession.

I am a Holocaust survivor from Germany,
France and Switzerland, and I might add that in all
of these countries, I was mistreated. As a child, I
lost both of my parents in the Belzich (ph)
concentration camp, extermination camp. I'm one of
the claimants here, but I'm not here to represent my
own case, to try to plead my personal case, but
rather I am here to represent the Federation of
Jewish Child Survivors of the Holocaust.

Let me define please what we mean by child survivors. Obviously, we are no longer children, but we were children during the period that we're talking about, the Holocaust. The Federation consists of 24 groups of child survivors in the United States and an additional 18 groups in 13 other countries, including, I might say, eastern and central Europe.



One of our members is the Swiss

Association of Hidden Children. Our last general

meeting was in September of this year, in Prague, in

the Czech Republic, and our next meeting will be held

in the year 2000, in Seattle.

I'm here to tell you that the Federation supports the settlement, but that was a position that we took before hearing some of the comments, particularly with respect to art. I wish I had the input of my fellows on that one. The lady who spoke on behalf of the stolen art, in my opinion made a very compelling case. With that exception, we support the settlement.

My comments deal primarily, not so much with the fairness of the settlement, but with how the settlement funds are to be used. To do this, let me just say a few words about our group, about the Federation.

We are a very diverse group. We have members born in all kinds of countries, having survived the Holocaust by all kinds of means and in all kinds of conditions, ghettos and concentration camps, slave labor, hidden. Many of us were hidden, false papers, escaped to neutral countries. Almost all of us lost at least one parent and in most cases,

1 like my own, both.

We came to this wonderful country during various periods, a few before the war, even fewer during the war itself, but mostly we came after the end of the war and the liberation from Nazi persecution.

We have different levels of education. We have different views on religious practice. We have different views on education. We have different views on politics, on almost everything else. What unites us is the common experience of persecution and suffering in our childhoods and the subsequent effects of this experience on our lives, on our adult lives.

The word children appears in our title, but most of us are now in our late sixties or even seventies, and we're very much concerned about the problems of aging. We are entering the last phases of our lives.

In spite of our diverse membership, to which I have already referred, the Federation has asked me to convey to you three points. They deal, as I said, primarily with the distribution of the funds, if I may.

Number one, the amount of the settlement

is so small that it can in no way compensate for all of the enormous losses that the Jewish people suffered. Thus, it is our position that after payment to those who can document losses actually incurred in Switzerland, all of the remaining money from the settlement -- let me please repeat this.

All of the remaining money from the settlement should be devoted solely, and I said solely, for the welfare of needy survivors.

Specifically, we have many members who are in poor health, others who have insufficient funds to live out their remaining days in dignity, et cetera. I have had the opportunity to visit central and eastern Europe recently, and our brothers there are in very sad condition, very sad financial and health conditions.

So that should be, in our view, the main concern of the settlement, to take care of the needy survivors, those who suffered during the Holocaust. These are the very people who should now be helped. That's my point number one.

Number two, and here I speak again on behalf of the Federation and personally, we specifically and vigorously oppose setting aside any funds to any religious organization for any purpose.

Our membership ranges from atheist to orthodox, with all shades in between. No single religious group can speak for all of us.

We firmly believe, and perhaps I'm overstepping my bounds here into a legal situation -- we firmly believe, under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, that it is not the province of a United States court to decide what constitutes "Jewish education," a subject on which we ourselves hold a variety of views.

Members of religious groups should be of course free to apply as individuals, as all other survivors, for their just share of the settlement, but we do not believe that any group should. Any person, orthodox or otherwise, is free to use the proceeds in any way that they choose, and they can certainly choose to support a religious cause, if they wish to do so. That's my point number two.

Number three, we of course have heard today and we have heard before, the circumstances that led up to the settlement and the suffering that our members and all survivors endured during the Holocaust.

Your Honor, I ask this Honorable Court to please ensure that legal fees be kept to a minimum.



If there ever was a case where pro bono should have a meaning, we believe this is it. I thank the Court for permitting me to make this brief statement.

THE COURT: Mr. Leo Rechter.

MR. RECHTER: Your Honor, thank you for permitting me to speak here. I am speaking on behalf of the National Association of Jewish Holocaust Survivors who were children or teenagers during the war. We are a sister organization of the Federation, which consists of small groups. We are a little larger and we are located mainly here in New York.

I will not take up too much of your time, but I would like to address myself to some of the remarks that they made today. We are supporting the agreement. We feel that under the circumstances, as was explained, there is no other solution. Even though we were children at one point during the terrible years, right now time is passing by. Only two days ago, I had to go to a funeral of one of our best friends (ui).

We support the organization, but it hurt me this morning very much when one attorney after another was talking about fair, reasonable and adequate. Fair, reasonable and adequate? And the Swiss lawyer was telling us complete closure. You

want complete closure? Bring me back my father, bring me back my uncle, bring me back my whole family in Poland.

It's not fair. Like someone said here, we are pragmatists; we have to accept what is offered; we know there is not much time. So we settle. This is a settlement, but by all means, don't call it fair or adequate. It can never be complete closure.

Why are we settling? Why are we in favor of settlement? Because not like somebody said, the overwhelming majority of survivors are in favor of the settlement. They are not in favor of the settlement. They are sick and tired of the shenanigans which have been going on for years and years and years and of every lawyer jumping in to get his share.

We appreciate their legal efforts on behalf of us and we appreciate all the help we got from the Jewish Restitution Organization and from Mr. Braufman and from the World Jewish Congress. We appreciate all that.

We don't think it was necessary to have that many lawyers for this particular case. I don't see why it was necessary, and everybody submitting claims four million, for four and a half million, and



here two lawyers, terrific lawyers, the effort they
put in -- one is asking for four million and one is
asking for four and a half million. And we should be
grateful for them? What are the survivors going to
get in the best of cases, after all this is
distributed?

Your Honor, we had submitted proposals for the allocation to you and to Master Gribetz, and we feel that there should not be (ui) survivors.

Everybody who lost some assets one way or another should be entitled to a share. Either way, it's not going to help much.

There are very needy survivors all over the world. I know, because I was one of the interviewers of the (ui) Foundation. I interviewed people in Washington Heights that were living in tenements with (ui) chairs and tables, and I interviewed people in Rego Park that were on dialysis and could not afford even the monthly payments for the (ui).

And now the money is going to come in handy to all of them and we want to settle it as fast as possible. But in the best of cases, nobody is going to get rich, and I wish that after all this is over, we should publicize what the survivors got and

what some of the other parties that are involved, what they are getting or what they are asking for.

I also would like to mention that somebody mentioned here that a substantial portion of the proceeds should go for Jewish educational institutions. As my colleague Norbert Bikales said before, this should be up to the members, to all the survivors, not up to somebody to tell us who we have to give to and what we should give.

Statistically, there are more yeshivas in existence now than there were before the war. So there is a good chance that Jewish education will come through. I come from an orthodox family and I believe very much in the tradition and I believe very much in orthodoxy, but each one should be free to pursue his religion the way he wants.

Finally, we also oppose -- our organization opposes very strongly any kind of deduction, as was mentioned, of 25% for social agencies and another 20% for education and for memorials. I don't know whose names would be attached to those memorials.

Initially, as you know, we submitted a proposal, quite a number of years ago, that we also would like to see the medical needs of all survivors



being taken care of by those proceeds. But since we are a democratic organization, we also asked the membership what they might think about it, and let me tell you that unfortunately, the membership of child survivors are very disappointed and very disgusted of the large American Jewish organizations. They had very bad experiences in the past. They are perhaps no longer justified, but this is the case.

Over 1,500 people that we queried, everybody practically -- we didn't get a negative response -- signed petitions against any kind of deduction, be it 25%, 45% or whatever the case might be. All the petitions are available for your perusal, your Honor. We very strongly feel about that.

During the war, we had no voice over what was happening to ourselves. Now we have amongst us, as you know, doctors, professors, chairs of Holocaust studies. We even have two Secretaries of State and a head of the Board of Trade of Chicago. We have talented people and we think that the Holocaust survivors should have been involved far more in all the negotiations than they actually were.

The delegate or the counsel from Switzerland mentioned that long list of names of

organizations that support the settlement. We also support the settlement. We never realized that among all those names you mentioned, there are only two organizations of Holocaust survivors or three, and we feel that was very unfair in the past, and we hope that in the future, everybody will take cognizance that although you can get away with it right now because you have the power and the influence, that this not just, not in the eyes of the survivors.

Thank you.

THE COURT: We have two more speakers and then we'll break for lunch. Senator Carl Kruger.

SENATOR KRUGER: Good morning, your Honor.

My name is Carl Kruger. I represent the 21st

Senatorial District of Kings County.

This morning we're presented with both opportunity and with challenge. Your Honor is faced with a dilemma, to try to weigh, as you always do, equity and justice. And quite frankly, at the end of the day, my constituency, which represents probably the largest concentration of Holocaust survivors, certainly in the metropolitan area and perhaps in the country, are deeply perplexed. We're deeply concerned and quite frankly, we're moved by not only what happens here but with the events of years past



2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and years yet to come.

Survivors today are eighty and ninety years old. The funds that are presented to them today dwindle as they age in the process and as their golden years move on, and their ability to use the few dollars that may come out of this allocated settlement becomes more a question of preserving a quality of life than somehow or other trying to infuse a life.

People lost their families. They lost their business, they lost their homes. But most importantly, they in most instances even lost their will to live. Today they're faced with the opportunity to say that this government and the organizations that have fought so vigorously for so long to try to make some right into what was obviously such a terrible wrong cannot really do that, to the extent that these families now have to use the few dollars that come out of this settlement to supply themselves with, as one of the prior people that gave testimony here this morning are talking about, medical care, food, sustenance, a rent subsidy, the kinds of things that this money was never intended for but ultimately will be used.

As the attorneys argue, we seem to feel

like this a low-key chorus. Everybody is arguing in the background, while the main players remain on stage. We ask you, at least I ask you, that the broad sentiment in my community is to create a fund, create a fund, a pool of available resources that people can tap and use so that their life can be made a little bit more secure and the quality can be raised somewhat in their golden years.

We certainly cannot ask at this point for justice, because justice is not even an issue. We ask your Honor to distribute equity, to distribute fairness, to try to do the right thing by people that otherwise can't speak for themselves. So today is historic. It presents challenge, it presents opportunity and it presents for your Honor a unique circumstance, a circumstance that will never be duplicated in the annals of our history. Thank you.

THE COURT: Judith Hager.

MS. HAGER: His Honor, my name is Rabbizin (ph) Judith Hager and I was admitted to (ui) in New York. I was preaching Jewish philosophy.

I represent an institution which is a yeshiva and a settlement, which is called Kiergot Chidushe Harim. Before speaking about the angst and why we are asking for help, I would like to tell you



2.4

what I felt on this shabbes. On this shabbes, we read from the book of Obadiah and Davtela (ph) and the prophet says in sentence 17, "And in Zion shall be remandments, and there shall be holiness and the house of Jacob will inherit their inheritance." It's the great privilege of the United States that the fulfillment of the prophecy of Obadiah is done through the United States court.

Your Honor, the Kiergot Chidushe Harim is named after the great genius and pious grand rabbi. Harim is the initials of Harad Itzak Meil (ph). There were thousands of synagogues which were all over Poland after this name of Rabbi Isaac Meil, who were dealing with his ideas, with his writings, and they had a very special way -- I would say a special way in the terminology of holiness, kindness, of purity, of very high intelligence.

