

CRISIS
in
PALESTINE

By

**MOSES
MILLER**

CONTENTS

RULE BY TERROR	3
BACKGROUND TO CRISIS	4
LAND OF IMPERIALIST INTRIGUE	6
LAND OF BONDAGE	7
AMERICA ENTERS THE SCENE	9
ZIONIST POLICIES	11
EXODUS FROM EUROPE	14
ARAB-JEWISH UNITY	19
THE TERRORIST MOVEMENT	22
PARTITION SCHEMES	24
ZIONISM IS NOT A SOLUTION	27
THE SOLUTION	30

RULE BY TERROR

A LITTLE over a year has passed since that memorable day when the world thrilled to the news of the final defeat of the Nazi Juggernaut. Yet peace has not come. And a people, whose scars have not healed and whose memory of crematories and gas chambers and concentration camps and of six million dead has not dimmed, faces persecution and pogroms anew.

The Jewish community in Palestine (Yishuv) is in the grip of terror, ruthless and fearful in its savagery, instigated and executed by a "socialist" government.

The most fundamental and elementary rights have disappeared. Jews are dragged from their beds in the middle of the night and held incommunicado for weeks and months on end. Homes are raided and looted and smashed. Colonies built up after years of endless toil have been destroyed in a night.

Thousands upon thousands languish in prisons and concentration camps and have been subjected to beatings and torture. On the pretext of looking for a handful of terrorists, Tel Aviv, a city of 200,000, is victimized in a 72-hour inquisition. Ships filled with hungry, emaciated and half-dead souls, are continuously hunted down. The toll of wounded and tortured and dead keeps mounting steadily.

With terror and pogroms becoming more and more the normal way of life, it is no wonder that Mikunis, of the Palestine Communist Party, cried out:

"We did not hear of similar 'laws' being imposed upon the murderers and destroyers of our people in occupied Germany. We know that the opposite is being done. We did not see a similar severity in the Belsen trial against the murderers of hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children. On the contrary, we know that the Nazi gangsters all over the world have been and are being treated with silk gloves by Britain and America. That is because there exists a joint relationship inherent in the very nature of imperialism 'there' and 'here.'"

In this moment of bitter agony and travail, the Yishuv looks to us for aid. We dare not let them down. We dare not allow their fate to become the fate of Jewry under Hitlerism.

The Yishuv, which has grown into the third largest Jewish community in the world, is our concern as it is the concern of every Jew to whom the fate of his people is dear.

It is the concern of every human being to whom democracy and the lives of peoples are sacred, to whom the cause of peace is precious.

Neither hysteria, nor tears, nor emotion will save our brethren. Action is needed and now. But such action can be decisive only if we are clear as to what we seek to achieve and how, in which direction we are headed, who are our enemies and who are our allies.

To answer these burning questions, it is necessary that we understand something of the background of the problem and the development of events which have led to the present tragic situation.

BACKGROUND TO CRISIS

The story of the British conquest of Palestine, with its shady deals, contradictory promises and subsequent results is one of the dirtiest in contemporary history. It is the story of a ruthless power, going back on treaties, scrapping promises and betraying the hopes and aspirations for freedom of two peoples.

In 1914, British interests in the Near East were being menaced by the Turks, who were in alliance with the Germans. Discontent and resentment of the Arabs against Turkish oppression loomed as possible sparks that could be kindled into a mass revolt which would be harnessed to British imperialist ambitions. British strategists therefore entered into negotiations with Arab leaders promising them independence in exchange for military assistance in the fight against Turkey.

Agreement was reached between Grand Sherif Hussein of Mecca, in behalf of the Arabs, and Sir Henry McMahon, representing Great Britain. The Sherif made it clear that he would mobilize his forces for an Arab revolt with the understanding that the territory agreed upon, including Palestine, would be the independent territory of the Arabs.

This feeling for independence was so deep on the part of the Arabs that every British spokesman had to take cognizance of it and pay lip service to it. The joint declaration of Great Britain and France issued to the press by General Allenby in Palestine on November 9, 1918, declared:

"The end aimed at by France and Great Britain in their carrying out of the war in the East, unloosed by German ambition, is the complete and final enfranchisement of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks and the establishment of national governments and administrations drawing their authority from the initiative and free choice of the native population."

The promise of independence, however, turned out to be empty phrases. For at the very moment that Britain was making promises to the Arabs, it was preparing to conclude a conflicting treaty with France.

In March 1916, the Sykes-Picot Agreement was signed by Great Britain and France. Under this agreement territories promised to the Arabs were to be considered as British and French spheres of influence.

It is significant that the Sykes-Picot agreement would have remained secret had not the Soviet government made it public when it took possession of the Russian archives.

These two contradictory agreements, however, do not complete the story of Britain's vicious game.

Britain used some of the deepest aspirations of the Jewish people to offset its betrayal of the Arab national liberation movement. In 1917 the Balfour Declaration, the third British document, was issued, promising the assistance of the British Government in "The establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. . . ."

The British government made believe this declaration arose from a deep concern for the suffering and homelessness of the Jewish people. In 1937 the Peel Commission swept aside the pious phrases of their government and stated quite bluntly that the Balfour Declaration was a war measure designed to win the support of the Jewish people for the Allied cause.

Many volumes have been written by apologists for imperialism trying to reconcile these three conflicting documents. Many of them base their conclusions on the reservations the British negotiators had in mind. Whatever "mental reservations" these treaty makers may have had, one thing is very clear. In each and every document, these imperialists made very certain that sufficient loopholes were left to enable them to repudiate any and all agreements.

One example will suffice. Despite the promises that were made to Hussein, the Arab territories were carved up between Great Britain and France. When confronted however, with the threat of revolt by the two sons of Hussein, Feisal and Abdullah, British intrigue maneuvered them into serving British interests. Feisal was made King of Iraq with Britain pulling the strings and remaining the real master. Abdullah, too, was taken care of. Transjordan, an integral part of Palestine, was set up as an independent territory with Britain as mandatory power and Abdullah as its "ruler."

This partition took quite a bit of maneuvering, since under the terms of the Balfour Declaration, Palestine was supposed to become the Jewish National Home. But again the "loophole" was found, this time by Winston Churchill. In 1922 a White Paper was issued which stated that it had never been the intention of Great Britain to turn Palestine into a Jewish National Home. What Britain had promised, said the White Paper, was a Jewish Home *in* Palestine and therefore the Transjordan deal was perfectly legitimate.

From the day British imperialism set foot in Palestine, its policy has been motivated by one major aim—the maintenance of its control over the Arab Middle East. There is the consistency which runs like a red thread through years of contradictory promises and acts. It is a consistency based

on imperialist aims in an area of great strategic and economic importance to the Empire.

Every measure undertaken by British imperialism in Palestine (as in all colonial countries) for the past quarter of a century has been calculated to set one group against the other, to foment hatred and to prevent Arab as well as Jew from seeing that their problem was a common one.

LAND OF IMPERIALIST INTRIGUE

It is no accident that this ancient strip of land should have become the scene of raging and turbulent conflict. Here, the heart of a region where East meets West, is the center of the lifeline of the British Empire. Here is the bridgehead of the Suez Canal, key point of the sea route to India and other points East and South. Palestine is the strategic air center of England and its far-flung Empire.

Oil from the fields of Iraq flows steadily through the pipeline to Haifa, port city of Palestine and major terminus of the pipeline. And here, in Haifa is the major British naval base in the Mediterranean.

It is obvious, therefore, why Britain has such a deep attachment for this little country.

Palestine holds a key position in the defense of Britain's vast possessions in Africa, the Near and Middle East, India and Australia. And Palestine's significance to the British Empire is constantly increasing.

The movement for independence in the Middle East is on the march. In Egypt, in Syria and Lebanon, in Iraq and Iran, the people, weary of long years of promises and betrayals, are beginning to move in the direction of open rebellion.

