

PALESTINE: *What Now?*

The fight against US and British imperialism has only begun. Outlook for the Jewish and Arab states.

By A. B. MAGIL

DOES the United Nations action mean a free Palestine? Yes and no. When the vote of the General Assembly is implemented, it will provide the political framework and the opportunity for genuine independence. In this sense the UN decision marks a new stage in the battle of the peoples of Palestine and of the whole Middle East for freedom and democracy. However, this decision is more beginning than end. It opens the door to independence a few inches, but the forces seeking to slam it shut again remain formidable and can be overcome only by the most determined struggle on the basis of a realistic appraisal of the problems involved.

What is the nature of this initial victory and how was it won? These are not academic questions: the answers to them are essential for understanding what is required to carry through the UN decision and reach beyond it to fuller freedom and progress. The most fundamental fact about Palestine is that it is a colony whose problems are interwoven with all the conflicts that rend the imperialist world, particularly those of that vast oil empire and key strategic area known as the Middle East. The second fact to bear in mind is that after thirty years of imperialist rule whose fruit was increased oppression, bloodshed and what even the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry termed "a semi-military police state," the first positive step toward solving the Palestine problem and fulfilling the aspirations of its peoples was taken only as a result of the mobilization of anti-imperialist forces inside and outside of Palestine through the medium of the United Nations. The third fact is that in this anti-imperialist alignment the decisive

role was played by the Soviet Union and the new people's democracies of eastern Europe.

All previous efforts to shape a solution of the complicated Palestine problem had failed because all of them were based on continued subjection of the country to alien rule. This was true not only of the various commissions and plans of the British government, but also of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in 1946. This latter effort, since it for the first time officially involved the United States in such a body, only served to underline the bankruptcy of all imperialist solutions of the Palestine problem.

It required the introduction of a new factor, an anti-imperialist factor of major proportions, to alter the relation of forces in the Palestine struggle and compel an imperialist retreat. When Gromyko made his historic speech of May 14 at the special session of the UN assembly, it became clear at once that tremendous power had been thrown on the side of Palestine freedom. The Soviet initiative, actively supported by its allies in eastern Europe and joined to the efforts of the Jewish liberation movement, including the vacillating Zionist leadership, proved decisive. Today the warmth of feeling toward socialist Russia among the Jewish people in the United States, in Palestine and in other countries contrasts sharply with the virulent anti-Soviet propaganda that pollutes all the channels of public opinion.

IT SHOULD be no less clear that those who retreated in the Palestine struggle were not only the British imperialists, but the American as well. It has often been said that the US lacks a policy toward Palestine. However, it

is not lack of policy but the difficulties of carrying it through and the conflicting pressures to which it has been subjected that account for the ambiguities, hesitations and hypocrisies in Washington's approach. The principal direction of American policy toward Palestine is governed by its imperialist stakes in the Middle East and by the role of the US as leader of world reaction in the drive against democracy and socialism. The main thrust of this policy is so strong that even under President Roosevelt it was not significantly curbed. In his book *Behind the Silken Curtain*, Bartley Crum, a member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, reports that on examining the State Department file on Palestine he was shocked to discover that "since Sept. 15, 1938, each time a promise was made to American Jewry regarding Palestine, the State Department promptly sent messages to the Arab rulers discounting it and reassuring them, in effect, that regardless of what was promised publicly to the Jews, nothing would be done to change the situation in Palestine."

Though these words were written months before the opening of the UN debate, Mr. Crum's words accurately describe the essence of American tactics in that debate: the shifts and doubletalk, the oblique efforts to reduce British power in Palestine yet save it from total expulsion, the public support of independence and the behind-the-scenes sabotage — all of which reached a climax in the eleventh-hour effort of the State Department to use the US satellites, Haiti, the Philippines, Liberia, Greece, and Kuomintang China as trigger-men in killing the UN plan. If this devious game failed, if the conflict of interest between Britain and the US redounded to the benefit of the anti-imperialist forces, if President Truman's concern about the Jewish vote in 1948 ultimately overrode the State Department's concern about imperialist plums, it was only thanks to the strong stand of the USSR and the massive support which the majority plan of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine enlisted both in the UN and in our own country.