Most of those people were business people and were very successful. By the way, to remind my own grandfather (ui). Thousands of them were bearing the name of these synagogues Chidushe Harim silver Torah ornaments, (ui), shabbes and yomkov (ph) candles, Hanukkah candles, and all of this was melted and given to the Swiss banks.

There were a lot of other documents that

were there, like the Sifra (ph) Torah itself, thousands of them, which we don't know where they went, and also this society was the queen of Judaism in all Poland. Nothing is remain from all those glory.

The voices of those that went to the gas chambers and those (ui) which were a crown and a symbol of a way of life to all Jews, all over Europe, from England to Germany to Italy and even in Yemen, the voice of those Jews came, in the way that they lived and the values that they were carrying. While going to those gas chambers, I'm asking myself, what did they think at the last moment?

We know that you can today destroy the world with one button, just pushing one button. So the greatness is really not the power of conquering or destroying a world, which the Nazis should have known. This is no such great thing if someone doesn't have any weapon and you come and you attack him and you kill him.

The greatest greatness of the Jews and the real hero is the one that doesn't give up his values at the last moment of his life. Those people who went to the gas chambers screaming and believing that their values will continue someplace and there will



come a day that people will pay revenge.

We are not looking for revenge; we are looking for justice. What does it mean, justice?

Justice means -- our rabbi say, if you want take revenge from someone, if you kill him, that's not revenge. You say, I'll beat him, I'll give him back punishment. But the real revenge is when you're carrying on a greater quality, you develop a greater standard of your own morals, of your own behavior. It takes from you courage, it takes from you a lot of patience, but this is the revenge.

Now I think that the remandments that
Obadiah spoke, the remandments in Zion of those
thousands and thousands of Jews, that their voice is
not heard anymore, (ui) is to help the Kiergot
Chidushe Harim to develop and to continue in this
great belief and the great values.

To the Swiss banks I would like to say, you didn't behave right while not admitting. As I hear it, the last man didn't want to admit what you owe. Again, in our Torah it's written daminn.

Daminn means blood and daminn means money. So I don't think that billions of billions of dollars that would have been given to all of those people that ask will compensate for the evil that was done.

4 5

•

No-one of the Nazi or Swiss banks should think that they are finished with compensation and that they don't deserve anything to be punished. But we are too little, too small to give the right punishment for something that never happened in history before.

I myself meticulously was researching the Holocaust and I came to some conclusions this is not the place to say. But the real revenge for what has been done is only given in the hands of God. He created the (ui) and the prophets always speaks about it. God will lead us to the right way of life and we will see what is the right revenge for all those deeds.

But as I said, the greatest revenge will be by continuing our straight line, continuing bringing the children, our next generation in the right ways, in the Jewish way, which was the light of the world and will be the light of the world, as being the chosen people.

Again, I want to thank United States for this great opportunity she gave people to speak out. It's not a matter of how much pennies or how much dollars or how much millions you have; it's the great opportunity to speak out, even 55 years later, and I



think that even 1,000 years later, our generations to come will continue to speak and to value it -- the evil and to continue in the path of helping each other.

So I would like, your Honor -- I put in the papers what are the aims of Kiergot Chidushe Harim. They need a lot of help to continue on those research that they're doing, to continue to help couples to live in the Kiergot. Kiergot is a settlement. They would like to continue to have computer and to build up their own children in the right way, to build an (ui), to build a park. The memory of all those thousands that were gone should remain forever. Thank you.

THE COURT: We'll break for lunch for a half hour. We'll be able to have another eight to ten speakers.

(Break)

THE COURT: The next speaker is Steve

Placek. We'll just go on to Naomi Nagel and Alice

Fisher.

MS. NAGEL: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is

Naomi Nagel. I am a sole survivor from my parents.

My parents were originally from Czechoslovakia and

ı

-

when the Nazis came in, they fled to -- they wanted to flee to England but they never made it. They went to south of France, where I was born. Then I was two-and-a-half and three years old. First my father was taken and then my mother to Auschwitz.

My mother placed me in a cloister before she was taken to Auschwitz, where my life was saved. After the war, when I was almost seven years old, my aunts found me and they took me to Hungary, where we discovered papers from my parents, the letters what they wrote to my grandmother and my father's sisters. That was the number of the -- my father was a very successful traveler for a big firm and he used to go to Europe to sell cattle all over.

Whenever he was in Europe, he used to go to Switzerland and that was money in Sweizeviche
Kapitanstalle (ph) in Basel. My relatives had the number of the account and I was trying for the last 15 years to get it back, which I never succeeded.

Now I joined the class action and I feel that the settlement is fair and reasonable.

I just feel that those people like me, who have an account number and all the documents, they should get first, because that's what my father left me. It's my money. I feel that that's why we should

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

be number one and then all the other causes. That's all. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Alice Fisher.

MS. FISHER: My name is Alice Fisher. I have here (ui). I have to comment on some of the matters I heard here. This settlement is by no means sufficient or fair or reasonable. I heard here that it's overwhelming. This I never heard from anybody. Nobody thinks that it's (ui) endorse, but we have no choice. Look around our faces here. Considering our ages, we have no other choice but to accept. But for six million people, this is by no means fair or sufficient. And about the communication of the Swiss banks, I can tell you my communication, how they communicated with me.

My father was a very wealthy businessman. I come from Czechoslovakia. It was occupied by the end of 1938 by the Hungarians. And because our area was politically very insecure, so all the Hungarian and Czech Jews went periodically to Switzerland to make assurances for the children and deposit their life savings.

My father represented the (ui) German company Singer Eskachech (ph) company. Every

)

business trip, he stopped in Switzerland to put the money. From 1934, the secret law came out that you can deposit money under a number only. Inside they had the name, because it was illegal to take out money from the country.

From 1934 until 1944, many Hungarian and Czech Jews, all of the (ui) Jews that I know there deposited their money. In the list that came out, not one of the Hungarian or Czechoslovakian Jews' names was there.

THE COURT: That's not the final list you have; that's just the first list.

MS. FISHER: Okay. Let's hope that (ui). Thank you, your Honor.

In the ghetto (ui) ghetto in April of '44 from Hungary. My father was taken out and beaten by the Germans twice because they knew that he was a wealthy businessman. This was the system of the Germans. Before the killing, they first interrogate. They torture the victim, they should reveal where they keep the money.

My father came back. He was a 44- or 45year-old man. We are not talking here about old
people. He came back bloody from the interrogation.
Many Hungarian Jews, perhaps under duress, revealed



their numbers and (ui) documentation that many Nazis came in in '45 and '46, in Switzerland.

I do not want to go into details, but after -- my father was taken and deported, half dead already, to Mauthausen concentration camp. There he worked for eight months slave labor with my 14-year-old brother and after this, three weeks before liberation, they killed them. This was a death march in Mauthausen concentration camp. My little 9-year-old brother was thrown in the gas showers in Auschwitz. My 39-year-old mother went with him. She could have perhaps survived. I was in Baden Baden concentration camp and I survived all alone.

So those noble Swiss, after the war, when we came to them, (ui) all alone, took advantage from (ui) of the family is dead. I brought the death certificate in because in Israel, after the war, the Israeli government provided an office -- from '48, there was an office in (ui), near Jerusalem, searching for relatives. In end of '49, they found records in Mauthausen concentration camp that my father was -- of course, the Germans, whoever they killed, it was recorded that they died in typhus.

So I had a death certificate of my father and I produced this, so they had -- I have here all

the copies of the letters with Swiss banks I corresponded. I didn't start this now. I started this over 20 years ago, when I could afford a lawyer.

After the concentration camps, we still struggled and we still struggle. Our lives are not like my parents planned it for us. I came out from a very rich home, but the Holocaust shattered my life and ruined it, still today. And now I hear about the communications of the Swiss banks.

My father provided for us well and he taught us in the ghetto that you have a future after the war in Switzerland. He trusted the Swiss banks (ui) and the Swiss, what did they do? Now we know that they financed Hitler's warfare.

They prolonged the war by this and all the Hungarians, they are responsible for the deaths of all the Hungarian Jews. By us, the Holocaust started only in middle of '44. In March '44, we were still in our homes. Hitler marched into us only March, 1944. And in May/June '44, Adolf Eichmann, Hitler's right-hand man, was already ready to make deals with the head of the Zionist Organization, Adolf Kasmir (ph), for thousand (ui) or thousand Jews.

I don't remember the exact figures, because they were bankrupt. They could not continue



the Holocaust. The Russians were advancing from the east and the allies started bombing already, so the Holocaust could not have gone on to '45, if not for the Swiss money and the Swiss -- this is the (ui) -- the Swiss paid them our money for our (ui). So our parents and our brothers were killed. The Hungarian Jews could have been spared.

So this is not a fair deal, considering for how many people they did it. Anyhow, as you heard here, this is not just a material issue; this is a moral issue. And the moral side of it is that at least this hearing is a part of the moral side of it. This puts the Holocaust on the map against all the denials. So with this, I am satisfied, at least, that my parents and brothers' memory will not be assaulted like they were.

But with the Swiss I communicated for many years and I spent -- I invested in this a lot of money, because I have here the letters that every bank requested 500 francs for search. Then the answer is, there is no information. I had a lawyer in the '70s and in the '80s, in Basel one and in Zurich one. After a few years of search, they sent me back the power of attorney that I sent them, with a bill of course for their fees.

And they wrote me a letter, Mrs. Fisher, we cannot ask for more money from us, because I pay for each one 500 francs, because we see that the banks hide under the law of secrecy and don't want to give any information. The law of secrecy from '34 that was supposed to protect us, now they make it work against us and we could not achieve anything until the Banking Committee of the U.S. government was involved with this.

In 1996, when I went with Mr. Fagan, who is my lawyer, to the House of Representatives in Washington, then the deal started rolling, because as private citizens, we couldn't achieve anything. So I really believe in the United States justice, that some measure of justice will be done, because justice cannot be done for a crime like this one. These are atrocities that (ui) for this. But a measure of justice, perhaps, for the victims and for the survivors.

I heard here also from one of the speakers that those that are entitled to this money are not sitting here anymore. Too many of them are not here, but some of us are still here. Please, do not select heirs for us. We are still here. We will give our own charities and we are giving our own charities.



It is not fair to select percentages to organizations or to charities. We give as any other Jew. Why should a Holocaust survivor be assigned a special percentage to give? Every Jew, every human being has to give. This is for the Holocaust survivors and we are still here. Look at our faces not for long, so this is why we have to accept this deal, because the Swiss banks left us no choice.

But when I hear the word contribution or fund, then this is really very -- this is adding insult to injury, because German companies don't give any contributions to me. This is my money. I never applied for the (ui) Germans, despite that no-one suffered as much as I did, no-one lost as much as I did. Many lost as I did, yes, but no more. I lost all my family and I come from a very wealthy home.

Our home was full of art, objects. The German officer in the elegant uniform just came into our house and just pointed to (ui). My grand piano was taken, everything. They stripped us naked (ui). They took the greatest property in the world and now you see one billion and a quarter. This is just a fraction of the interest that they make from our money. And it's our money, because my father put it in for my name and for my children's name.