Britain is caught on the horns of a dilemma from which it finds it difficult to extricate itself. It is forced to maneuver and to make promises. It grants fictitious independence to Transjordanian thereby hoping to prevent the issue from coming up before the United Nations. It makes certain, however, of retaining complete military and economic control over the country. In the case of Egypt, it is forced to promise complete withdrawal of its troops, a promise, the executions of which it however manages to find reasons for delaying.

Hand in hand with this, goes Britain's desire to turn the Middle East into a base for anti-Soviet intrigue and as a possible jumping off point for a war against the Soviet Union. Witness the bitter battle of both Britain and America before the Security Council on the issue of Iran. Did this issue have anything to do with the fate and independence of small nations, as they maintained? Or was the issue one of preventing Iran from slipping out of their fingers and thus upsetting their plans of turning Iran into another "poor little Finland."

More than ever before, Britain needs a central, strategic point in the heart of the Arab Middle East which will serve as a center from which to safeguard its vital imperialist lines of communication, from which to stifle all independence movements and from which to carry on its intrigues against the Soviet Union.

Palestine is rapidly becoming that central point. That is why there are now more troops in Palestine than during the whole course of the war. Freda Kirchway writes in the *Nation*:

"Though I had read about the concentration of military and police forces in Palestine, I had no idea till I went there how overpowering it had become. Convoys of British tanks and trucks move along the roads holding up civilian traffic. The public barracks, located at strategic points only a few miles apart, are really forts, concrete structures formidable in size and structure. . . ." (June 22, 1946)

Millions of dollars are being spent for new airfields, military camps and fortifications, naval bases and radar installations. Gaza, ancient seaport town and for many years a deserted village, is now a bustling reservation with 60,000 troops. Akko has become the site of a vast network of military camps and fortifications. Haifa has become a city bristling with guns and overcrowded with soldiers.

And here, to this country whose people know no peace comes General Anders, notorious fascist and anti-Semite, to discuss with the British the question of transferring some 40,000 of his fascist Polish troops to Transjordan and possibly to Palestine.

Is it any wonder then, with imperialism so desperately concerned with strengthening its military position, that it seeks to prevent the people of the country from uniting against their common enemy? Britain, long experienced in the game of enslaving peoples, knows that the old Roman principle of "Divide and Rule" is still, even after 2,000 years, the best method by which to control a foreign land.

And this Britain has done with a vengeance.

LAND OF BONDAGE

In this country, where Britain rules with an iron fist, there is no democracy or self-rule.

There are no legislative councils or parliamentary institutions. The High Commissioner is a virtual dictator, taking orders from no one but the Foreign Office in London.

"Neither Jew nor Arab has been included in the highest ranks of administration. British officials hold all important positions. They exercise as much authority as in a country where the mass of inhabitants are in a primitive stage of civilization." (From the Report of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry.)

Both Jews and Arabs pay taxes, not for the improvement of their living conditions, their health and their education, but for the privilege of being saddled with troops, military installations, foreign monopolists and a parasitic bureaucracy.

Thus, out of a budget of twenty million pounds, over six millions are spent for police and prisons, while only 1,684,000 pounds are spent for education, health and social services.

Nor do the municipalities even have the right to spend their own funds without the direct and written permission of the District Commissioner, who has the authority to reject any part or all of the municipal budget. Daniel Auster, who was Vice Mayor of Jerusalem, wrote in disgust:

"The authority of the Municipal Councils is so limited that even if it is decided to appoint a minor clerk at a salary of 36 pounds per annum . . . the approval of the District Commissioner is necessary. A council of twelve or fifteen elected representatives may spend hours and days arriving at a decision which, when submitted to the Commissioner, is responded to by a curt note cancelling it." (*Palestine Review* [England]—April 17, 1936.)

Even in the case of municipalities and local councils where elections are held, the franchise is extremely limited. In the main it is only the propertied classes that have the right to vote. Thus in Jerusalem, out of an adult population of 70,000 only 7,000 are entitled to vote. In Gaza, with a population of 19,000 there are 500 voters. Nablus with a population of 20,000 has 900 voters.

Like all other colonial countries, Palestine is a happy hunting ground for foreign capital. While the government consistently sabotages the development of local industry, it places no obstacles in the way of foreign investments.

In January of 1946, an agreement was signed between the Palestine Government and the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Company, a subsidiary of the American-Arabian Oil Company which is owned jointly by Standard Oil of California and Texaco. The agreement granted this American company the right to lay its pipe line from Saudi-Arabia to the Mediterranean through Palestine. The concessions, granted for a period of 70 years, include:

"The right to build bridges, railway lines, ports, roads, telegraph lines, means of transportation by land, sea and air, air fields, electrical installations and pipe lines for water, gas and oil supply.

"The company is exempted from all taxation and can bring in all materials it needs free of duty. It may import workers from other countries for employment in its works. The Government has pledged to confiscate the property of Palestinian citizens for the benefit of the Company."

The Palestine Government, back in 1931 granted a similar concession to the Iraq Petroleum Company (in which American oil interests hold 24 per cent of the stock; Britain and France hold the rest.) In 1933, this very same company was handed 2250 dunams of land near Haifa Bay, free of charge for the purpose of setting up the terminus of its pipe line.

With pipe line terminals and refineries in Haifa, one would imagine that at least the cost of oil and gas would be low. Such however is far from being the case. Fuel costs are very high. "The price of petroleum in Haifa is the price as delivered in Manchester, England, plus the transportation from Manchester back again to Palestine." (*New Palestine*, [U.S.A.] January 7, 1944.)

The Electric Companies are free to charge whatever rates they please and are subject to no control with the result that industry as well as agriculture which needs electricity for the development of proper irrigation has been hindered by the exorbitant rates.

Nor is this the only method by which the government has obstructed the development of local industry and agriculture. The major banks of the country are in the hands of foreign bankers. These banks, working hand in hand with the government, stifle local development by means of exorbitant rates of interest, by making mortgages prohibitive, and by refusing to grant cheap credit for poor farmers.

The government has consistently hindered the importation of raw materials and of modern machinery. It establishes regularly a list of so-called "essential" raw materials, by which is meant anything that the monopolists would like to have for themselves. And it creates inflationary conditions which make it impossible for local industry to compete with foreign industries.

AMERICA ENTERS THE SCENE

The establishment of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry was indicative of a very major development in Middle East politics. It symbolized the inability of Britain to rule any longer by its own power alone, and proved that American imperialism was now a constant factor in Palestine as in the Middle East generally and that the U.S.A. would pursue an increasingly aggressive role in this area.

"As a result of World War II," writes Grant S. McClellan in a Foreign Policy Association Report, entitled "Palestine and America's Role in the Middle East," "the United States became intimately involved in the affairs of the Middle East, and Palestine is situated in the very heart of that strategic area. . . . It is evident therefore that the troubled country of Palestine emerges as a world problem and any course the United States pursues toward it must be developed in relation to our broader policy, especially with respect to Britain and Russia."

McClellan could have presented his thesis much more simply if he had said that American imperialism is primarily concerned with its own intrigues both in relation to cutting in on Britain and to using the Middle East as a base of operations against the Soviet Union.

American imperialism has, over a long period of time, been making deeper and deeper economic and political inroads into the Middle East. This has taken place in most cases directly at the expense of Great Britain. While this policy may enrich some Arab leaders, it impoverishes the peoples and puts added obstacles in their path to liberation from imperialism.

In such places as Saudi-Arabia and Bahrein Island, American oil interests have exclusive concessions, which under present day conditions means not only control of oil fields but of air bases, ports, communications and the like. In Palestine, Turkey, Egypt, Syria and Lebanon, American interests are tied in with the British and French through the Iraq Petroleum Company.

In some of these latter countries, America, despite the fact that it had agreed to undertake no exploitation of these countries by itself, has forced Britain to make one concession after another.

The Shinwell-Ickes Oil Agreement of 1945 represents one such case where Britain was forced to grant oil and air base concessions to the United States.

The concessions granted to the American-owned Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. in Palestine is another case in point.

Nor have American Zionists been indifferent to this question. The Zionist Organization of America called a conference in July of 1945 which was addressed by leading American businessmen and officials on how to provide "an opportunity for American business men and industrialists to consider how Palestine and the Middle East offer possibilities for increasing postwar business relations with the U.S.A. (*Palestine Post*, [Palestine] July 22, 1945.)