Does the UN decision constitute a vindication of Zionist policies, as American Zionist leaders claim? On the contrary. The world Zionist movement has in recent years been divided between the adherents of Dr. Chaim

Weizmann, who continued to place their trust in British imperialism, and the American Zionist leadership, who oriented toward American imperialism. How suicidal were the policies of both groups was demonstrated when last year's Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, despite the presence on it of a number of liberals and even "left" Laborites, turned its back on independence and insisted that "Palestine shall be neither a Jewish state nor an Arab state," but must continue to be a British colony. It was only to the extent that the Zionist leaders, in the course of the UN debate, modified their previous hostility toward the Soviet Union and supported the efforts of the USSR and its allies that they were able to exert the kind of pressure on the Truman administration which contributed to the favorable vote. For the rank and file of the Zionist move-

ment and for the Jewish people generally all this holds profound lessons for the future.

WHAT of that future? In the first place, between the UN decision and its practical fulfillment lies a very stony road. Both Britain and the United States can be counted on to feed the flames of Arab-Jewish conflict and create pretexts for preserving imperialist rule in Palestine. It will require unceasing vigilance and determined efforts by the progressive forces among both Arabs and Jews to bank the fires of Arab-Jewish antagonism and give bone and muscle to the UN resolution.

Second, it should not be blinked that the independence of Palestine is being established in an unfavorable form which derives from imperialist rule. By creating the conditions which

divided these peoples and made inevitable the partitioning of Palestine British imperialism, even in the process of loosening its grip, has succeeded in erecting serious obstacles to complete independence. However, it should be recognized that the UN plan has three important advantages over all previous partition plans as well as over the status quo: it provides for the elimination of the British governing authority and British occupation troops; it establishes statehood and political independence for both Jews and Arabs; it provides economic union of the Jewish and Arab states, which can become the foundation for eventual political union.

Though partition and Jewish-Arab antagonism (which, incidentally, exists more at the top than among the peoples) are at the moment uppermost, the central problem facing Palestine is

My Fall from Grace

IT'S hard for a man to face objectively the fact that his own character has been undermined. I knew that Hollywood was generally conceded to be a sinful place but until quite recently I deluded myself that I had survived twelve years there with only minor damage to my moral standards. During the last few months, however, the evidence of my depravity has accumulated so rapidly that even I am convinced.

It started when the Production Code Administration, familiarly known as the Breen Office, rejected a script of mine on the grounds that it attacked the institution of marriage by showing that the parties to a divorce might eventually readjust to new relationships. Then the picture *Forever Amber*, a measure of responsibility for which it is too late to disclaim, was judged a serious threat to the precarious state of virtue in which the Roman Catholic Church always finds its communicants. This startled me because Philip Dunne and I had taken the precaution of using a typewriter-ribbon inked with Purex for the screenplay, and most of the cash customers we heard from were under the impression they had been betrayed in a quite different sense.

I realize now there must have been plenty of talk by this time about my moral disintegration. I can even remember a tendency for parents to

send their children out to play when I came calling, but I always assumed it was because they were sick and tired of the little rascals' constant chatter like anyone else. When the final clinching blow struck in the form of a cancellation of my contract with 20th Century-Fox, invoking a clause designed to protect the studio from the stigma of moral turpitude on the part of its employes, I was jolted into awareness of the depths to which I had sunk. Had I actually permitted myself "to be held in public ridicule, scorn or contempt" as the official letter of dismissal alleged? The answer was so clear that only my blind subjectivity could have obscured it. From condoning divorce I had descended to portraying a seventeenth-century Corliss Archer, and finally to a point where I publicly questioned the intentions of the Thomas Committee. A less demoralized character than I would not have waited till Eric Johnston so branded it to realize that citing the Bill of Rights against its opponents is "a disservice to democracy."

RING LARDNER, JR.

(Mr. Lardner, who has written this statement for NEW MASSES, is one of Hollywood's famed nineteen hostile witnesses, and one of the ten who were "purged" from the movie industry at the command of the Un-Americans.)

the fact that political independence will still leave the country economically unfree and geographically situated within the vortex of major imperialist power drives. Virtually all of its neighbors provide eloquent confirmation of Lenin's statement in *Imperialism*: "Finance capital is such a great, it may be said, such a decisive force in all economic and international relations, that it is capable of subordinating to itself, and actually does subordinate to itself even states enjoying complete political independence." A glaring example in our own back yard is the Philippines.