I will give my own charity and I really ask that it's not a contribution. It's not a fund. I don't want funds and I don't want contributions from banks. They don't have to go collect the money for us. They should give us back our money that we put in our for our life's safekeeping.

Please, your Honor, I hope that you can differentiate between all those that started this thing, this matter already years ago, because with this mailing that you did now that cost so much money, this mailing only encouraged, I am afraid to say, people that are not legitimate Holocaust survivors. Because as groups, this money is not for persecution.

I heard him mention many names of groups. They were persecuted by the Germans, yes, but if they had Swiss accounts, they are entitled to it, but not as a group. As a group, they were persecuted but not taking the money. So I just ask you -- God should really give you the wisdom, your Honor, Judge Korman and Master Gribetz -- God should give you the wisdom to know how to distribute this money. First the bank accounts and then those that are really entitled for the looters and robbery of the Germans first and then the Swiss.



I thank you very much, Judge Korman and Master Gribetz and all the honorable attorneys, for all your time and effort that you've given this matter.

THE COURT: Thank you.

David Handwoho.

MR. HANDWOHO: Your Honor, my name is

David Handwoho. I'm a Holocaust survivor. I also

participated in the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. I

was in various camps. For four and a half years,

I've been in camps, in and out, working camps as well

as the concentration camps.

I have spent my whole years from one camp to the other. I was also in Auschwitz, I was in Lydanek, I was in Berkenau (ph), I was in Dura (ph). I was also in Gleibitz (ph) and from Gleibitz I went to Dura, Albestadt (ph), Termane (ph) and so on, until we got to Libik (ph).

At Libik, we were ordered on a ship. The name of the ship was Capricorna (ph). On this ship were 9,700 inmates from various countries, and I saw -- I was on the top when the Americans came and I put (ui) in the middle of the ship. The ship got engulfed in fire and I managed to grab a piece of thick wood and throw it into the ocean. And then I

went on that piece of wood and I paddled to shore.

You could see from a distance the shore. I came over and there were the British and I was liberated by the British.

Going back to the camps, your Honor, let me tell you something. Whatever you see on television, whatever you read, you only know maybe 10% of what went on in the camps, because a normal person could never comprehend what really happened in the camps. You lived from minute to minute. You survived this minute; then you had to look to survive the next minute.

Then you had to know every trick the Germans had. If you got hit by a German, you had to (ui) right away, make him show where he struck, and then pick up the tool and start working. If you don't, he'll hit you as hard as he could until you're dead. So those tricks, you had to know.

Since I've been an old timer Holocaust survivor, I learned the hard way those tricks, and that's why I'm able to stay here and talk to you about the atrocities. I lost 180 people from my family, who perished. I'm the only survivor, your Honor, but I cannot see that there's so many dogoders, sitting with their hands ready to gobble up



to the (ui) the money that it's entitled to us. We are the ones who suffered. There is no-one in the world that can give us the amount of money what we went through. But still, everybody wants to have his piece.

Your Honor, I beg you, you have a lot of thing to do about it. I talk to your heart, as a Judge. Your Honor, I believe in the judicial system of America. Please, use your influence and see to it that justice is being done. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Eliezer Blaustein.

THE CLERK: Can we have the Russian interpreter, please?

MR. BLAUSTEIN: Deeply respected Judge
Korman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Eliezer
Blaustein. I'm from Ukraine. I was born in Odessa,
in August 17, 1932. I live in Brooklyn (ui) years.
I have a little English and you excuse me for my
Russian interpreter.

THE COURT: There's an interpreter.

MR. BLAUSTEIN: I think it is necessary to tell the Court the falling about the fairness, about the fairness of this settlement, the settlement between the Swiss banks and Jews, the survivors of

Holocaust and their heirs.

October 22nd, 1999 was the date established by the Court. That date was established for registration of information about the distribution of funds and also the claims and the time when the claims would be filed in the Court. This time is not enough.

Hundreds, maybe thousands of people, and not only in America, but also in the Republics of former Soviet Union, victims and survivors of Holocaust and their heirs, were deprived of the opportunity to file an original application, because there was not enough time and also not enough applications were mailed.

THE COURT: I think there is a misunderstanding. The questionnaires that had to be filed by the 22nd were what we would describe as informational. First of all, we're still accepting those that have come in after the 22nd, and you did not have to file the questionnaire in order to be eligible for whatever plan of allocation was made. So even if somebody did not file one of these questionnaires, they still could be eligible.

MR. BLAUSTEIN: I understand, but I don't have -- but I just don't have a chance to apply, to





submit this application.

THE COURT: You could submit it. This is not a date where if you didn't submit it, you're not eligible to participate.

MR. BLAUSTEIN: I would like just to give an example. This is the example of what I said before. November 19th, this year, newspaper Forwards (ph) published a small notice and that notice said, and I quote, "About new 44,000 accounts opened by Jews before or during Holocaust, page 3. Jewish organization kiosk only November of 1999 started this work to help people to fill out applications for Russian-speaking Jews, people who don't speak English."

As a result, many, and I would like stress this word many -- I don't know exactly how many, but many potential plaintiffs up until now can't bring into the Court for the Court's consideration their material loss. So it is very difficult for the Court to establish the real size or the real amount of their material damage.

And the second: This form which was sent to us, that form does not indicate on what period the amount which was stolen, which was hidden and which was lost should be estimated. So the plaintiffs --

let's say the fourth category as far as the settlement, could not determine and could not notify the Court the amount of the material damage which was caused to them, and I stress these words, the material damage.

The amount of 1.25 millions of dollars, which Swiss (ui) agreed to return to their victims and survivors of Holocaust isn't adequate, isn't adequate to the material damage, and it isn't also adequate to the health and the life of hundreds of thousands of Jews of the former Soviet Union.

Six million Jews of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, in ghettos and concentration camps, in evacuations -- it is impossible to estimate it in monetary form. I think that (ui) in 1.25 million dollars, which was suggested to your consideration, your Honor, is not a compensation, but just not enough amount of money, money of the Jews which were hidden in Holocaust and which were stolen and besides money, also jewelry and some other stolen property hidden by Swiss banks and their heirs after the Second World War.

And I am finishing. To my mind, Swiss banks must carry not only moral responsibility in front of the Jews of Europe and former Soviet Union



2.1

and their heirs, and their heirs in the United States and Canada, in Australia, but also in front of them United Nations. The sum which was given for your consideration, in our opinion is not fair and is not adequate.

By the way, for 60 years, there was a very substantial interest which was accumulated in Swiss banks. Alongside, we think it is possible to ask you, your Honor, to approve the settlement and to approve that amount of 1.25 billion dollars as a first branch. It is like the first original step of compensation, and to start in this year to distribute the money among the survivors of Holocaust and among their heirs. And only God knows how long these people will still be alive.

And our suggestion about the distribution or about the plan of the distribution of those funds will be given to you, Mr. Gribetz -- will be given to you in the (ui) order. Thank you for your attention.

THE COURT: Lea Kartyn.

MS. KARTYN: Your Honor, my name is Lea Kartyn. I came from Israel. I've been residing there for seven years.

I address you here, not only for myself, but also my countrymen who live in a town called

Ashkelon (ph). They are also plaintiffs in the class action suit against Swiss banks. I was asked to express hope that the respectful Court will approve this settlement, although it's not very adequate in terms of the amount of claim, but we victims of Holocaust don't have much time to wait.

2.4

I express my gratitude to all involved in this suit, the individuals and the organizations, for the fact that they were able to find evidence of the cooperation of Swiss banks with Nazi Germany, and so they were able to find accounts in the Swiss banks which were hidden. I also express my gratitude to all attorneys who were involved in preparing this claim, especially the ones who refused to charge for this claim. I ask the others to follow their example.

I understand that the claim amount is far from adequate, but nevertheless we support this agreement, but we're asking the Court to include the corrected dates, the corrected dates of compensation, so that the very first distribution of the compensation would take place in June of the following year, and the final distribution should not take place longer than a year from that date.

I'm a plaintiff in this action. I lived



in Odessa and all my properties and my family properties, my father's property, who was a movie director. My parents inherited gold rubles from their parents, which was significant amount, who in turn inherited their money from the Russian traders of the first and second degree, the art, antiques and jewelries, which were hidden, of course, for this reason, from the Soviet authorities, in the basement of our apartment, and they were forced to leave all their possessions because they had to flee Odessa.

Not only I experienced a material loss because of the damage of my properties, but also physical. During the evacuation from Odessa by ship, my ship was bombed by the Nazi planes. I was thrown out to the sea. I was rescued, but because of the tremendous number of injuries, I lost my vision. By accident, instead of arriving to the place of evacuation, I ended up in Leningrad, now called St. Petersburg two days prior the German blockade. I survived the Leningrad blockade, lost my health because I experienced hunger, and then I was evacuated to the central (ui).

There are a lot of people like me who suffered because of Holocaust. We all need material and moral health. We also need help in reinstating

our health and reinstating our social needs. We don't have much time to live.

I'd like to support those who presented their comments today about the fact that religious groups should withdraw their claims from this agreement. This money should be returned to those who lost them. Religious groups and the educational groups should follow the Torah's rules. They should express their pity to the victims; Help in bringing up a future religious leader should come from different sources. Thank you for your attention.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE CLERK: Mr. Kartyn.

MR. KARTYN: May I address you?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KARTYN: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure today's hearing will be entered in the history of jurisprudence. I, as a Second World War veteran, listening to these speeches today, felt like I'm listening to the Nuremberg process all over again. That's why it's impossible to make a mistake when you're going to decide the fate of this.

Although you've heard a lot of different opinions, I just want to support those speakers who talked about religious organizations such as yeshiva.



When we found out about it from the Israeli radio, all war veterans, Holocaust victims and survivors were shocked. A lot of universities could envy yeshiva the nations.

And I'm addressing not as much you, your Honor, but to the attorneys and the administrations who represent those. I just want to tell them please think what you doing. The compensation has to go to Holocaust victims. Of course, the young people who studies and other universities don't know much about wars, about the war which took not six days, not four months, but four years. That's why I'm asking them to withdraw their claim, because the money should go to the Holocaust survivors only. Thank you.

THE COURT: David Tannenbaum.

MR. TANNENBAUM: My name is David

Tannenbaum. I'm a survivor and I spent all my best

few years, teenage years in three famous

concentration camps, Bleidernech (ph), Plaschoff (ph)

and Klausenberg (ph). Your Honor, gentlemen, ladies,

I present myself to you other survivors.

The reason I'm here is because our opinion is that this settlement is very unfair, because as we know, the whole world is trying to erase the fact of the Holocaust, (ui) Auschwitz (ui), while the Swiss

government does not want to recognize the settlement, because if a government will recognize it, they will admit to the guilt. If a bank institution does, it's a humane thing.

I want to stress three points, which were sent by application. Really, I and my brother survivors, we really don't understand how people, intelligent people, which they do probably -- made up those applications -- that for instance, for (ui).

We know I'm sure -- there's been plenty in the press and television and in the history of the Holocaust -- that the Germans surrounded a town and they went around to the houses in the streets and they chased everybody under stress, under the whip, chased everybody out into the town square, and from there into cattle trains and were sent away, nowhere that we know until really this day.

I'll take up my area, which we trying to find out that there was Belzets (ph) and Saribourg (ph). The conditions which those people died we knew later. People were brought to Belzets. That was not actually a camp. That was just an area where people were sitting in bunches. They got undressed and they were waiting and transport brought them to Saribourg, where they were gassed.