Britain has of course been none too happy about these concessions for they mean the constant weakening of British interests in the Middle East. However, because of her weakened position since the war, and her overwhelming need of American credit, because she must seek help from her more powerful rival to save her colonial power, Britain is forced to agree to American inroads.

The participation of the United States in the Inquiry Commission on Palestine verified in a public and official manner the growing role which American imperialism was now playing in the Middle East. It was also an expression of the agreement between Britain and America on the fundamental policy of Anglo-Saxon imperialist domination of the Middle East.

It was at the same time indicative of the policy of Great Britain not to

undertake any unilateral action because of her difficulties in carrying through any such policy by itself and because of its fear that the United States might offer better terms and thus win over more of the Middle Eastern countries to its side.

It has become more and more evident that since the establishment of the Inquiry Commission, Britain has not taken a single important step in Palestine without the active or tacit agreement of the United States.

While America on the one hand continued to play its own game in order to win for itself more and more of Britain's Empire, a factor which makes for continued clashes and rivalry, it is on the other hand as concerned as Britain in preventing the peoples of the Middle East from achieving independence, since this would be equally injurious to its own interests.

America and Great Britain are both members of the United Nations, are both pledged to act within the framework of the UN Charter, which they themselves participated in drawing up. The very fact that, both in the case of the Inquiry Committee as well as in the case of the Cabinet Committee, they completely ignored the UN and the Soviet Union clearly indicates that this is an alliance for reaction and not for peace and for the freedom of peoples.

"We must remember," states the Communist Party of Palestine, "that American imperialism which fights against the Chinese, defends Franco Spain, appoints Nazis to public posts in Germany, tolerates anti-Semitism in America and does not outlaw it, that this American imperialism cannot be an ally of the Yishuv.

"We must remember Truman's statement that 'he does not know whether the Mufti is a war criminal.' We must not forget that in the American zone of Germany, German guards murder Jews and American courts condemned tens of Jews to imprisonment. American imperialism is no different from its British counterpart. The smell of oil emanates from both. Both are after oil and strategic bases and both are ready to sacrifice Arab and Jew alike."

ZIONIST POLICIES

Bitter days for the Yishuv. Days of disillusionment, of deep protest and anger. Days, in which growing numbers are beginning to realize that theirs is the fate of millions upon millions of colonial people.

Nor is this feeling limited to the Yishuv alone. Everywhere, those who are concerned with the fate of the Yishuv are asking: "What is to be done to halt this reign of terror and to insure the future peace and security of the Yishuv?"

Certainly the facts presented are undeniably clear in their import.

The strengthening of its own rule, the creating of antagonisms between both people—this is the major strategy of imperialism.

One would imagine therefore that the path which both Jewish and Arab leaders must take is clear: Resistance against imperialism; unity to prevent antagonisms; joint struggle for independence and freedom.

Tragically, this has not been the case. Both Jewish and Arab leadership have gone their own ways, each hoping that imperialism could be won over to its side. And imperialism has thus been able to chalk up victory after victory in its "divide and rule" policy, making promises to each group it never meant to be fulfilled, encouraging antagonisms, and playing one group against the other.

Ever since the issuance of the Balfour Declaration in 1917, the Zionist movement charted its course on the assumption that the British Government was the main instrument by means of which they would secure their aims.

They looked upon all conflicts with Britain as "temporary" ones, as "passing tension." They saw no contradiction between imperialism as master and the establishment of a secure and peaceful life for the Yishuv.

Many a Zionist leader spent much time in trying to convince the British that their interests could best be served by a large Jewish community in Palestine. Thus Menachim Ussishkin, veteran Zionist leader, stated:

"A Palestine which is wholly Arabic means that sooner or later Great Britain will be forced to leave just as it is gradually leaving Egypt. A Palestine which is largely Jewish means a political alliance cordiale . . . between the Jewish people and the English." (*Palestine Review*, July 3, 1936.)

And Lord Melchett, leading monopolist and one time head of the British Jewish Agency, stated that if support were given to the Zionist cause it "would provide the British Empire with a healthy and intelligent population in the Near East always ready in case of necessity to take up arms in an imperial cause."

With an orientation of reliance upon imperialism for the achievement of their objectives, it was quite natural that the Zionist leadership should disregard the question of cooperation with the Arabs and look upon it as a negligible factor. Through the years they remained calmly indifferent to the fact that the Yishuv would live in an Arab world and that long after British imperialism was gone, the Arab world would still be their neighbors.

Zionist leaders have paid lip service to the Arab question but have in practice pursued a quite different policy. Certainly the policy of "Kibbush Avodah" (conquering of spheres of work for Jewish labor) or the policy of "Totseret Haaretz" (campaign to get Jews to buy home produce) which in actuality meant "Buy Jewish Goods" were not very helpful in laying the base for Arab-Jewish friendship.

M. Erem, a leader of the Poale Zion (Labor Zionists), protested against this "Buy Jewish" slogan back in 1935.

"If it is to serve mere purposes of declamation, then we must consider it as the babblings of provocateurs since it aggravates the already tense atmosphere of national hatred in Palestine. . . .

"Only the blind and naive can make themselves believe that the Arab market will not react, sooner or later, against this 'noble' slogan. The danger appears even greater because this reaction will not limit itself to the economic field, but will most definitely have its repercussions in the political alignments in the country. What will happen then? . . . Our very existence is charged with explosives, which need but a spark to ignite." (*Proletarische Gedank*, Nov. 15-Dec. 1, 1935.)

Nor did this attitude change for the better as years went by. On the contrary, Zionist policy moved further and further in the direction of isolating itself ever more from the Arab population.

In 1942 the convention of the Zionist movement at the Biltmore Hotel called openly for the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. Thus the Zionists who had for many years spoken of this only with hushed breath, now brought it forth as their official program.

As late as November 30, 1945, Eliezer Kaplan, one of the leaders of the Jewish Agency stated before the Mapai (Jewish Labor Party):

"I think that the aim of our struggle is also the renewal of the alliance. I believe this can be done, for I think—as far as I can judge—that there is no basic contradiction of interests between us and the British government. I will go further. There is and can be the widest cooperation between us and the British government."

And what now? Is there any excuse today for not realizing that a people struggling to be free can have nothing in common with its oppressors. Yet, even now, Dr. Eton of the Jewish Agency states in a press interview:

"The Jews in Palestine are ready to defend themselves. This does not mean that they are against continued presence of British military forces in Palestine to defend and guard the legitimate interests of the British Empire."

This is the language of leaders of a people who are being made the victims of merciless persecution. Programs, terror, repression—these are the "legitimate interests" of British imperialism.

Zionist leaders maintain that they have always been ready to reach an agreement with the Arabs. One thing however always stood in the way and that was the question of unlimited immigration and the right of the Jew to become a majority in Palestine.

"It is in our vital interests to reach an agreement but we shall not give up our right to immigration," said Shertok, head of the Political Division of the Jewish Agency before the Anglo-American Commission. And many, deeply disturbed by the sufferings of the Jews will nod their head and cry:

"Look at the unprecedented misery of our people. This is our immediate problem. If the Arabs agree, fine. If they don't, we will get along without them. Our task is to save our brethren."

It is of the utmost importance that we analyze this argument carefully and thoroughly for in this argument is the crux of the Zionist position and the confusion that it has brought into Jewish life.

EXODUS FROM EUROPE

Europe, say the dominant Zionist group, is a hell where anti-Semitism is increasing, where life is becoming more impossible each day. The new governments are impotent. Our task is therefore to help our brethren escape from Europe. There is no longer any place for Jews in Europe. They must escape to Palestine as no other country is willing to accept them.

The Zionist movement has spent millions of dollars on propaganda to convince the world that Jews can no longer remain in Europe and that the only place left for them is Palestine.

Yet the very cry of the "Exodus from Europe" which they raise is the slogan which Hitler raised and which all the remnants of fascism are using in order to carry on their attacks upon the Jewish people.