Today Palestine's electric power, its large banks, insurance companies and other leading enterprises are controlled by British capital. The American-owned Trans-Arabian Pipeline Co., in which Rockefeller interests are dominant, has been granted a concession to build an oil pipeline from Saudi-Arabia to the Palestine coast, and to construct its own harbors, railroads and airfields and maintain its own police force—all this tax-free. Native industry, preponderantly Jewish-owned, labors under many disabilities.

More serious is the fact that, though Palestine itself contains no oil, it is surrounded by the richest oil empire in the world, the hunting grounds of

American and British trusts and their governmental patrons. Moreover, situated at the crossroads of Europe, Asia and Africa, this tiny country with an area approximately that of Maryland serves as a bridgehead for the aggressive designs of the powers which dominate that empire. A fog of propaganda about "Russian expansionism" cannot conceal those who have really expanded into the Middle East, who are looting its treasures and quarreling over the booty, and who are seeking to dam up its ancient peoples in the feudal bondage essential for continued plunder. "The United States is rapidly replacing Britain as the biggest oil operator in the oil-rich countries of the Middle East," stated the February 11 issue of David Lawrence's magazine *World Report*. And according to the same publication, "Oil has brought the US a new frontier between the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean Sea. Like all frontiers it is a potential source of international quarrels."

And along with American oil concessions in Saudi Arabia go American loans to its feudal rulers — and an American air base. With Greece conceived as the western rampart of this oil empire, it is clear that the Truman Doctrine, apart from its larger world

significance, has a special meaning in relation to the Middle East. The Middle East, in turn, because of its proximity to the chief anti-imperialist force, the Soviet Union, has a special place in the military-strategic plans of the Wall Street and Downing Street empire-builders.

WHAT role, then, will the independent Jewish and Arab states of Palestine, once established, play in this witches' cauldron of imperialist plunder and power politics? The answer to this question depends, in my opinion, primarily on the internal development of the Jewish state. In an area in which imperialism is buttressed by feudalism, the Jewish state will be economically and politically the most advanced in the Middle East. Moreover, the Jewish nation in Palestine has a relatively large and vigorous working class which has attained considerable political maturity. One out of every four Palestine Jews is a member of Histadruth, the Jewish Federation of Labor. The political weight of the workers and the strength of socialist sentiment is attested by the fact that Palestine's largest party is the Labor Party (Mapai) and that three other parties to the left of it—Achduth Avodah, Hashomer Hatzair and the

Moscow Said to Order Liquidation Of Budapest Opposition by Dec. 1

By JOHN MacCORMAC

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

VIENNA, Nov. 6—The Hungarian Communist party, it has been learned from an absolutely reliable source, has received instructions from Moscow to liquidate all effective opposition to its plans by the end of November. This order is believed to be the immediate sequel to the formation of the Communist Information Bureau in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

Developments today in Rumania and Czechoslovakia suggest that similar orders may have been received in all the Danubian capitals.

In Bucharest, George Tatarescu, Vice Premier and Foreign Minister, and his National Lib-

change the "arithmetical illusion" of the 65 per cent electoral majority for the Slovak Democratic party into the reality of Communist domination.

In Yugoslavia, all organized political opposition was suppressed long ago and the heat now is on foreign newspaper men. In Hungary, the flight of Zoltan Pfeiffer is being followed rapidly by the dissolution of his Independence party. A number of his Deputies are seeking refuge either in the party headed by the Rev. Istvan Balogh or the Democratic Peoples' party, whose leader is Istvan Barankovic. The Balogh party long

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

sona-
fri-
lati-
Gerr-
and
Mr. B-
for-
M-
Gerr-
de-
by-
the-
The-
ove-
lot
eye-
ing-
Mr.
cun-
"He-
no-

Left: On November 7 the New York Times scored a clean beat with the exclusive front-page dispatch reproduced above. On December 1—the fateful date—the pillar of American journalism followed through with the above story (right) from the same "absolutely reliable source."

Communist Party—also have a substantial following. In addition, large numbers of Palestine's farmers are socialist in sentiment and have organized cooperative and communal farms partly in an effort, however illusory, to escape from the imperatives of capitalist market relations.