Under the conditions those people lived, I will not describe it, because the human mind I don't think can comprehend it and can describe it. The fact is Dr. Michael Birenbaum (ph) -- he's got a book out, Witness to the Holocaust, in which there's a testament of the guy which was the commandant of Saribourg.

I take up those things and another thing here, to bring out the time of death, the place of death. We know that from my area, they were sent to -- but we really don't know exactly the time when they were put into the gas chamber or the time or the day when they were brought into the gas chambers.

Some transports waited naked on the outside for days, until they got into line to get to Saribourg.

I myself started all these things here, although I am one survivor myself, but I tried -- all my life, Holocaust was my side job. I myself -- I want to bring out one other thing, how I survived. In the course, they put us compared to other (ui). All along, everything was Jews. The Jew was always separated from all the things, until the last minute, in the last camp, and the camp was already have to be evacuated and the allies was surrounding the area.

The first thing was the Judinraus (ph) and

the camp was -- the guards left the camp and they left everybody else. But the Judin, the Jews were out, because we had a special yellow strip and they know -- the block leader, he knew who was Jewish from -- they had an account of us.

We went on the transport, which then became a death march. There was left over -- they liberated maybe 40 of us. From a couple thousand, there was 400 (ui). With all that they want to buy -- we came to an area and we were surrounded and the guards left us. That was all Jews, because all the others were left in the camp for the Swedish Red Cross to take over.

This is history; I'm not telling a story.

We were in the woods and the guards left us alone.

That meant that we were -- we didn't believe it but we were liberated. We never dreamed of that. We were waiting in farmers' pig stalls, hiding again.

They came in about four or five hours later and they took us out.

There was 57 young boys and they were all shot. I was safe. I was the last one in line and the tanks came around, so they were (ui). I personally caught the other guy, one of the guys. I brought them to justice. I was the only surviving



witness and he was hanged. I got the whole case from the military tribunal in Dachau.

Therefore, we don't see how we could agree that somebody could buy off and say, we give you so much and forget about it and no claims, nothing, nothing happened. We erasing the Holocaust. That's my opinion and that's why survivors (ui). We get money, we get a certain amount of money and forget about whatever happened, whatever parents -- I lost my whole family. I had three brothers, two sisters, father and mother, uncles, aunts, two brothers who were highly educated. One was in (ui) yeshiva until the war. One was in another high school, an artist.

We were together (ui) in the last camp.

They sent him away and he died in Mauthausen. I

happen to know because there were other people who
survived. They knew him. They knew when he died.

The oldest brother was shot while trying to escape.

People who survived told me he ran away and they
brought him back there.

Therefore, your Honor, I think -- I believe -- I'm here in this country 15 years -- that there is justice and there is understanding. It was in our name, in the survivors' name which all the settlement was made. I think that you can see we

cannot live our lives out -- pawn themselves off for a certain amount of money. It's not the money that I'm asking, more or less; I don't care. There's \$500 which they gave. I didn't take it.

I bought my Hanukkah lamp in Warsaw,

Poland two years ago, which I paid \$4,500. I brought

it here. If you people want to see it, I'll show it

to you.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS)

MR. TANNENBAUM: That's something which I paid for as a gift. I always got punished because I unscrewed the lines, the lines of Judah. For 18 years, I was telling my daughter -- she just graduated Georgetown and I lit this in Georgetown with Michael Birenbaum. He was that time (ui). So for 18 years I've been telling her, is that Hanukkiah (ph)? That's not the Hanukkiah. That's something which I had. After 18 years, I came and I brought this. She was going to school, so the rabbi invited me and I came and I lit this.

This is what I wanted to say. Thank you for listening and I hope that people (ui) will understand why we have the grievance for us.

THE COURT: Roman Kwaitkowski.

MR. FISHER: He's outside. Why don't you



take the next one?

THE COURT: Yaron Schwartz.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Yaron Schwartz and I was born in Israel. I am the son of Holocaust survivor, representing my sister, my brother and my mother. However, I think that I speak for a lot of other people my age and generation.

We grew up without any relatives from my father's side of the family. My father spent all his time, energy and money to fight hostile European bureaucrats, bureaucracies, institutions and courts, trying to claim his dignity, humanity and property. Unfortunately, to this day, and after 40 years of trying, his efforts are unsuccessful. The horrible Bible quote, "You are the killer; now you are the heir, too" became the tragic reality facing him and hundreds of thousands of other victims.

I do have much sympathy and a lot of respect to the survivors that I heard before, and they spoke in favor of the settlement. However, I must object to the proposed settlement. There is one thing common to all of us here; we are all tired, very tired. You're looking at the face here; people are tired. They're tired to hear about it, they're

S

tired to speak about it, but that's not an excuse to accept it. We should wash our face and get back to the battle.

The proposed settlement ignores hundreds of thousands of second generation Holocaust survivors, who were robbed and stripped by post-war Swiss bureaucrats, bankers, officials and institutions, of a normal, happy childhood and better quality of life during the last 55 years.

The proposed settlement amount is totally unproportional (sic) to the money and property looted and is not representing any punishment for the years of deception and evidence destruction exercised by the Swiss banks, companies and entities involved.

The proposed settlement amount is grossly insufficient and unfair, even without knowledge of how many victims are actually participating in the class. I heard today the number of 400,000. I don't know how many are qualified, but it just proved my point.

Switzerland proudly presents itself as a neutral country, founder of the Red Cross, defender of democratic values, oasis of peace and harmony, is in reality unmasked as a self-centered, mercantile nation that prospered from its dealings with Hitler,



showed no sympathy for his victims and emerged untouched and richer from the conflict that devastated its neighbors.

Accepting the settlement amount instead of going for a trial would amount to participating in the cover-up, the laundering of crimes, the rewriting of history facts, criminal mischarge of justice and lost opportunity to right the wrong.

This Court should order, in addition to immediate, full, complete finance compensation to all the victims, that the Swiss banks, companies and entities involved must be responsible for founding special educational centers all over Switzerland, free to the public, that will tell the story, the true story of neutral Swiss, before, during and after the war.

Switzerland ambassador to Washington urged his government to wage war against allegations that Swiss banks have failed to account for missing funds. In 1961, nearly 40 years ago, my father visited in person the Swiss National Bank in Zurich, asking to be allowed to look into available numeral lists of deposits, where the depositors did not come forward since the end of Second World War, and/or to allow him to submit a family list for inspection, checking,

search and so on. The application was rejected; he was simply thrown out. He was not the only one. We heard about many of them today, too.

The neutrals asked for war and they should get war. I urge this Court to move to trial. I have a brother from my father's second marriage, who is living in Israel now. His name is Schlomo (ph) and he's 12 years old. For the last several years, Schlomo helped my father to write Hebrew letters and memos on this endless battle.

I want to ask the Swiss gentlemen in this courtroom and elsewhere and get an answer if possible, if this is the way that they spend their quality, valuable, precious time with their daughters and sons of this age.

I'm claiming my lost childhood given to this (ui) and emotional, unavailable father. The deep impact of such painful childhood memories shape the adult life and characters of my sister, brother and myself. We are second generation Holocaust survivors and we're still paying the price.

1.25 billion is a big number; it's a huge number. Most people cannot understand this number or digest this number. However, the settlement amount for this case is a very small number. The magnitude

of this case -- for a case in this magnitude, it's an insulting number.

I want to remind everybody that there is an issue moral here and I want to throw the challenge to the Jewish nation and to the non-Jewish people. We should get our forces together and finance the needy and get the needs and the people that have the time clock ticking away and continue the battle and achieve some sort of recognition and the truth to come out.

I don't see the defendants' attorneys -you can recognize yourself. You can deliver a small
message to the Swiss government. The Yadveshem (ph)
money that's supposed to go to fund the computers, if
they can spend it on a trip to Israel, to Yadveshem,
it would be much more helpful. Thank you.

THE COURT: Is Roman Kwaitkowski here yet?

MR. FISHER: Your Honor, I'm Barry Fisher,
one of the settlement class counsel. I'm just going
to briefly introduce Mr. Kwaitkowski.

I've been working particularly with the non-Jewish Holocaust-era victim groups, including the Jehovah's Witnesses and the Romany people, so-called gypsies, who were victims, like the Jews, as a matter of race.

International Romany Union and others, support the settlement. Here today representing the Romany voice is Mr. Kwaitkowki, who is the President of the Polish Association of Roma, whose family after the war

returned to their family home, which happened to be

in the town of Auschwitz, where he now resides.

Romany groups, including the UNNGO

-

Mr. Kwaitkowski?

MR. KWAITKOWSKI: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Roman Kwaitkowski. I'm the Chairman of the Associations of Romas in Poland. I live in Auschwitz.

I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to address all of you. I would also like to thank Judge Korman, all the attorneys and also our attorney, Mr. Barry Fisher. I would like to thank all of the Romas who support this settlement. I hope that Mr. Gribetz became familiar with our losses and our proposals about distribution.

During the Holocaust, half a million Romas lost their lives. Although they were wanderers, they also were owners of their own properties. We received information from the media that the Romas were included in this settlement. In connection with that, we invested plenty of efforts to inform all of



the Roman areas about this case. We are very happy to know that this time, nobody forgot about us. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ernest Lobet.

MR. LOBET: Your Honor, Master Gribetz, thank you for giving me an opportunity to appear before you. I am a relative Johnny-come-lately to these proceedings. I am a Holocaust survivor of the Auschwitz concentration camp, Dura and also Nordhausen (ph). I think I have standing to appear before you, by virtue of the fact that I also spent my time as a slave laborer at the Auschwitz concentration camp, working for the I.G. Farben works.

Whether this makes me a class action member, I really do not know. I know that in 1938, I tried with my family, carrying silver chandeliers and a menorah and some gold rings to the headquarters of the German Gestapo in Breslau, Germany, my home town.

And whether this money was ever melted down and ultimately found its way into the Swiss banks, neither I nor anybody else will ever know. Whether my efforts at the Auschwitz concentration camp as a slave laborer, which were of course not compensated, were ever or ever came for the benefit

of Swiss subsidiaries, because I.G. Farben of course did have subsidiaries in Switzerland, neither I or the Special Master or anybody else will ever know.

So I have to assume that the vast majority of the class members, unless they had accounts or their relatives had accounts, belong to the vast class of applicants who really cannot establish a nexus to the Swiss bank money. Nevertheless, this money is here and I presume that ultimately, a decision will be made that all these people who filed applications, myself included, will be included in the class of members to be compensated in one way or another.

I have no quarrel with the settlement. I do not say it is fair, because fairness is a relative term. No amount of money can possibly be fair under those circumstances, but I'm quite sure it is the very best that could be done by the groups that negotiated for the settlement. The world is not perfect and the people that negotiated I'm sure tried their very best, and I think they deserve our cooperation and deserve that they be supported and the settlement be approved.

There are, however, two issues that I would like to address. They have been addressed



before, one briefly by Dr. Norbert Bikales. The question really is before this Court, now that this money is available, how is it going to be distributed?

And out of the woodwork come many claimants who claim to have some nexus to this money, but the fact is, I believe, that this money should only go to those people that are still alive and that are in dire need of being supported by these funds. That means both in the way of health and funeral expenses and in the cases of people that are really needy, and that can be established by income tax returns, that these people benefit by this fund.