And while Zionists raise this slogan on the grounds that anti-Semitism cannot be wiped out they fail to answer the question as to how Jews are going to be safe in Palestine, since according to their own preachings, the Arabs are opposed to Jewish immigration. Who is going to insure their security in Palestine? British imperialism? The Jews by themselves against the whole Arab world?

Never was this confusion more apparent than in the reaction of the Zionist leadership to the Anglo-American Commission report. Despite the fact that the report insured the continued oppression and rule of imperialism, the Zionists hailed it because of its recommendation that 100,000 Jews be allowed into Palestine.

"Britain is on our side," exclaimed the Zionists. But a few hours later, Attlee stated that no recommendations would be fulfilled until the Jewish community was disarmed and America agreed to military and financial aid. "Britain has betrayed us," shouted the Zionists. Truman declared he was still for the admission of the 100,000. The Zionists were loud in their praise. The Anglo-American Cabinet Committee proposed partition and making all immigration dependent upon acceptance of the plan. "We have been let down," clamored the Zionists.

Is it leadership or bankruptcy that permits them to hail promises made by these imperialists which, as every child in Palestine has come to learn, is concerned only with its own imperialist interests?

The report stated:

"We recommend that 100,000 certificates be authorized immediately . . . and that these certificates be awarded as far as possible in 1946 and that their actual immigration be pushed forward as rapidly as possible as conditions will permit."

Quite correctly did Meier Vilner of the Palestine Communist Party ask:

"And who is to stipulate how far it is possible? Who is to determine whether 'conditions' (what conditions?) will permit it? To this decisive question a reply is given by that part of the report which deals with the basic solution of the problem of immigration:

"It must, we think, be conceded that it should be the right of the government of Palestine to decide, having regard to the well being of the people of Palestine, the number of immigrants to be admitted within any given period."

"These words reveal the climax of cynicism and hypocrisy. The Government of Palestine 'has regard' for the well being of all the people. . . . If it pleases them, they will open the gates a bit and will rouse the Arabs against the Jews. And if it pleases them the other way, they will close all immigration and rouse the Jews against the Arabs.

"Once they will cover themselves with a pro-Jewish cloak and next time they will hunt refugee ships in the most cruel ways. Everything according to the old imperialist game of 'divide and rule.'"

Posing the problem of immigration as something existing in a vacuum, completely divorced from the question of democracy and security in Palestine, has ended in the tragic events we are witness to today.

How many Jews have gotten into Palestine since the end of the war? And of those that did manage to get in, how many now languish in prisons and concentration camps? And how many have been shot down in cold blood by British police and soldiers?

Is life "safe" in Palestine with colonies destroyed, with persecution and terror a daily occurrence? Is life more bearable in a concentration camp in Palestine than in Germany? Does the future hold out any security in a country which is rapidly being turned into a gigantic military reservation?

The Zionists have engaged in much "saber rattling" with regard to the pogroms in Poland and have declared that all Jews must leave Poland. Certainly no one who is concerned with the fate of the Jewish people can be indifferent to these horrible pogroms. But the Zionists seem to forget that there have been as many if not more Jews killed in Palestine. They fail to point out what whereas in Poland the government, a democratic government, is vigorously fighting and executing the pogrom makers, who are part of the fascist underground, in Palestine it is the government which is carrying on this terror. And this government has no intention of relinquishing its grip.

They fail to point out that it is this very same Government, together

with the American government, which finances and encourages and supports the fascist pogrom makers in Poland.

The Zionist leaders are quite aware of the inhuman conditions of the Jews in the DP camps. Yet have they asked—why did America and Great Britain have to keep them in DP camps at all? Why were not the homes of the Nazis turned over to them? Why have American authorities put these hapless Jews under Nazis, and fascist Poles? Why have American soldiers been allowed to persecute and to murder them?

This persecution is taking place in a zone under a government whose President makes such loud protestations of concern for Jews and their right to go to Palestine. May one ask why one who is supposedly concerned with the right of Jews to go to Palestine should allow them to be murdered in German DP camps? May one ask how many Jews will be alive to go any place if the American government does not take steps to halt this dastardly treatment of victims of Hitlerism?

The answer is available to anyone who cares to face the truth. The American and the British governments are pursuing a policy of maintaining rather than liquidating Nazism. Col. Bernstein, former aide to General Eisenhower, speaking before the American Jewish Conference made these grave charges and added that this was part of the plan to establish a Western bloc against the Soviet Union. He maintained that the only region in which Nazism was being liquidated was in the Soviet Zone.

Of the supposed concern of the American government, Serezhin, in the Soviet magazine *New Times*, aptly remarked:

"... these circles believed that participation in the Palestine Committee and in the adoption of decisions ostensibly aimed at promoting the welfare of the Jewish people might help to some extent to divert world attention from the obviously unsatisfactory situation in the western zone of Germany in respect to denazification and the eradication of fascism. Lastly it should be remembered that in the United States, the Palestine question has always been considered a good card to play at election times, leaders of both political parties freely promising to support the Zionist claims to Palestine in the attempt to secure the influential Jewish vote." (June 1, 1946)

For those who are not blinded by tragic illusions, it becomes more obvious each day that there is an inexorable relationship between persecution in Europe and in Palestine and that it is the very same forces that are responsible for both.

Yet, while Zionist leaders are quite well aware of these facts, we have seen no criticism on their part of the American and British governments and their treatment of the Jews in the DP camps. We have heard of no campaign on their part for the immediate liquidation of these camps and the turning over of this question to the Security Council?

The Zionists have raised a hue and cry about the 100,000. This leader-

ship knew that even its program for bringing 100,000 Jews to Palestine would be a major task and would take some time. Even under the best of conditions, the economic problem alone of resettling 100,000 Jews would be a formidable one.

But there are more than 100,000 Jews in Europe. What was the constructive program of the Zionists for all the other Jews? "They must all leave Europe," is the answer of the Zionists. If their program for the 100,000 remains unfulfilled and hardly possible of achievement within the near future, how ridiculous it is even to talk of the rest of European Jewry leaving.

Yet, flying in the face of realities, most Zionist leaders called for panic emigration with complete disregard for the welfare and well being of these Jews. Many of them helped to sabotage and tried to prevent the reconstruction of Jewish life in such countries as Poland, where moderate Zionist leaders were participating with all other Jews in the community in the task of building a new life.

These Zionist leaders have refused to face the fact that since the defeat of Hitler, British and American imperialists have become the main carriers of anti-Semitism and that this imperialism, which is responsible for pogroms in Poland, is the very same force which causes pogroms in Palestine.

In contrast to the conditions of Jews under imperialist control, one might well ponder the report of Robert Gary, Jewish Telegraphic Agency correspondent who wrote after a ten day tour of the Soviet zone of occupation:

"Every Jewish leader with whom the writer spoke praised the Russian authorities both when Russian officers were present at interviews and at other times. Restitution of Jewish property has been progressing since the Russians took over the area from the Americans last July it was pointed out. . . .

"Jews who returned to this area from different parts of Europe were at first billeted by the Russian authorities in the finest hotels available. They were then transported either to their old homes, many of which had been used by Nazi officials, or were placed in former Nazi homes. Everyone received more than enough clothing, as well as money grants. All Jews were either returned to their former businesses or were given businesses taken from the Nazis. Top food priority was also extended to the Jews. . . .

"Soviet authorities as well as Jewish leaders pointed out that there never were displaced person camps in the Russian zone. Local Soviet commanders stated that it was taken for granted that Jews should receive preferential treatment and that any display of anti-Semitism would immediately be prosecuted. The commanders added that to date there has been no real trouble."

How deeply ironic it is to find these two great democracies, America

and Great Britain, trying to convince the world that they just don't know what to do with these Jews. We are to believe that in all this time they could not if they really wanted to, have opened the gates of America and Great Britain to the Jews in the DP camps; that there was room for thousands of Polish fascists but not for Jews. We are to believe that they just couldn't get along without DP camps. If they were so eager that Jews have the right to go to Palestine, they could have established a free and democratic country, a condition which would have made it possible for Palestine to be included amongst the countries to which these Jews would have been able to go in safety.