However, everything depends on whether the Jewish workers and their allies will be able to unite against both American and British imperialism and thrust aside those leaders who under cover of socialist phrases truckle to one or the other power.

Two paths of development are open to the Jewish nation and its state. One is the path of accommodation to imperialism and the creation of a bourgeois republic after the Western pattern within the narrow economic and political limitations that imperialism will impose. In practice this will mean that Palestine will become a satellite of the United States and a pawn in its war plans. The other is the path of democratic development toward socialism through transition forms springing from Palestine's own conditions and similar to those of the people's democracies in eastern Europe. This is possible in Palestine because monopoly capital exists there only in the form of foreign capital, chiefly British. In the absence of a Jewish monopolist bourgeoisie—though many Jewish businessmen have close ties with American and British capital—and in view of the relative strength of the labor and progressive elements, the establishment of a Jewish state affords the opportunity to utilize state power as a major political lever for combining the struggle to free the country from all foreign exploiters with the democratic battle for a people's democracy facing toward socialism. And by nationalizing all foreign-owned enterprises as part of an anti-imperialist program the government of the Jewish state can acquire a major economic lever for moving toward this goal.

IT CAN be taken for granted that not only the outright bourgeois parties in Palestine—the General Zionists, Mizrahi (orthodox religious group), the extreme right-wing Revisionists, etc.—but also the present Social-Democratic leadership of the Labor Party, who are political bedfellows of Bevin and Attlee, will seek to drag Palestine along the first path. However, the

MONOPOLY LOVE SONG

Under the Rockefeller sky,
By the Morgan and Company moon,
I swear my cartelove for you
(A B.M.I. copyright tune).

DuPont to DuPont, Ford to Ford,
Armour, toujours l'Armour;
As corporation to capital,
So my love for you is sure.

Like Taft and Hartley, Un and American,
Let us be faithful and true;
Merging our interests and per cents
In one company union for two.

EVE MERRIAM.

strength and political level of the working class and its allies create favorable opportunities for frustrating these efforts and taking the path of full independence, democracy and socialism. One effect of the achievement of statehood by the Jewish and Arab nations is likely to be the acceleration of the class struggle within the country. So long as Palestine was a colony, the class conflict was subordinated to the national struggle and nationalist illusions and prejudices prevailed among all workers except those influenced by the Communists. Even under these conditions large militant strikes have taken place, in some of which Jewish and Arab workers have fought side by side.

As for the Arab state in Palestine, it can become an important factor among the Arab nations in the battle for the economic, social and political liberation of the whole Middle East. The Arab nation in Palestine will face the problem of combining the struggle against foreign imperialism with the fight against the native feudal effendi and religious leaders—the fight for an agrarian revolution and bourgeois democratic reforms. This task will be greatly facilitated by the forging of cooperative relations with the Jewish state. At the moment the future of the Arab state is clouded by the bitter reaction to the UN decision. Much will depend on the attitude of the progressive Arab labor leaders and intellectuals, who hitherto have failed to recognize that despite the reactionary, pro-imperialist character of Zionist colonization after World War I,

the irreversible present-day reality is that the Jews in Palestine have developed to the point where they constitute a distinct nation and not simply a national minority. If the Arab workers and other progressives quickly abandon their hostility to partition and press toward cooperation with the Jewish state and common struggle against common enemies, the Arab nation too can move in a relatively short time toward people's democracy and socialism.

For the Jewish and Arab peoples are not without allies. Throughout the Middle East the forces of national and social emancipation are awakening. In Asia and Africa the anti-imperialist tide is rising. In the United States and other countries the democratic elements who resist the advance toward fascism and war will be rendering aid to democratic Palestine. Above all, there are those who provided the dynamic leadership which made possible the UN decision. For in one important respect Lenin's previously quoted statement, written thirty-one years ago, needs amendment today. Finance capital is no longer everywhere "a decisive force in all economic and international relations." Today the force of socialism is increasingly decisive. The Jewish and Arab states can by trading with the Soviet Union and the new people's democracies help solve their economic problems and reduce their dependence on the United States and Britain. Close political friendship will also be of powerful assistance. The victory at the UN is an augury of what, despite enormous difficulties, is possible in the future.