No money, I feel, should be given to any organization, be it religious or otherwise, because I do not believe that this money should really go to them, regardless of how laudable their purpose.

Your Honor, as was pointed out by Dr.

Norbert Bikales, we are a huge group of totally

divergent people. True, many of us, the vast

majority probably, are Jewish. But within the Jewish

group there are again vast differences, from reformed

and liberal to the super-orthodox.

Who is going to decide, among all these different clans, who should be entitled, what

)

constitutes education, what is in the best interests of our children? I do not believe that really can be done. Therefore, I personally believe that none of the organizations should benefit by it.

There are those that believe that religious education should be paramount. I do not believe that. There are those that believe that institutions and synagogues and museums should be established and helped. I do not believe that.

There are those that believe that religion plays an all-important role, but it does not for me, your Honor. And I do not want to be blasphemous, but as far as I'm concerned, I did not see the Almighty stand at the ramp in Auschwitz when the selections were made.

Therefore, to issue number one, where should this money go, I and many of the survivors that I'm in touch with believe it should only go to the needy survivors who truly need the money. I personally do not need the money and I know many of my friends that have come to this country and have prospered here are not in dire need to need this money. The maximum amount should be going to those that truly need it.

Your Honor, I came to this country and I



2.2

became a lawyer, and I'm a lawyer in New York today.

I really have not done very much when it came to the Holocaust, since I decided, together with many, many of my fellow survivors, to draw a big, big line under my past and to forget about anything that had happened before.

Therefore, it is only in the last year that I've become somewhat active in the movement, and I want to address myself to an issue that has been touched here, but only barely, but that I feel very strongly about, and that issue is the fees that should be paid to the legal establishment, meaning those attorneys who believe that they're entitled to special fees for the work that they did for the class that they represent.

Your Honor, I was in Germany last fall, at a meeting of Holocaust survivors. I met many of my former inmates. When I told them that I had become an attorney in New York, I found it difficult to believe the derision and contempt that the profession had earned among these people.

I have always been proud of being an attorney, of being a lawyer, and I was very, very disappointed to see that the vast majority of the people that I spoke with, people that I was in camp

with, really believe that we are nothing but a bunch of greedy people, for whom the Holocaust settlement, whether it be with the Swiss banks or with the German industrial networks, is nothing more than a way to enrich ourselves.

There are many, many lawyers who have given their all, I understand, in these negotiations, working pro bono, without requesting any specific compensation. But I understand that there is a small group of attorneys who have or are about to submit requests for fees that are truly outrageous. I have seen some letter that says that these fees that have been requested amounting to 22.5 million dollars out of one thousand 250 million dollars (sic) are truly peanuts, a very small sum.

Your Honor, I believe that this is not true, because those fees are the ones that will become an issue in the newspapers and the press and in the media, and it will be pointed out that this entire Holocaust settlement is nothing more but a scheme by attorneys to enrich themselves. This should not be allowed to happen.

I beseech your Honor, and I understand it is in your power to make this decision, to very carefully look into this issue of legal fees, of



2.2

requests, that each lawyer submit time statements, time sheets, showing exactly how he spent his time and what he requests of this Court to allow him for his work and why.

I believe that by and large, my own belief as an attorney, that the attorneys who worked on this should in fact work pro bono and should only be compensated to the extent that they in fact have spent money out of pocket. But those that feel that they should ask for large fees and therefore enrich themselves, in contradiction of what the Holocaust settlement should be, should not get away with that, and I feel that this Court should be very, very careful when making this decision, because it will loom very large when this settlement is ultimately settled.

Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yakov Goodman.

THE CLERK: Can we have the Russian interpreter?

MR. GOODMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Gribetz, the first thing I would like to say is to express my gratitude to Mr. Braufman, Rabbi Singer, Mr. Steiner (ph), and other people who committed themselves to spending a tremendous amount of time in order to

£

bring this case to court.

States, in Israel and in Canada.

My name is Yakov Goodman. I'm the

President of Worldwide Organization of Byelorussia

(ph) Jews. And unfortunately, I'm the only person

who represents the organization who has Jews in the

former Soviet Union. There are 4,000 members in

Byelorussia and about 1,000 members in the United

As I stated previously, the people who worked in order to 1.5 billion dollars almost concluded a tremendous amount of work. You, your Honor, in my opinion, have much more difficult work. You will have to come to a conclusion that almost everybody has to be satisfied.

This settlement is very important and extremely painful for almost all former Soviet Jews, because Soviet Jews became victims of Nazism. Then they became victims of communism. And at the end, they haven't received anything, they haven't received even what was received by Jews from the claims conference.

Unfortunately, this politics still goes on. Seven million which were allocated in '96 and '97 have not reached them; only five have -- excuse me, only two have reached them. We encounter a



tremendous number of unjust cases when we communicate with the claims conference, when it comes to our Jews.

The same thing happened with the fund which was organized in Switzerland three years ago. Two sisters applied to that fund; both of them were in the evacuation together. One sister received help, another one didn't. We're not talking about \$500. We're talking about justice; Justice is the word which was pronounced a lot today. I believe that one of the reasons is the discrimination of the Russian Jews when it comes to preparing the list of documents needed, distributing the applications, et cetera.

Unfortunately, it happened so that I am the one who is addressing this issue now, and I'm the one who is bringing out the question about the condition of the Jews who are left there in the former Soviet Union. We are prepared to send our representatives when the discussions on the funds distribution will take place, because that money is ours, our parents', our grandparents'.

Our grandparents paid those contributions which were imposed on the ghettos. They were robbed before they were killed. Unfortunately, the

situation could be described something to the effect that the dead ones cannot speak and the live ones are not willing to listen.

From our point of view, we feel that the money should be divided into three directions. There is enough money to spend for people who went through the horrors of war and who need that money now. The ones who buried in the graves there do have the right to have some money spent on them by building memorial or put a small stone above their graves.

I grew up in a small town, Moze (ph), in the south of Byelorussia. Five thousand Jews were killed only there. There are five graves. None of those graves have even a stone or a fence around them. Those Jews repeated the act of heroism of the Masada heroes. A few dozens of people decided to burn themselves and everybody else, but not to give in to the enemies. The youngest was seven years old, the oldest was eighty. On the place, one could find today burned wood and that's it.

Another problem is we lost two million souls after the war because of the assimilation.

This money will be enough in order to either prevent or bring it down to zero, the process of assimilation. If we are not going to stop this



process of assimilation, then what we live for and why do we leave them?

The question about the attorneys' fees.

If those gold rings and gold teeth which were torn out of Jews were placed here on the table, I don't think any of the attorneys would have the nerve to reach for them. Maybe I'm too naive, but that's what those attorneys want to reach for.

In the Talmud, there is a verse that a judge who brings peace to people creates peace.

Albert Stein said that when he characterized Jews as a nation, he said that Jews want to have justice, basically, in their lives. And I think not only people who are present here today but also those millions who are not here, they all hope and wish and desire that you, your Honor, will come to the right conclusion. Thank you.

THE COURT: Christoph Meli.

MR. CHESLEY: My name is Christoph Meli and I used to work at the Union Bank of Switzerland. I was the bank guard who in January, 1997 discovered that certain Holocaust-era documents were being destroyed. I saved some documents from destruction. I could not save them all.

Because of this single incident, I found

.

.

myself in the middle of an international, legal, political and moral dispute. I had no idea what I had stumbled into, but after a very short time, as an outsider, I realized that one very important thing was going on. What I realized was that the claims and the demands of Holocaust victims were not taken seriously or were ever addressed.

Because of this case, finally Holocaust victims get rights and get their rights back and justice. I do not pretend to understand all of the horrors of the Holocaust or what the Swiss bankers did or did not do. I have gotten some understanding of what the Holocaust victims wanted out of this case.

I have traveled all over the world, speaking to Jewish communities, both before and after the settlement was announced. What I have learned from survivors is that they are grateful to the Court, to the Deputy Secretary Eisenstadt, Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Control Hevessey, the plaintiffs' lawyers and the Jewish organizations who helped conclude this settlement.

I'm grateful to God that he put me in this position to do the right thing on the right time, but sometimes my wife tells me, you did the wrong thing



on the wrong place. I only wish I could do more and I will promise for survivors that everything that I learned (ui) I want to go on. I want to continue helping survivors with their claims for compensation against other known Swiss companies. Hopefully, this settlement is only a beginning and not an end for restitution claims of Holocaust victims and their heirs.

Then another thing: I believe we have to finish this fight, because when we go on in five years, we are here again and people like her are not anymore here. Like Esther Shapiro -- she only had one year to spend her money. I don't want that we have again many people lost. They're still alive yet and I think it's time to ending this. Thanks.

THE COURT: Maurice Deluity.

MR. DELUITY: Good afternoon, your Honor. The Honorable Judge Korman, thank you for granting me a chance to voice an opinion in this public hearing, on the issue of the Swiss bank money settlement. I wish you (ui), heavenly guidance and King Solomon's wisdom in judging the distribution of this settlement.

My thanks also go to distinguished appointed Special Master Mr. Gribetz and chairman of

ر

a resettlement in the east, but instead we were one of the first transports to arrive at the infamous Auschwitz/Berkenau location for the final solution of the Jews. That was shortly after the Vansi (ph) Conference.

The location could be called hell on earth. The transport, except for a few young men and women, including myself, who were selected for the concentration camp work -- the rest of them perished that night, of blessed memory (ui).

Mind you, while the killings were being carried out, all possessions, valuables, et cetera were gathered, shipped to warehouses to be sorted for the purposes of conversion into various products.

All personal valuables was the gold, including the crowns removed from the victims, and personal jewelry were shipped to special locations for business transactions, perhaps some to Switzerland or other so-called neutral countries.

Case in point about the victims' assets.

I have to mention that my father of blessed memory
was an expert grain merchant. As soon as the Einsatz
group entered my town, they confiscated my family
business plus valuables. At one point I released my
father held as a hostage and I was shipped to a



2.2

civilian slave labor camp, guarded by military police, for about a year, and returned to join the transport to Burchenau/Auschwitz.

With some luck, I had a chance to work in the (ui) as a wood worker. That was the first part, until the evacuation and the unforgettable march Gleibetz (ph), Buchenwald, Ordruf (ph) and then my escape from (ui) train with an epidemic of dysentery on here.

Let me get back to the confiscation of the valuables. The products produced in that industrial complex included where I worked. That means the Bunau (ph). There was synthetic rubber, chemicals, zyclon gas used for the gas chambers, to kill the Jews. The question comes in, what did they do with my labor? Who was responsible for it?

The point of mentioning those facts stems from understanding the categories in the questionnaire of settlement eligibility. It questions as follows. I took my questionnaire to Mel Weiss's office, who I have to compliment as one of those pro bono attorneys, who were unable to answer my questions. They told me, why don't you bring it up at the public hearing?

A) How can I substantiate records of the

confiscated family assets and whether they were connected with the Swiss? It's like telling to bring

3 my parents' death certificate from Auschwitz.

B) My slave labor time for large German corporations at Bunau. How can I tell which ones were involved in business with the Swiss?

C) Any (ui) eligible for slave labor compensation? Is the length of time which I was over there, two years in the Bunau/Auschwitz and worked for those companies and about one year prior to the concentration camp, at a camp called Unhovo (ph), under civilian administration, guarded by German armed guards. Would it be the same as those that only worked a short time or several months?