Palestine does not exist on Mars. It is a part of this world and its problems. Can life be secure for the Jew in Palestine if the imperialists succeed in destroying the new governments in Europe? Will Palestine be safe if the imperialists succeed in launching another war, a war in which the Middle East will be a major battlefield?

Palestine can make its contribution to the question of immigration for the DP prisoners and for those who wish to leave Europe, in a positive way, only if the present colonial status of the country is abolished and democratic self-government is instituted for both peoples.

It is possible to solve the question of immigration to Palestine only as part of the major issue of the security of the Yishuv. And it is possible to solve the question of the Yishuv and its security only in terms of the removal of imperialism and the establishment of an independent Palestine.

Such a program must of necessity be based upon Arab-Jewish unity. But this is exactly what the Zionist leadership has refused to accept all these years. Shertok, political director of the Jewish Agency, revealed in his testimony before the Anglo-American Commission that:

"Some of our Arab interlocutors seemed prepared to accept the idea of a very substantial Jewish immigration, but they set conditions which we at the time could not fulfill. It was not for us to liquidate the British Mandatory Regime in Palestine, nor did we at that time particularly cherish the prospect of an early liquidation."

This then is the official position of the Jewish Agency. Contrary to what we have been led to believe all these years, there were Arabs who were ready to agree to "very substantial Jewish immigration." But this was unacceptable to the Zionists because there was a "hitch" to it. The Arabs asked that they join with them in fighting for the liquidation of the Mandate. This the Jewish Agency did not "cherish."

Thus it is not the question of immigration which stands in the way of Arab-Jewish agreement, as the Zionists have maintained these many years, but rather the refusal by Zionist leaders of a common fight against imperialism. And these very same leaders who today make claims to be the great advocates of resistance, actually refused to arrive at an agreement with the Arabs for a very large scale immigration because they had no

desire to get rid of imperialist rule in Palestine. They had no such desire because their program, which would turn a country in which two peoples live into a Jewish state, must rely upon imperialism for fulfillment.

How far the advocates of a Jewish State are willing to go for the achievement of their narrow and shortsighted aims, which in no way offer a solution to Jewish suffering is clearly indicated by an article which was printed approvingly in "*Palestine*," organ of the American Zionist Emergency Council. The article is by a W. E. Hart, described as a "British military scientist." Hart writes in the Nov-Dec., 1945, issue:

"To discontinue full immigration into Palestine means to deny to the British Empire the finest recruiting material that could be found in the Middle East. . . . The cut in Jewish immigration into Palestine means a reduction in manpower necessary for the defense of the Middle East."

This then is the great future which suffering Jews must struggle to achieve—the right to become "manpower" and "recruiting material" for Britain's imperialist plans.

And this with the approval of the American Zionist Emergency Council.

ARAB-JEWISH UNITY

There are those who ask: "You speak so much of Arab-Jewish unity. But can there be peace and understanding between Jews and Arabs after so many years of conflict? Are not the Arabs solidly lined up in a hostile camp opposed to anything that Jews may do? Are not the Arabs agents of fascism in the Near East? Did not the Mufti work in open partnership with the Nazis?"

Such a position is taken by many leading Zionists. Thus, J. Kossoy, a member of the Mapai executive, states:

"A socialist government (Britain) refers to two communities in Palestine and their aspirations without taking into consideration that there is on the one hand a community building freedom and social justice and on the other hand a feudal gang trying to force the Moslem sword upon the world." (*Davar*, organ of the Histadruth, Nov. 16, 1945.)

With such an approach there is naturally no basis for even touching the question of Arab-Jewish unity.

But are all Arabs a "feudal gang"? Is there no distinction to be made between reactionaries and fascist leaders and the masses of the Arabs who are oppressed and downtrodden and who suffer at the hands of both imperialism and their own leaders?

A Palestine correspondent of the *Zionist Review* reported that "one of the paradoxes of the complex and bewildering Palestine situation is the complete absence of friction between Jews and Arabs in the country. Probably at no time in the history of the Jewish settlement in Palestine

have Arab-Jewish relations been so unmarked by clashes and disagreement as during the past two years."

To this correspondent this seems very strange. But is it so difficult to understand that Arabs are like all other peoples and that the development of progressive movements is bound to take place amongst them like amongst all people?

When Jamal Husseini, the reactionary leader of the Arab Higher Committee, visited Jaffa and was welcomed by large crowds, his call to the Arabs to fight the Jews, to boycott Jewish goods, etc., was interrupted by cries: "And what about imperialism, what about colonial rule?"

When strikes and demonstrations took place in Arab towns and villages protesting the report of the Inquiry Commission, Arab reactionaries tried to turn the Arab masses against the Jews. They met with little success. The Hebrew press in Palestine reported frequently that the Arab demonstrators in Jerusalem, in Haifa, in Jaffa shouted: "Don't touch the Jews. They are our friends."

Ben Gurion, head of the Histadruth, maintained before the Inquiry Commission that "there exists a tragic conflict between us and the Arabs."

But four weeks after his statement thousands of Jewish and Arab workers marched out in a united strike carrying slogans in Hebrew and Arabic which read: "United we shall win. Long live the unity of the Jewish and Arab workers." 35,000 Jewish and Arab workers participated in this strike.

There were, of course, elements both in Jewish as well as in Arab life who tried to smash the strike. *Zohoraim*, the Hebrew newspaper in Haifa had a flaming headline: "The strike is the work of the Arab League. *Yedioth Aharonoth*, of Tel Aviv, stated that "the wages of the workers, the majority of whom were Arabs, would be payed by the Jewish tax payers in whose interest it is therefore to halt the strike."

On the other hand the reactionary Arab newspapers labelled the strike as a "Zionist maneuver" and called upon the Arabs to have no part of the strike.

Despite all efforts to sabotage it, the strike was a tremendous success with complete solidarity. This was Arab-Jewish cooperation on a scale hitherto unknown in Palestine.

With the rise of a working class amongst the Arabs (which has only taken place during this war) progressive developments have occurred. An Arab League of National Liberation has come into being which is in direct opposition to the reactionary leaders of the Arab people. This Committee has time and again pointed out in its organ, *Al Ittihad*, that freedom will come to Palestine only through a united struggle of both peoples against imperialism.

It would of course be naive and harmful to exaggerate the strength of these movements. They are not yet able to challenge effectively the domi-

nant reactionary leadership of the Arabs. For that matter neither are the forces in the Yishuv, who believe in Arab-Jewish unity, sufficiently strong to challenge the reactionary leadership in Jewish life that is opposed to Arab-Jewish unity and that insists on a Jewish State Now.

The major thing that we must bear in mind is that these are the forces that represent progress, that represent the true interests of both communities and that only the growth and strength of these groups can assure security and peace and national rights to both Jews and Arabs.

Certainly Arab-Jewish unity cannot be achieved over night. Imperialism has lost no opportunity to sow the seeds of antagonism between Jews and Arabs. And it has had the assistance of reactionary leaders in both communities in this matter. The path is no easy one. It is nevertheless the only realistic one, the only one that can bring an end to the suffering of both communities.

In this respect it is important to bear in mind that the major support for the Jewish State program comes not from the Palestine Yishuv but from this country. It was here that the Biltmore program was adopted. It was here that the maximum Zionist program was formulated. The Jews of Palestine are far from united behind the Commonwealth or State demand. In Palestine there is considerable division on this question.

In 1944 at a conference of the Histadruth Executive, a motion supporting the Biltmore Resolution was carried by only 2 votes, the count being 24 to 21. Thus in the executive of the most important body in Palestine today, almost half of the leadership voted against the Commonwealth proposition.

Within the Mapai (Jewish Labor Party) a split has taken place. Those who are opposed to the Commonwealth proposal have constituted themselves into a separate political group called "Thua Achduth Avodah" (Movement for the Unity of Labor).

In the elections held in 1945 for the Assefat Hanivcharim (Jewish Assembly) the vote for supporters of the Biltmore program was 130,000 while those opposed received 70,000.

There is the Hashomer Hatzair (left wing political party) which stands for Arab-Jewish unity and which calls for a bi-national state. There is the Ichud group (Unity movement) headed by Dr. Judah L. Magnes, President of the Hebrew University.

All of these groups, despite their Zionist character and despite many inconsistencies, have realized that there can be no peaceful Jewish development without an understanding with the Arabs. They realize that the program of the official Zionist leadership is a dangerous one.

Then there is the growing Communist Party of Palestine which has exposed imperial rule in Palestine and has been the consistent champion of Arab-Jewish unity.

Mark Krug, a staunch Zionist and a believer in the Biltmore program, has pointed out:

"It should be conceded that the opposition which has developed in Palestine to the Commonwealth program is considerable and its arguments deserve serious consideration. It serves no good purpose to minimize or brush them aside as mere fantasies of faint-hearted people. Those in Palestine who reject the Biltmore program do so because of a sincere conviction that it is absolutely necessary to reach an understanding with the Arabs if the Zionist effort is to be continued and expanded. The elections have shown that these views are supported by a substantial part of the Palstinian electorate." (*National Jewish Monthly* [Bnai Brith]—August 1945.)

THE TERRORIST MOVEMENT

It is difficult to remain calm in the face of the oppression that has come upon the Yishuv. When British generals openly call for anti-Semitism; when British soldiers and police torture innocent men, women and children; when the lives of infants and the aged are no longer sacred; when colonies are burned down before the very eyes of those who have given so much of their lives to building them; when funeral processions wend their way each day to give burial to victims of imperialist savagery, it is no easy task to sit back calmly and objectively analyze the course of events.

Yet do it we must for it is only along this path that salvation lies.

Each day we pick up the newspapers and read of groups in the Yishuv who are engaged in retaliatory measures. We read of the bombing of the King David Hotel, of the destruction of a railroad or a bridge, of the capture of a train or some munitions, of the kidnapping of some soldiers and in some cases of killings.

What does this movement represent? Will it aid the Yishuv to emerge from its desperate plight? Will it bring freedom? Or will it only add to their oppression and their suffering?

These questions we must each of us ask and each of us answer. It does not suffice to say: "It is enough for us that they are fighting back." Fighting for what? Fighting against whom? Heroism is magnificent. But heroism can often be wasted and fruitless and in many cases harmful.

There is only one basis upon which we can judge such a movement. Does it represent a movement to end colonial rule, without which there can be no peace and security for the Yishuv? Does it aim at establishing a greater unity between Arab and Jew, which is the only method by which a real resistance movement can be established against imperialism?

We can answer these questions, not by abstract theorizing or sentiment, but by a study of the concrete demands of this movement.

The movement is of course not a unified one. There is the Hagannah

(the so-called general defense movement which has a very large membership probably numbering 50,000 or 60,000). Then there are such openly terroristic groups as the Irgun Zvai Leumi (National Military Organization—estimated as having some 3,000 or 4,000 members) and the Stern Gang (estimated as having about 1,000 members).

The latter two, which are an offshoot of the extreme right wing of the Zionist movement, the Revisionists, have time after time been repudiated by the entire Yishuv as well as by the Zionist movement itself (although Zionist leaders during the past year and up until the bombing of the King David Hotel had lapsed into complete silence with regard to these terrorist organizations).

It is quite well known that the British authorities have made very little effort to apprehend them since their activity offered Britain the excuse for its savage and brutal activities.

Ben Gurion, head of the Histadruth, in an interview in Paris with the newspaper *France-Soir* went so far as to state that the Irgun was tied up with the British Police.

On December 2, 1944, Gerold Frank wrote of the Irgun and the Stern gang:

"These two organizations, a bizarre conglomeration of youngsters in their teens and veteran terrorists, combining the technique of Chicago gangsters with the posturings of a comic opera, have precipitated a crisis and dealt Zionism a damaging blow. They prey not only on the British but also on the Jewish community, using extortion, blackmail and kidnapping to swell their treasury." (*The Nation*)

In their publications they have constantly attacked the left wing groups in the Zionist movement. They have thrown bombs at the printing shop of the newspaper *Neu Velt*, organ of the Poale Zion (Labor Zionists). They have burned newspaper stands which sell Yiddish papers. They have attacked numerous workers clubs as well as anyone opposed to their methods.

They draw their inspiration from the Revisionist movement, which such a staunch Zionist as Dr. Stephen S. Wise has labeled as "a species of fascism," and which the Zionist movement itself has often attacked as being anti-labor, anti-Arab, and extremely chauvinistic.

And what of the Hagannah?

There is of course no doubt that large numbers of the Hagannah are sincerely and earnestly desirous of freedom and believe with all their hearts that what they are doing will aid the cause of the Yishuv. Unfortunately it is not they who are in the leadership of the movement. Unfortunately, sincerity alone is not always the decisive test.

Leadership and direction is given by the leaders of the Zionist movement and as yet none of these leaders has called for a fight to remove British imperialism. None of these leaders has called for a joint Arab-

Jewish united resistance movement. On the contrary, they have very clearly and publicly stated that:

"The aim of our struggle is not to drive the British out of here. The aim is to prove to Great Britain that it is worth her while to come to terms with us."

In the very midst of the severe attacks on the Jewish communities the organ of Mapai (Jewish Labor Party) stated:

"We are fully aware that the interest of Zionism and those of Great Britain in this corner of the world go hand in hand." (*Hapoel Hatzair*—June 19, 1946)

Neither the Jewish Agency nor any of the leading Zionists have called for the removal of British troops or even for a reduction of their numbers. And the reason for this is evidenced by the statement of such leaders of the Jewish Agency as Dr. Sneh, who stated that:

"Our struggle, even in its extreme manifestations, does not have an anti-British character." (*Haaretz*—January 25, 1946)

The Communist Party of Palestine has very aptly pointed out that "tanks and divisions are not the only signs of colonial rule. The corner stone of this rule is the 'divide and rule' policy. It is only by attacking this policy at its roots that the firm stand of imperialism can be shattered. This of course, necessitates Arab-Jewish unity. The struggle which goes on today is a distorted one, notwithstanding the 'extreme manifestations,' because it does not attack this policy of imperialism."

It is evident that a movement not raising the demand for the removal of imperialism, which is responsible for the terror and persecution of the Yishuv and which will always continue to use the Yishuv as well as the Arabs as political footballs, cannot achieve anything, even though its participants show the courage of a Samson and the fearlessness of a David.

It is only united Arab-Jewish movements of resistance, directed against imperialism and fighting for the removal of its oppressors; it is only a movement which recognizes the fact that there are two peoples in this country and that both are equally entitled to their national rights that can represent a real liberation movement.

PARTITION SCHEMES

The headlines of our newspapers are filled each day with details of the much heralded partition or federation schemes proposed by the Anglo-American Cabinet Committee.

Plans for partition are of course nothing new. Much was heard of this scheme back in 1937, when the Royal Commission proposed that Palestine be divided into three separate parts—a Jewish State, an Arab State and a British sector between the two.

The Commission indicated what the real meaning of partition would mean, when it stated in its summary:

"The problem cannot be solved by giving either the Arabs or the Jews all they want. The answer to the question which of them will govern Palestine must be 'Neither.'"

This "neither" is the crux of the matter. Imperialism is concerned with the continuation of its own power. Insofar as the peoples of any colonial country are concerned, whether it be India or Burma or Palestine, the answer will always be "neither." Freedom for no one. Self-rule for no one. Imperialism remains master.

Unlike the 1937 scheme, the present one represents the efforts of the Anglo-American partnership. For political reasons quite obvious to all, Truman may demur in public and may even propose that more territory be granted to the Jewish sector. There is quite a great deal of evidence available to show that the original scheme proposed was purposely a harsh one so that eventually agreement could be reached on a more modified plan which in no way however would affect the basic factor—the maintenance of real control by imperialism.

Whatever fine speeches might be uttered by President Truman and the State Department it is clear that American imperialism is cooperating in the Palestine question as in the Middle East generally, not for the purpose of aiding peoples to achieve freedom but in order to aid in the strengthening of imperialist domination.