Your Honor, this is what I said before.

The question perhaps is bigger than all of us. My
point of view regarding acceptance of the settlement
discussion is as follows. Since the general
survivors are at their twilight, it makes no sense to
object to this settlement now. An unforeseen delay
do not serve the survivors' purpose. It will not
affect the attorneys' fees but it will affect the
chance of many survivors to receive the benefits
while they're still alive.

Furthermore, to those who object to the



settlement, I would say the time to object was at the bargaining table, with the U.S. government participation and suggesting economic sanctions, and to stay firm. At this point, it makes no sense to object.

Before I conclude, I would like to get back to one issue regarding the settlement. Your Honor, with so many people have spoken about various ways to deal with the distribution of the settlement, there is one basic issue of great urgency. It's preservation of the health of those who are dying right now.

prescriptions. The HMOs today -- it's a fighting battle. I have experienced it recently with my wife at the hospital. This is one of the issues that should be settled at once and part of the fund should be reserved for that purpose, to see health care in whichever form, an insurance policy for a number of years or prescriptions, because the money part will not amount to anything.

Thank you for listening and giving the time.

THE COURT: Liz Berney.

MS. BERNEY: Hi, my name is Elizabeth



Berney. I'm one of the many pro bono attorneys with some involvement in this matter. I also have sort of a personal connection to it. My father was a last minute refugee from Germany. Many other members of the family perished and were killed by the Nazis.

I think that one thing that we should think about is how the whole Holocaust got started. It didn't start with the killings. It started with the dehumanization of individuals, My father often spoke to us about his initial -- his childhood in Germany and how there were more and more restrictions placed on Jews over the years. You couldn't go to a swimming pool, you couldn't go to school, you couldn't hold a bank account, you couldn't take money out of your bank account; it was sealed. Every day, there were horrible caricatures of Jews in the Stermer (ph) and all of the newspapers.

I think that a lot of what this case is about is not just the money; it's trying to restore individual dignity to survivors who have had their needs and just ordinary rights to hold property -- to receive their property back restored to them.

In 1998, a group of approximately 70 survivors, including the woman who was the initial lead plaintiff in the case, hired myself and co-





. 2

2.0

counsel to represent their viewpoints on the approval of the settlement, the distribution issue and several other matters. The lead plaintiff is no longer involved in the group but many of the other survivors are.

We held a series of meetings to discuss the views of survivors, as to what they wanted to have and how they felt about the settlement. They were really remarkable in many ways. Something that came out in these meetings was very similar to what we've been hearing here today; that survivors really feel that this is their money, that it doesn't belong to organizations, that they can give their own charity if they see fit, that their human dignity was trampled on, that they have a right to receive their accounts back and that the health needs and dignity of survivors in their later years are the prime concern of survivors.

Not only did the members of the group who came to the meetings agree with this, they all signed a one-page settlement regarding their views on these issues, and I believe some of the members of the group also went around and obtained the signatures of several hundred other people to this viewpoint, which we heard expressed here today by Alice Fisher,

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Senator Carl Kruger, Norbert Bikales, Leo Rechter and other survivors.

The general consensus of everybody in the group is that the settlement is wholly inadequate. There is a belief that much evidence was not brought out to the world's attention regarding the massive access that existed and that you can never fully compensate Jews and others involved for the huge losses that were involved.

Some of the evidence that apparently did not come to light included couriers. The ninetyyear-old courier had been found by some of the survivors, who had carried money to the Swiss banks from Czechoslovakia and Hungary and Romania, and these people's testimony apparently was not taken.

I know there's a lot of concern about survivors that -- several issues concerning the adequacy of the settlement were not brought to light. Nonetheless, as you've heard expressed here today, the survivors felt that they had to go along with the settlement. They were too old, there were too many people in dire straits to question it and to oppose it.

The distribution proposal that the survivors favored would be an enhanced distribution



for anyone with provable accounts, 70% of what remained to go to -- to be distributed evenly amongst survivors and their heirs, another 25% to be set aside for ill survivors' medical care and a maximum of 5% for all administrative expenses.

The survivors were also concerned about the entity that receives the distribution, and although signing the statements, asked that the Court appoint a receiver consisting of survivors, along with professionals such as accountants to affect the distribution. There is a feeling that this is a basic human dignity, an individual survivor issue, that organizations and others should not be placed in charge of effecting the distribution, that the distribution really needs to be effected by the survivors themselves.

Finally, the survivors had a discussion and reached a consensus on the attorneys' fee issue, what they felt about that. Of course, they're in favor of whoever will serve pro bono doing that. But there was also a concern that attorneys be encouraged to take on these cases and that reasonable compensation be effected to those who asked for it.

They ask that that be capped at \$150 an hour, that in no circumstance should it go above

that, that no-one should be asking for a percentage of the settlement. They felt that this middle of the road position would best serve their interests and encourage attorneys to continue to represent survivors' interests in other Holocaust cases.

Finally, a very important point is that the survivors insist on a complete accounting of the distribution, a point which has been raised here a number of times today.

To add a few more words about the human dignity issue, I think that there were a number of other aspects of this case that -- a number of other things that this case did that no-one has really spoken about today. In the course of these meetings and all the hearings that have been held to date, it brought survivors together to speak with one another, give each other support, which I think has been remarkably cathartic.

It has also brought survivors face to face with people in the European press, with young Europeans in a very positive way. We had a lot of press people come to our meetings. I think there are a lot of bridges that need to be healed between the survivor population and Jewish population and Europeans, and this case has actually done a lot in



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's much more that can be done. that regard.

I think the Swiss banks and all of the Swiss people should be asking themselves, what else can we do, not whether we've closed the books for good now, but can we send kids over, teenagers over perhaps to help survivors who are having health problems. What else can we do here to be of benefit and to be of help. Thank you.

> THE COURT: Izea Katzap.

THE CLERK: Can we have the Russian interpreter, please?

MR. KATZAP: Good afternoon. I am Dr. I am the President of the Holocaust Survivors from the Former Soviet Union and the Territorial Former Soviet Union.

I wrote you a letter but it was in Russian, in the Russian papers -- I have here 657 signatures of the people accept my opinion on this This is the letters. I'm sorry. Because this was write in Russian, I want to talk in Russian. will read it in English, what I've written in Russian, so people here in the courtroom will understand.

Your Honor, Professor Heberny (ph) -- the questionnaires which we received were translated.

2.4

received them in September and they were distributed among survivors. The questionnaires were received by more than a thousand survivors on September 30th of this year. I just want to let you know that all information we have received was distributed among the survivors and the information from the claims conference and the World Congress was delivered to people.

I would like to read you what I've written about these questions. I was born in Besaradia (ph), in Romania. The Jews from those regions, Besaradia and Romania and Buchavena (ph), they were allowed to have accounts in Swiss banks, and even the smallest business there had to have an account in Swiss bank.

But we were children at that time and we couldn't remember anything and we couldn't have any documents at that time. Yes, we are just live witnesses of Holocaust. The (ui) surrounded us. They burned us, they buried Jews alive, they drowned them in River Nester (ph), they threw them out of their houses and they shot thousands of people.

Prior to that, they will strip them naked, will tear their teeth out, the ones which had gold over, rob them and move their properties. Everybody who was able ran away without even thinking of their



2.1

property or documents, because everybody wants to save his or her life.

When fascists reached Leningrad, Moscow and Stalingrad, they killed more than three million Jews. Where is their property, the ones who were put into ghettos and concentration camps, and where's the property of those who was able to run behind the front line?

When people were burned alive and buried alive, when they were killed in Badayar (ph) and hundreds of other places, do you think the Nazis would give them documents of their properties which were taken from them? When we were forced to do all kind of works, do you think they paid us or they told us who we're working for?

The Holocaust in the territory of the Soviet Union began after the Nazis realized that the world was silent. Nobody was interested in a Jewish question and the lives of those Jews. And then Nazis began to build factories of death.

Raul Hilberg (ph) -- he was a historian of the Holocaust and author of the book called

Destruction of the European Jews. He said that today in Moscow is more than one hundred million pages, but it's not open until this time. The (ui) in 1945,

they took us to Moscow, and it's right. It is
absolute secret. Until this day, it's not open and
we don't know. If we will open these papers, we will
see what it's right. We will see that it was killed

not six million but much, much more.

In my town (ui) -- this is Bokavena -- in one day, the (ui) Chenchesko (ph), he sent 50,000 people to Tresistre (ph), but back it's come only 50. From Verahui (ph), also Romania, was transported to (ui) 26,000 people. Alive after this, only 179 people. We don't know what is with the things and what is with the accounts. I am sure that these people in Romania, they used to have accounts in the Swiss banks.

Switzerland was silent and it covered -it hid the accounts of the killed people. It helped
Nazis to commit their crimes by financing them. It
also saved robbed properties. For Switzerland's
actions for destroyed Jewish lives, for burned towns
and villages, for robberies, Switzerland has to pay,
as well as Germany, Romania, Italy and other
countries.

Money from this fund, 1.25 billion dollars, must be returned directly to the former -- to the Holocaust victims. They shouldn't be robbed



10`

for a second time. Holocaust survivors from the former Soviet Union are in a really bad condition. These people are elderly, ill, lonely. They lived through horrible years. They don't have full medical coverage. They need money and their living conditions are bad.

The money they receive from the (ui), it's only enough to pay the rent. I am asking to help them in this time, because it's going to be late later, because 10% of survivors (ui). The Holocaust survivors from the former Soviet Union, for the last six months, 200 people died.

I ask for justice. I think we have to help the Holocaust survivors. We have to think about their medical care, to help them with the medical care. What we have to remember who was killed and we have to make research. We have to help the remembrance of these people that was killed in the (ui) and the concentration camps at the time of the Holocaust. We want also your help to open the hundred million pages (ui) history of the Holocaust and of the territory of the former Soviet Union. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Fira Stukelman. Sorry. Norman Rosenbaum.

2.0

2.1

MR. ROSENBAUM: Your Honor, Special Master Gribetz, Counsel, ladies and gentlemen. I appear here today as the pro bono legal counsel for the Australian Asian Pacific Jewish Restitution Committee, which provides assistance, representation, advice and advocacy to those people seeking restitution arising out of the Holocaust. In particular, one claimant, Judith Goldberger, specifically requested that we assist her in providing representation before your Honor today.

Her comments and objections in regard to the settlement in part have already been addressed this morning and I won't labor those, other than to endorse wholeheartedly the objections put to you by Ms. Weber from the European Commission for Art, in terms of the unacceptable width of the settlement class to include assets generally, and in my submission, that would go to undermine the very object of what the various pieces of litigation which have now been amalgamated before your Honor first were set out to achieve.

The only point I would like to add to what Ms. Weber said this morning is that when we're talking about art, in Australia, in the Asian Pacific area, we have already experienced, in Duneden (ph),



New Zealand, where since 1996 there has already been uncovered one significant piece of Holocaust looted art, which my submission is demonstrative of the fact that the ramifications which flow from the Holocaust extend far beyond the United States and Europe, even to small countries and small Jewish communities such as New Zealand.