One would have imagined that when such partition proposals were first put forward Zionist leaders would have hastened to repudiate them. Unfortunately such was not the case.

Nahum Goldman, speaking before the Zionist Convention in England, declared:

"I anticipate the moment when we shall be forced to accept serious and tragic resolutions and accept them quickly. We shall have to make concessions to a reasonable extent."

Every one knew he was referring to partition. When he was asked whether he meant partition, he replied: "Don't ascribe words to me which I do not wish to utter." It was this same Goldman who recently flew from Paris to Washington to have an emergency conference with Truman. Could it be that he came not to fight against the partition scheme but for better "concessions"?

Weizmann told an audience that "partition of Palestine should not be rejected as a possible solution even though one may disagree with it in principle." And when the *New York Times* reported that American Zionist leaders had stated that they would accept partition, Zionists hastened not to deny or to repudiate partition but to say that they had said nothing.

When the actual plan was formally proposed, the Jewish Agency meeting in Paris repudiated it. It was obvious however that their repudiation

stemmed not from opposition to partition in principle. There is no doubt that if the scheme is made a little more palatable by granting a little more territory and a few more concessions, the majority of the Zionist leadership will be for acceptance—unless the Jewish masses raise their voices against a program which will mean a life of endless slavery and antagonism for the Yishuv.

The propaganda that will be carried on by the pro-partition forces will of course have much that is alluring in it. They will throw out the bait that even though partition is to the liking of no one, at least it will bring a Jewish State. And that they will maintain is the most important thing. It will give us recognition. We will have the right to be heard and represented in the halls of nations.

With all of its sweetening and coating it will still be poison. What kind of security is in store for the Yishuv which will have to rely upon imperialism and its military for the establishment of such a state and for its maintenance? What kind of economic development can take place with imperialism remaining master?

Let us look at this "state" a little more closely. The present scheme, like the previous one, insures that all strategic areas such as Haifa and Mount Carmel and the corridor between Jaffa and Jerusalem remain in the hands of Britain. The stranglehold over the economic life of both "states" would continue. Railroads, foreign trade, post offices, air bases, shipping, utilities and the major markets would remain in the hands of imperialism.

Let us also remember that the major British bases would be within the Jewish state. And the entire Middle East struggling for independence will also remember this. This then will be the Jewish state that Jews will have. A British garrison where Jews will play attendant to an imperialist army. **There** is no doubt but that a few wealthy Jews will be quite happy with such a set up. They will make some money as contractors and agents for the army. But is this what masses of Jews have toiled and suffered and died for? Is this the utopia for which Jews fled from Europe?

What role could such a puppet state play in the affairs of nations? India appears in the halls of nations. Is it the voice of a free India that speaks? Is it the voice of the millions of suffering and downtrodden and starving masses that issues forth? Or is it the voice of some lackey or puppet who speaks as the master orders?

Such a Jewish "state" is a mockery of statehood and a betrayal of the Jewish people. And those who call themselves Jewish leaders who accept such a state will bear the responsibility for having plunged the Yishuv into more abject slavery and despair. They will bear the full blame for having aided imperialism in its game of "divide and rule."

Let us remember that the Yishuv lives in the midst of an Arab world, a world which has many reactionary and pro-fascist leaders at its head,

many of whom were friendly to and aided the Nazis. But there are also in this world Arab masses, struggling for liberation, a struggle that plunges them into ever greater opposition to their own reactionary leaders.

The Arabs will be there long after British imperialism will have been removed. These are the neighbors of the Yishuv. It will either be Arab-Jewish unity or it will be Arab-Jewish enmity.

Meier Vilner, in his testimony before the Anglo-American Commission on behalf of the Communist Party of Palestine, stated:

"The partition of this country would spell disaster to Jewish and Arab citizens alike. First of all, because this would strangle any possible economic development. Secondly, this would strengthen the imperialist regime, since partition means the dependence of both 'states' upon the monopolistic British rulers. Thirdly, such an arrangement would widen the gulf between Jews and Arabs.

"The partition plan is an imperialistic program destined to find a new form for the continuation of the old British rule and for the increase of tension between Jews and Arabs."

ZIONISM IS NOT A SOLUTION

Zionism is a political philosophy which asserts that the Jewish question everywhere will be solved only with the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

"We shall always remain strangers among the nations," wrote Moses Hess back in 1840. The Jew has no allies in his struggle. He can look to no one for aid in his fight for security and equality. The solution is auto-emancipation. The Jew must emancipate himself.—Such is the theory of Zionism.

Denying as it does, the social, political and economic factors that make for anti-Semitism, it is quite natural that Zionism should preach that anti-Semitism is eternal.

"I believe," stated Dr. Weizmann, head of the world Zionist movement, before the Anglo-American Commission, "the one fundamental cause . . . of anti-Semitism is that the Jew exists. We seem to carry the germ of anti-Semitism in our bags wherever we go. The growth and intensity of anti-Semitism is proportional to the number of Jews or to the density of the Jews."

With such an approach to the question of anti-Semitism, it is no accident that the Zionist movement never brought forward a program of struggle for equal rights for Jews, never rallied the Jewish masses for struggle against reaction and fascism. Its answer was always and is today—Jews must go to Palestine, thus diverting the Jewish masses from the general struggle against reaction, of which the fight against anti-Semitism is an integral part.

While Zionism sought to divert the Jewish masses from an alliance with the democratic, progressive and revolutionary forces by preaching the doctrine of auto-emancipation, it did not hesitate however to disregard its own teachings when it came to seeking allies of a different sort.

Theodore Herzl, father of political Zionism, wandered from country to country seeking to win to his cause such notorious reactionaries as the Sultan of Turkey, Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, and Von Plehve, Tsarist Minister and pogrom maker.

And to this day, Zionist leaders still rely upon one or another imperialist power to achieve its Jewish state.

It is quite logical that those who preach that anti-Semitism is eternal, that Jews have no allies, should call for "exodus from Europe."

The dangers to the Jewish people inherent in this theory is obvious. If it is "exodus from Europe" today, what is to prevent it from becoming "exodus from America" tomorrow? Once the supposition is accepted that what the Hitlers have ordained we must carry out, the basis of Jewish existence in all countries has been undermined.

If the struggle for equal rights and for survival is in no way related to the struggle for democracy, there is no hope for Jews anywhere. And this holds for Palestine as well. For if anti-Semitism is eternal what are the special guarantees that will prevent Jews from being subjected to it in Palestine? If anti-Semitism is eternal, can Jews look forward to a life of security and peace, surrounded as they are by millions of Arabs?

And what of the argument that with a Jewish state and a Jewish majority the conditions of the Jewish people would alter radically?

Let us for the sake of argument imagine that a Jewish state had been in existence in 1942 when Rommel's armies were approaching Egypt and threatening Palestine. Would this Jewish state have been able to save the Jews of Europe? Would they have at least been able to save themselves? Would the fate of this majority have been any different from the fate of all the other majorities in Europe?

Who saved the remnant of Jewry from death, from the crematories and concentration camps? The Jews alone could not have saved themselves. It needed the heroic efforts of the Red Army, it required the unity of the Big Three to achieve the liberation of all mankind and with it the remnants of the Jewish people.

What has this to do with majority or minority? A minority can be safe in a democratic society. A majority can be hounded and persecuted under a colonial or fascist regime.

The Yishuv in Palestine is one of the important Jewish communities. It is not, as the Zionists maintain, the center of Jewish life. The five million Jews of America will not go to Palestine. Certainly Soviet Jewry, the only Jewish community in the world which lives in full freedom and equality, for whom the "Jewish question" has ceased to exist insofar as it

relates to anti-Semitism and discrimination, has no intention of leaving. And in such countries as Hungary, Roumania, Poland and Bulgaria, where democracy is being developed and where anti-Semitism has been outlawed, Jewish people in very large numbers, despite Zionist attempts to create panic and hysteria, are intent upon and are in fact rebuilding their lives on a very solid foundation.