Our experience in Australia has been something similar; that numerous people are able to articulate with specificity pieces, not only art in the traditional ways in which we identify that word, but more importantly, artifacts, pieces of gold, jewelry, which cannot be dismissed as being simply gold, statuettes, coin collections of significance, stamp collections, et cetera.

In my submission, the propositions put by Ms. Weber this morning, when it comes to art and the width of the settlement class, should be confined to ensure that those people whose legitimate rights to specific artifacts and pieces of art-work are not compromised in any way, as would possibly be the case with the settlement class as they're currently drafted.

The second point in terms of the width of classes really comes to the inability to ascertain

1

3

6

5

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

with any type of accuracy the general aspects of the releases which are provided within the settlement. The reality is that many people just can't work out whether in fact by remaining within the Swiss bank settlement, they will inadvertently compromise another possible claim they will have.

As Mr. Sam Dubbin put this morning with regard to the insurance cases, which because of the generality and the lack of specificity attributed to some of the releases, inadvertently, people who would have otherwise pursuable and achievable pieces of litigation against specific insurance companies and we believe non-Swiss banks, who at this point in time certainly appear to fall within the definition of having been controlled by Swiss entities at the time, whose claims are based on fully documented accounts which they were able to take with them from Europe, that those claims would be inadvertently compromised because of the lack of specificity.

Your Honor, you asked Ms. Weber this morning whether in fact if a second opportunity was given to opt out, would that cure, at least in part or address at least in part the concerns she raised with you.

In my submission, if indeed we are able to



extend with specificity the releases which are provided for under the settlement, it would be appropriate to give people a second opportunity to opt out, if for no other reason than at this point in time many people have made application to be part of this settlement class for no other reason than that the letter from Professor Neuborne urged them to do so, as did the introductory words on the information questionnaire: If in doubt, please apply.

While nobody can criticize such an approach, at this point in time, we wouldn't want such approach, in my submission, to compromise another claim they could have which they had never contemplated as ever arising within the Swiss bank settlement per se.

The second area of objection which we've been asked to put to your Honor today is in the determination of the fairness of the actual settlement amount per se. I've heard many eloquent speakers here this morning speak as to the fairness. I for one am unable to advise any people who come to me whether it's fair. I certainly do not envy your Honor having that job before him.

There is a time at which the figure of 1.25 billion dollars was struck. The Volker

· ·

ب

Committee had not at that stage formulated its report and we had no idea that the amount of accounts to finally be admitted to by the Swiss banks would number some 55,000, that being the figure which I heard Dr. Singer put to your Honor this morning.

It is imperative, in my submission, that when you're evaluating the adequacy and fairness of the 1.25 billion figure, that that report be taken into account, that it not be taken into account merely on face value alone, that it be critically evaluated.

When one thinks of Swiss bank accounts of any point of time, but particularly at that point of time, the reports that we've read in the media to suggest that people would have Swiss bank accounts for two and three francs or 30 Swiss francs or 300 Swiss francs that would exist today is ludicrous.

Indeed, when the Volker Committee report is published, as I think I heard your Honor refer to in the coming week, that we look at that report critically and extrapolate from that report really what's gone on in 55 years, and not just to accept at face value what that report says to us, but to take a look very carefully whether in fact those charged with the responsibility of carrying out a forensic



audit would stand up to scrutiny if they themselves had their particular means and examinations looked at carefully.

The reality is if one takes 55,000 and divides it into the 1.25 billion dollars available, my rough calculations come to just under \$23,000 per account. Your Honor, when one takes a look at \$23,000 and looks at a history of time of 55 years which has elapsed, one must wonder why anybody would have had a Swiss bank account and how amounts of 200 and 300 Swiss francs or even ten or twenty Swiss francs, as we know some people have already been advised by the Volker Committee their accounts amount to. Nevertheless, I believe information will be contained within that report which will play an important place in your evaluation process of the adequacy, fairness and justice of that amount.

It's somewhat ironic when we heard this morning from the representative of the Justice Department, when he spoke about the importance of this process as given to cooperation. Because ironically, when the plaintiffs' counsel were placed in the position of having to negotiate the 1.25-billion-dollar amount, the knowledge of the existence of those 55,000 accounts was not with them,

5

unfortunately. Indeed, it was something within the defense counsels' knowledge, something within the Swiss banks' knowledge and something which had been within their knowledge for some considerable time.

Your Honor, the last point which I wish to bring to your attention is that Ms. Goldberger, in the course of making inquiries about German slave labor, answered an advertisement from a Melbourne firm of barristers and solicitors. That firm of Melbourne barristers and solicitors had sent to her a questionnaire and information about attorneys' fees, if they were to undertake her claim and represent her in regard to German slave labor restitution.

That claim form which was sent to her makes reference to Swiss banks. It also makes reference to one of the plaintiff counsel involved here as being involved, but more importantly, includes a contract for contingency fees.

It's inappropriate to name the counsel at this table because it's unfair. There is no reason to believe that -- the counsel's name may have been employed but not to their knowledge. But I do believe in assessing the appropriateness of any counsels' fees, attorneys' fees in this matter, that that document be taken into account, the matter be



17.

investigated and that not only the question of contingency fees be discounted, but more importantly, you will see from the document itself, a copy of which I've already forwarded to Special Master Gribetz, and I'll leave an extra copy for your Honor, that the actual document itself misrepresents and is deceiving and unfortunately relies on the lack of familiarity with the law, let alone the specialties of the class action process.

As a pro bono counsel, I suppose it's rare to endorse any counsel's applications for fees. But at the same time, I do believe it is important, as I heard previously said this afternoon, that counsel who undertake such cases as this be encouraged to do so.

But at the same time, it has to be a fair and reasonable allocation of fees and it has to be something which must in this very sensitive situation, in my submission, be something which those survivors and the heirs of survivors understand as being a proper and true reflection of the benefit which they have received from the very hard work of lawyers. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yakov Polishchuk.

THE CLERK: Can we have the Russian

interpreter, please?

MR. POLISHCHUK: Honorable Court, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Polishchuk, Yakov. I was born in Kiev, Ukraine. I won't tell you much about my biography. You can find it in "Schindler's List". One thing I will tell you. When fascists attacked Kiev, walked into Kiev city, and it was September 29th, more than 100,000 Jews were destroyed in Babiyar (ph).

In 1943, I found myself in concentration camp Dachau. Everybody know for a long time the situation, the horrible situation which was in concentration camps. Eleven million people were destroyed, were killed and perished the day after. Among them, they were just citizens from occupied territories and military men. Four million out of six million were Jews, and these people were destroyed in concentration camps of Swenson (ph), Mydanek (ph), Treblinka.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, and you, your Honor, to distribute that amount of money of 1.25 billion dollars in a fair way. Take into consideration a human approach to distribute it reasonably and to take into consideration the fact that some people worked for large industrial



2.2

enterprises which also were employed by concentration camps. 600,000 people passed through -- were prisoners of that concentration camp and 31,000 of them were killed, were destroyed.

That concentration camp sent into its branches, sent to different branches people to work for industrial enterprises, at plants and factories, people who were basically slaves of concentration camps and who worked at different types of horrible jobs. And one of the teams -- and I was a slave of that team. It's a team of Nuendorf (ph). It was a very hard and exhausting work. They fed us terribly. People -- they were exhausted and they couldn't that horrible conditions and they died; they perished.

I ask you, your Honor, to pay special attention to the slavery conditions which fascists or Nazi animals -- the profits which they extract on our labor, and then they sent it to different enterprises. And I ask you to distribute that amount of money in a fair, reasonable way, adequate way.

After the liberation, at the Stalinesque regime, I worked in mines of Ukraine, of (ui). I worked there for two years in the mines. If this money would be distributed justfully, in a lawful way, I will be very, very grateful to the Judge and

to people who assisted him. Thank you so much for your attention.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ronald Coleman. Ronald Coleman. Grunya Klebanov.

THE CLERK: Russian interpreter, please.

MS. KLEBANOV: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, it is after 5:00 already and I understand that you are a little bit tired. But please, I would like you to listen to me very attentively.

My name is Grunya Klebanov and my dead husband's name was Hyam (ph) Klebanov. Me and my husband twice were victims. The first time, we were victims of fascist occupation. We flee and we ran away in order to save our lives. We flee in summer clothes. We didn't take any belongings with us. In addition, they were bombing. Bombs were falling on our heads. This time, on the road you could see a lot of corpses just laying around, people who, like us, were running for their lives but they died. Among the people was my sister. She died, she perished.

The second time, we were victims when we flee communist regime. Once it came that the Jews got the possibility to go abroad from that regime, to



escape that regime -- I'm a doctor and I worked 38 years as a doctor. This time, me and my husband was allowed to take from the Soviet Union, while we were coming here to this country, only two suitcases, 20 kilograms or 40 pounds each. Was it allowed to take some valuables with us? No, it wasn't.

We came here at an older age and we couldn't bring much valuable stuff with us. Also, I couldn't (ui) my diploma in order, I could get a job here, as far as my specialty. So me and my husband had to apply for SSI and collect public assistance from the government, and it was essential to us, to pay our bills, to pay the rent and just basic things, providing our life. Your know what? We had no money to put to the bank or to accumulate some savings in the bank.

Currently, I am a member of international organization of Jews who are originally born in Byelorussia, and I am here, your Honor, to ask you to reach the conclusion or to make the decision and a decision which would include something that happened to my late husband, Hyam Klebanov. And very shortly, I will tell you what happened to him.

My late husband Hyam Klebanov applied to get compensation from Germany. In his application,

2 3 4

my husband stated that he had to leave his native town of Gomul (ph), because it was threatened by fascist occupation. Then he moved to central Asia; to be specific, to Kazakstan (ph). And over there, he found a job first at the construction site and then at the factory which produced aluminum for the planes.

He was a specialist of a very high rate, of a very high scale, so he was not supposed to go to the Army or to go to the front, to become a soldier. Claims conference sent a response to the application of my husband that they didn't believe that he didn't (ui). They explained their refusal by his age. They said that on that time, he was only 23 years old.

My husband was a very honest person and in his application, he stated the truth. It took us more than a year until we found two people, one in Pennsylvania and one in Baltimore. These were the people who spent the whole war with him, working at the same plant. These people testified under oath and their testimony was notarized and then sent to claims conference.

Then we got a response from them. The response stated that witnesses' testimony just don't count. Things which showed me most -- my husband was

very frustrated and upset and aggravated about it, because they portrayed him to be a liar, as if he wanted to get some money which he had no right to have at all. Otherwise, they just accused him to be a thief.

They also wrote there, please don't bother us again. We gave you two refusals and this is enough, this is final. In their reports, claims conference states all the time that they help people to get or to obtain necessary documents from the former Soviet Union, but in the case with my husband, this is just not true. Then we wrote to a few different organizations, but we didn't get any answer at all. And claim court, they should have given an answer.

Finally, our friend went on a business trip to Russia and from Russia, he brought us a paper from the Red Cross, from the Russian Red Cross. And it was written in the paper that yes, indeed, my husband was evacuated in Kazakstan, from Gomil (ph) to Kazakstan. But even that document claims conference did not want to accept, referring to the fact that more than 18 months passed already and the case was closed. But all to do just to admit that they do wrong, to admit that they mistake, to

--

apologize and to give us the check, which we were supposed to have and which we had the right to have.