Jewish people have deep roots in these countries, socially, culturally and economically. Certainly it would be stupid to underestimate the tremendous difficulties which they face. Nor would it be correct to deny that there are many who wish to leave and who should be aided in doing so.

It is a crime of the greatest magnitude, however, to fail to realize that in Eastern Europe real peoples' democracies are being built and that within the framework of this new development lies security and peace for the Jewish people.

The concern of Communists, and of progressives generally, for the Yishuv in Palestine arises, not from a belief in Zionism or its ideology. On the contrary Communists consider Zionism a reactionary philosophy because it rejects the need for the Jewish people to struggle together with all other progressive forces for a democratic way of life and for socialism. Zionism attempts to divert the Jewish workers and middle class from the struggle against reaction into nationalist channels.

Our concern for the Yishuv arises not from any narrow, short-sighted nationalistic aims but from a deep concern for a Jewish community, the third largest in the world. Such a community is our concern as are all other Jewish communities. One must bear in mind that its struggle is a different one from that of many other Jewish communities because of the fact that a democratic solution must of necessity recognize the national character of this community and therefore the national rights to which it is entitled.

The aspirations of the Yishuv cannot be achieved by ignoring the just and legitimate aspirations of the Arabs. Joint struggle of both peoples is the prerequisite for the achievement of national rights for both peoples.

Thus, the struggle of the Yishuv in Palestine like that of all other Jewish communities is a struggle against reaction and for democracy and equality, which means that allies must be sought within the general camp of progress and particularly among the working classes of the world that are leading the fight against reaction.

No Jewish community, no matter how secure or developed it may be, can solve the problem of any other Jewish community. It can of course be of tremendous assistance morally, culturally, financially and otherwise, but it cannot do away with the basic need for each Jewish community to struggle for its rights, a struggle which must of necessity be an integral part of the struggles of labor and of the progressive movement.

Such a struggle must inevitably, if it be a realistic one, take to heart the lesson of the Soviet Union and the solution which it has brought to the national question. Let those who speak of the eternal character of anti-Semitism remember that in few places in the world had the masses of people been so infected with the virus of anti-Semitism as in the Russia of the Tsars. Let them also remember how thoroughly, under the leadership of the Bolsheviki, the people have been cured of this evil.

The Soviet Union has pointed the way towards the solution of anti-Semitism, inequality and oppression. Article 123 of the Soviet Constitution states: "Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an infeasible law."

In addition to the complete equality which Jews enjoy in the Soviet Union, they have also been given the opportunity to develop their own national life in Biro Bidjan.

"As a result of the establishment of a Jewish autonomous territory the Jewish people will become consolidated and acquire all the attributes of a nation. The creation of the autonomous territory will give a new impetus to the blooming of Jewish culture." (Kalinin)

The Soviet Union has thus shown that peoples can live together provided that the forces who cause oppression are no longer in power.

THE SOLUTION

The Yishuv now stands in dire peril.

How shall we aid it in bringing about an end to the reign of terror? How shall we aid it in achieving the national rights to which it is entitled? First and foremost it is important to remember that above all else Palestine is a colonial country and that no people have the possibility of developing their life and security under a system of colonial oppression.

It is furthermore important for us to remember that within Palestine there are two peoples, Jews and Arabs, and there can be no freedom for one people without freedom for the other. We must also recognize that the fight for the freedom of Palestine is a part of the struggle of the peoples of the Middle East as of all colonial peoples.

Therefore, if we truly seek freedom for the Yishuv we must recognize that our allies can be found not within the ranks of either British or American imperialism, but within the ranks of the Arab peoples of Palestine and of the Middle East generally, and of the labor and democratic forces throughout the world. Palestine must be independent, if its peoples are to be free.

First and foremost it is therefore imperative that the main source of danger to the peace of Palestine be removed. This main danger is the

mandatory power, Great Britain, which is supported and strengthened in its rule by its senior partner, American imperialism.

The establishment of a free and democratic Palestine, demands the immediate abrogation of the mandate and the transferring of the Palestine problem to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such action would curb and hamper the intrigues of British and American imperialism. It would place the question on an international basis and would give the Soviet Union, the only country which has openly and forthrightly condemned the terror in Palestine, an opportunity to lend its moral and political weight for a just and democratic solution.

This demands that all of the Jewish people, Zionist and non-Zionist alike, forsake narrow and shortsighted aims and rally for a program which will bring a solution to the present crisis.

It is this way out which American and British imperialism seek by all means to avoid. They realize quite well that if the question were to be put on the agenda of the Security Council, their real intentions would be immediately exposed. For this very reason, however, it is in our interests and in the interests of democracy and peace that the decision as to the future of Palestine shall not remain in their hands, but that an international trusteeship be established within which the Soviet Union shall have full participation and which will aid Palestine to advance towards self-government, towards independence, towards freedom.

We shall be able to advance this program to the extent that we deprive the imperialists of their dangerous weapons of "divide and rule." This end requires a consistent and persistent campaign for the unity of the Arab and Jewish peoples. This means recognition of the fact that neither British nor American imperialism are pro-Jewish or pro-Arab and that both Arabs and Jews alike will suffer if imperialism remains master.

A free and secure national life for the Yishuv does not depend upon whether it is a majority or a minority, but rather upon whether democracy exists. And democracy can exist only where colonial rule has been destroyed and peoples enjoy freedom and equality.

Senator Pepper correctly pointed out that there is a contradiction between peace and security for peoples and the presence of colonial rule. He therefore demanded that the question of Palestine be immediately placed on the agenda of the Security Council. He further demanded that the gates of America be opened to at least 100,000 of the Jewish refugees.

The demand of Senator Pepper with regard to the issue of UN is the just demand of all the democratic forces in the world. It must become the demand of every person to whom the fate of the Yishuv is dear, to every person who is concerned with the cause of peace and democracy.

The Morning Freiheit Association, deeply concerned with the problems of the Yishuv, as well as with the problems of the refugee Jews in Europe, sent a telegram on June 14, 1946, to the American Jewish Conference urging that the following measures be undertaken:

1. The American Jewish Conference shall appeal at once to President Truman and to the Secretary General of the United Nations, asking them to recommend to the Security Council of the United Nations: „

(a) That the United Nations assume immediately full responsibility for the fate and maintainance of the Jewish refugees in German camps, and to intervene with the countries of the United Nations that they open their doors for the immigration and settlement of the Jewish refugees and to provide the necessary means for same;

(b) That Britain shall transfer Palestine at once to the trusteeship of the Big-Three within the United Nations for the purpose of setting up Palestine as an independent and democratic state of Arabs and Jews that will guarantee the equal national rights of both peoples, and

(c) that the United Nations shall recommend to Great Britain the immediate withdrawal of all British armed forces from Palestine.

2. That the American Jewish Conference shall organize and send a delegation to President Truman for the purpose of achieving the widest opportunities for the entrance and settlement of Jewish refugees in the United States.

3. That the American Jewish Conference shall issue an appeal to the Jewish Agency in Palestine asking that the Agency immediately open negotiations with the spokesmen of labor and other democratic forces of the Arab people in Palestine with a view to reaching an agreement for joint Arab-Jewish struggle for the independence of Palestine and for the purpose of reaching an agreement in favor of Jewish immigration into Palestine under joint Arab-Jewish control.

4. That the American Jewish Conference shall undertake to rally the widest united actions of the American Jews in collaboration with all progressive forces of the whole American people, especially with Labor and with the Negro people, in support of the foregoing proposals.”

The realization of such a program would make it possible for the Yishuv to free itself from the grip of terror and of pogroms, from the clutch of Anglo-American imperialism.

Such a program, which realistically faces the problems of the Jewish refugees in the DP Camps, would put an end to the inhuman treatment which they have been subjected to and would aid in arriving at a real solution of their problems.

Let not the tragic years of Jewish suffering and destruction have been in vain. Let not the lessons of those years have gone by unlearned. Let us remember that the evil which is fascism is the enemy of all mankind and that the Jew joined with the democratic forces of the world can secure democracy and peace for all peoples, the Jewish people included.