I ask you again, your Honor -- your Honor, I am asking you to make a decision and to find such a solution that things which happened to my husband would never, ever happen again to nobody from the Russian community, because I know that the similar things, they took place already not even once. And the last letter which I sent about that case, I sent to a person by the name of Mr. Taylor. I mailed the letter November 9th of this year. Up until now, there is no answer.

I am 80 years old and it can happen that I will never see the justice. What happened to my husband should never, ever happen again to anybody, in the distribution of that amount of money. And two more words.

I have relatives in Minsk and they have a very terrible hardship. Sometimes they have a choice what to buy, either some food or some medication.

They were also evacuated, they also lost their property. And the claims conference transferred the money, but the money lost somewhere in the way. So all they get is a few parcels a year, and every parcel costs around seven dollars.



Please distribute the money in a fair way. Thank you.

THE COURT: Daniel Urbina.

MR. URBINA: Good evening, your Honor, Counsellors, survivors of the Holocaust and ladies and gentlemen.

I came here today from Venezuela to speak in favor of my mother-in-law, a Polish woman who now is a Venezuelan citizen. Her name is Danuta Estanisova Vnusek Zeika (ph). She is about 75 years old. Her health is not pretty good, so she couldn't come here, and her social status -- also, she's a very poor woman.

When I applied with her questionnaire, I helped her to fill in the forms and I sent them, I didn't have an answer from the notice administrator. I tried via internet to make some questions and I didn't have any answers. So finally, I decided to come here myself and talk to you, talk to all of you, because I believe she deserves to have a share in this.

She suffered enormously. She is not Jew.

I've seen that most of the survivors have something
to do with Jews. But she told me that her father,

Visenta Vnusek (ph), died because he was helping some

Jews. He was living in Grohof Podolasky (ph), in Poland, and one night or several nights, he helped Jews. He gave them food. They stayed overnight. Some people betrayed him from the community, so he was arrested by the Nazis and he was taken into -- first to Podolasky and then to Versol (ph), where he died afterwards in a concentration camp.

Her mother, Adela Vnusek Zeika, was also killed with her baby in her arms; One of her brothers escaped to the northwest part and he joined the resistance to fight against Nazis. He managed to cross the line and he went to Russia, where he joined the Russian Army to fight against the Nazis. He seems to have been killed during the war.

My mother-in-law Danuta Vnusek was taken by horse to Germany, and she was forced to work as a slave in Mangen (ph), Germany between 1942 and 1945. She was only 17 years old when she was taken and she had no family at all. She told me that they didn't even give them food. She remembers escaping during the night or the evenings to (ui) nearby to eat some carrots and onions, because they were hungry and they were forced to work many hours per day.

I think she deserves, since she's so poor -- she's brought to birth eleven sons and daughters,



1.1

and I think she deserves something. I know it's a moral issue and it's not necessarily an economical issue, but I still believe she really deserves a share on this.

Unfortunately, she cannot prove this. All we have -- I have tried to search and all we have is a person who might be living in Venezuela, too. Her name is Stephanie Misgeviks (ph). I'm trying to locate her in Caracas. That's a very large city and until now, I haven't found a way to reach her.

But there is something besides this -what she wanted me to say here was that she was in
favor of the agreement, because she's an old woman.
She is sick, she is poor, and many, many people must
be in the same way nowadays, so it's a matter of
time. I believe it's a matter of time. I think that
money must be paid as soon as it is possible, and I
understand that's your, Judge Edward Korman,
responsibility.

But there is something which really -- and this is another thing that brings -- I mean, I'm curious about it, because if what I have found in my search is true, from what I've understood, some of the releases of the Swiss banks belongs to Jews.

That's something which really breaks my attention,



because it seems to like -- Jews have money in Swiss banks and they're going to give that money back to Jews.

So it looks like there are two Jewish parties involved in this problem. And okay, Danuta is not a Jew; she's a Catholic. But anyway, it looks like it's a religious kind of thing, finally, at the end. So this is interesting, and I just wanted to mention this here, because I don't know what else is behind this.

When I was searching, I read a lot of information about some Jewish families who somehow helped Adolf Hitler before the war, and I couldn't believe this. So I don't know, really. It's something that somebody said here that maybe it could be interesting, if someone tries to search, to investigate deeper in this stuff.

Anyway, I really thank you for listening to me and I hope somehow Danuta Vnusek could get at least a repayment or whatever because of all her suffering. She doesn't have a family back in Poland, as far as she knows. So she went to Venezuela because a friend -- not even a friend. This was an acquaintance who offered to include her in the passport. So she went to Venezuela and things there



.12

are not so easy, so she hasn't had that much opportunities to have any kind of wealth. I hope this would help her somehow.

Thank you very much for listening to me. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Lawrence Schonbrun is the last speaker.

MR. RATNER: Can you just give me one second, your Honor?

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS)

MR. SCHONBRUN: Good evening, your Honor, class counsel --

MR. RATNER: Lawrence, hang on. Just for the record, before you begin.

MR. SCHONBRUN: Surely.

MR. RATNER: I just wanted to put on the record our understanding that you do not intend, on behalf of your clients, to prosecute any appeals from the settlement.

MR. SCHONBRUN: That's correct.

MR. RATNER: Thank you.

MR. SCHONBRUN: Good evening, your Honor, Counsel, Mr. Gribetz, ladies and gentlemen who are still here, and to class members, wherever they may be.



Your Honor, my name is Lawrence Schonbrun.

I am representing two plaintiff class member
objectors, Steven Zuber (ph) and Henry Smith. I am
going to be speaking in the first person today, your
Honor, because I am also a member of this class. I
want to acknowledge that I have publicly opposed the
use of the class action mechanism to settle what I
have called claims of historical grievance.

Having said that, your, Honor, I am going to take Professor Neuborne's advice. I am going to work to see that the plan of distribution is adequate. I have questioned the propriety of the legal basis for this action in written objections that I have filed. I hope you will address them.

After having heard all the testimony from class members today, it seems inappropriate to talk about the legal basis, the legal justification for this Court having jurisdiction over this case and entertaining these claims, and I think it's that feeling of inappropriateness that I have that causes me concern about the propriety of this case.

Your Honor, unfortunately, my experience with class actions has been on the negative side. I have perhaps seen a lot of the bad things that happen when class actions go wrong. And as a class member,



I just didn't feel I could remain silent on these issues.

Your Honor, I am concerned about the lack of information being given class members on the question of the distribution. Many, many class members have talked to you today about their concern about the distribution. On the one hand, we are called respected class members, but on the other, we're not being told about how this money is going to be divided until after the settlement is approved, and while it's not clear to me, perhaps only after the fee is approved. John Coffey (ph) has referred to this kind of procedure, if you'll pardon the expression, as forcing class members to buy a pig in a poke.

I believe that what's going on here is that Counsel and the Court, perhaps with the best of intentions, are concerned that when the plan of distribution of this settlement is made aware to class members -- if I read the numbers correctly, roughly one billion dollars divided by 400,000 claimants is \$2,500 per claimant.

It's clearly insufficient and my concern is that rather than raising hostility from class members when they find out who is getting what out of

1.

2.2

the settlement, a tactical decision has been made not to announce who is going to get what out of this settlement until after it's been approved.

I think it's a mistake and an injustice not to let class members know. I think one has to bite the bullet and let class members know exactly who is getting what out of this, so there isn't a lot of disappointment. I think merely saying it's going to be a fair distribution is insufficient. This is a zero-sum game. There's a fixed sum of money here, and I think we have an obligation to these class members whose suffering we've heard about, to trust them and to let them know exactly who is getting what.

Your Honor, based on my experience, I have some concrete suggestions. Number one, that you only provisionally approve this settlement. Number two, that you speed up the hearing on the distribution.

Number three, that you not approve the fee until the class is made aware, individual class members, exactly what they're going to be getting.

I don't say this because I don't want attorneys to get reasonable fees. If indeed class members, after getting their allotment from this settlement, feel the attorneys have earned their

Ì



fees, then they will be certainly able to say so.

But I don't think the situation should be reversed,

where any decision is made prior to a distributions,

and I don't think any approval should be made of the

settlement until the distribution information is

being made aware to class members.

Your Honor, class counsel talk about the full disclosure being required of the Swiss banks.

There is a provision in this settlement that seeks to keep amounts of money and identities of claimants secret or anonymous. I disagree with it in principal. But more importantly, it's an issue of distribution and allocation, and I would request that you take that provision out of the settlement and that you treat it with the plan of distribution and allocation, and that the presumption going into this is that every dollar, every dime that is being given to anyone out of this settlement is a matter of public record.

Of course, if there's someone who wants to file a sealing order with respect to a particular allotment, that's one thing. But in principle, the provision of this settlement that provides for anonymous payments from the settlement fund, I think should be taken out of it.

Number two, there's --

2

THE COURT: These are awards by the claims restitution tribunal that are being paid.

3

MR. SCHONBRUN: Correct.

5

the amounts. The only reason for keeping anything

THE COURT: You're certainly right as to

6 7

else secret is to protect the privacy of people who

8

may want to have it protected. But these are

9

judicial proceedings in which these amount are being

10

adjudicated. They're quasi-judicial proceedings, I

11

should say. Nobody is simply writing a check out of

12

the settlement fund, anonymously.

13

MR. SCHONBRUN: I understand that, but

14

what I understand is that provision doesn't require that the identity and the amount of the money be made

15 16

public.

17

THE COURT: Certainly the amount of money,

18 to be sure.

19

MR. SCHONBRUN: Your Honor, the other

20

21

22

23

24

25

point that I raise for you is this issue in the settlement agreement with regard to what I consider to be a freedom of speech issue. I believe there is a provision in the settlement agreement that states that class members, upon receiving an allotment from this settlement, are not permitted to publicly claim



.19

2.0

-- to dispute the amount or in essence to try to organize, perhaps, some kind of whatever objection after the fact.

I believe that's a free speech issue. I believe it's beyond the province of the Court to do that, and I would ask that you address that aspect of the settlement as well, hold that one in abeyance until more thought is given to it.

Finally, on this question of the class action aspects of this, I would request, in an attempt to make this a viable class action, that you obtain declarations from these representative class plaintiffs. I asked about them. There are no declarations from any of these representative class plaintiffs, as I understand it, under oath, stating why it is they're able to represent the class.

I don't think you can make a finding of adequacy until you have these declarations, and I am concerned about your statement that they're just symbolic. In one sense, they are symbolic, particularly in the sense that they're often retained by class action attorneys. But in terms of the proper functioning of the class action mechanism, you have an obligation to make a determination of adequacy.

THE COURT: I was simply speaking about an objection that was directed to one or two of the class representatives that were actually -- one of which was added after the settlement was agreed to.

It isn't clear to me what the significance of it is.

MR. SCHONBRUN: Your Honor, in closing, I would like to say this. This is a very important proceeding, the main reason being that this proceeding is creating an additional historical legacy for the Holocaust. I think it's important that the fairness of these allocations to individual class members and the amount of the attorneys' fee be given the highest priority.

I would ask that in reviewing the propriety of the legal argument that I have made with regard to the class action mechanism being used to resolve these claims, that you address the two decisions by the Third Circuit District Court Judges in those two cases. Again, I have worked in class action area and I don't how class counsel can say that those decisions aren't relevant to the issue which you're deciding. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate your thoughtful presentation.

Thank you all. Good evening.

* * * * * * * *

transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct

Lisa Barron

Date