

Wallace Opposes Lifting of Embargo on Arms to Israel

By JACK BRAD

NEW YORK — Last Sunday, the newspaper PM reported that Henry Wallace was opposed to lifting the arms embargo on Palestine. The reporter, John K. Weiss, described a collective interview as follows: "He (Wallace) had a little difficulty with one ardent pro-Zionist reporter, who doesn't quite follow the Wallace objection to lifting the Palestine arms embargo. Wallace explained twice he opposes all shipments of arms from any country to any other country, adding that if the British continue to aid Abdullah, the USA should immediately cut off ERP aid to Britain."

This rather startling announcement, buried in an interview, required confirmation. A check was made with John K. Weiss, the PM reporter, who fully confirmed the printed statement. Weiss also stated that Wallace had made this position clear several times previously. A check revealed that this was true.

In his letter to Stalin, Wallace had as his second point "stopping the export of weapons by any nation to any other nation." As a result of this ambiguous formulation, Wallace has been asked numerous times if this applied to Palestine. In each case, he has affirmed that it does, according to Weiss.

In Spokane, on May 24, Wallace presented his three-point program on Palestine for new pressure on the United Nations to stop stalling, an ultimatum to the oil interests to cancel their contracts, and a threat to Britain to withhold ERP. But not one word on lifting the arms embargo.

WALLACE AND THE CP

On this matter, he is in disagreement with the Communist Party, which after years of opposing a Jewish State, and supporting Arab pogroms, now supports lifting the embargo for its own reasons. (The Stalinists for their part are attempting to fish in muddy waters. Any policy which can permit Russian intervention in the Middle East will gain their support. Ostensibly they now support the Jewish State but there is more than an inkling of

double-cross in the N. Y. Times dispatch on June 6, which reports: "in fact some limited supplies of munitions, it is believed, already have been shipped from Czechoslovakia to both sides." This is reminiscent of the Italo-Ethiopian War when Russia sold oil to Mussolini while Stalinists were howling for support of Ethiopia.) Of course, this is not the type of difference which leads to serious conflict, since both Wallace and the CP have shown an ability for infinite adaptation when opportunity requires it.

Just what is the relationship between Wallace's opinion and that of his own party? Here, we encounter

complexity. The New Party has had no convention, has not adopted even a tentative platform. The program of the party actually consists of Wallace's printed statements. Wallace as a political spokesman thus speaks for himself, in consultation with the Stalinists, who dominate his advisory group. It is notorious, however, that he often says contradictory things, and frequently repudiates or denies his own statements. This happened, for example, when Wallace called for the denial of the right to bear children to farmers living on sub-marginal lands.

Those who have reported Wallace's
(Continued on page 4)

Palestine Truce in Offing As British Shift Strategy

By ED FINDLEY

Efforts for truce in Palestine seem to be on the verge of success as these lines are written. There seems to be real hope that, for four weeks at least, the Jewish and Arab population will be given a breathing spell, that a temporary halt will be called to the fratricidal bloodshed ravaging the land.

The truce initiative belongs to the Anglo-American bloc in the UN Security Council, whose strategic and military interests in the Middle East call for an early pacification of the country.

Unsettled conditions in Palestine carry the real threat that Russia will be able to gain a foothold in this doorway to the Middle East. Two events of the last week highlight this danger: first, the demagogic but nonetheless ominous request of the Irgun Zvai Leumi for Russian military aid; second, the demand raised by Gromyko, Russian delegate to the UN, that Russian military personnel be included in the UN truce-enforcement mission.

The British Foreign Office had hoped for stabilization through quick, decisive military victories by the invading Arab forces which would lay the basis for the kind of Arab-Jewish "compromise" that would safeguard for the empire its strategic bases in the Negev region of Palestine.

PURPOSE OF TRUCE

The failure of the Arab League states to score strategically, and the unexpected assumption of military initiative on most fronts by the Israeli armies, led to a tactical shift in British policy which brought it closer to the United States.

British imperialism, giver of military aid to the Arab camp, suddenly appeared as the pious advocate of an "impartial" truce.

What is the political purpose of the truce?

Avowedly, the UN mediator is to conduct negotiations with the Israeli provisional government and with the representatives of the Arab states for a permanent settlement and peace. On what basis? The answer to this question is hidden behind the veils of secret diplomacy.

The TOTAL elimination of Israel as a state does not at this point seem to be the immediate objective of any of the interested powers. Even the Arab dynasts which undoubtedly would wish to crush the Israeli state must, for the present, content themselves with more limited objectives. Military and diplomatic realities of Palestine are not such any longer as to enable the Anglo-Arab coalition to reach their original goal.

The Arab leaders hope now for a successful diplomatic operation by the British surgeon to AMPUTATE PARTS OF ISRAELI TERRITORY AND RESTRICT ISRAELI SOVEREIGNTY IN THE CRUCIAL MATTER OF IMMIGRATION. A truncated Israeli state with drastically reduced economic and military viability would serve the twofold purpose of: (1) saving the face of the Arab League leadership; and (2) making possible the destruction of the Israeli state, at a later and more propitious moment.

The differences that exist between the Arab plan and the British or American policies are differences in degree only. All call for concessions by the Israeli state which would reduce its ability to exist.

(Continued on page 2)

Wallace Opposes Lifting Arms Embargo on Israel; His Party Hedges on Stand

(Continued from page 1)

speeches have noted a sharp disparity between his prepared written speeches (done by his ghost writers who are Stalinist fellow travelers) and what he says when he simply speaks his mind informally. James Wechsler, one of the few reporters accompanying him on his trip, has noted this frequently.

"NOT ACQUAINTED"

In order to ascertain the Wallace Party's opinion, this reporter called their National Headquarters. This reporter was referred to four different departments, including the research department and publicity department. The answer in each case was that they were not acquainted with Wallace's statement, and that they had to look it up. In each case, four times, a promise was made to call back. Not one did so. Several of those questioned stated that what Wallace said was the position as a matter of course. But when the *PM* quotation was read to them, they stated that it did not sound right, and that it would require research. When the conversation was opened with the question: "What is your position on lifting the embargo," the answer was "We are for lifting the embargo on arms to Palestine."

Not so long ago, Henry Wallace was the chief stumper in a by-election for Leo Isacson in the Bronx. Many analysts claim that Isacson's victory was primarily due to his vigorous position on partition and defense of the Jewish State. In checking with the American Labor Party, Stalinist front party in New York which ran Isacson, they asserted that the ALP was "Vigorously fighting to lift the embargo." They also assured this reporter that Isacson too is engaged in this same vigorous fight. When questioned on what attitude the ALP took toward Wallace's opposition to lifting the embargo, the publicity director of the ALP said: "I am not familiar with Mr. Wallace's statement." The ALP and Isacson have certainly not had a word to say about this, good or bad, even though Wallace is for them, their leading national spokesman, and his opposition to lifting the embargo is of some influence in maintaining the embargo.

What does Wallace's position amount to? By opposing the sending of arms to both sides, he does not exactly render himself impartial. In fact, this was precisely the British formula in the UN, which was rightly denounced as actually an anti-Jewish stand, since the Arabs were already well armed by the British, and could normally obtain all they wished for replacement through

their governments in Egypt, Lebanon, etc., whereas the Jews were deliberately disarmed up till May 15. Indeed, carrying and stockpiling of arms was illegal until the day of the British departure, and the opening of the Palestine war. It is inconceivable that Wallace does not know these facts, since they have been carried in all the press. Wallace's position means in effect support to the Arab War.

CONCERNING INTERFERENCE

Wallace's positive position for withholding ERP to Britain is, if anything, an even more amazing proposal. In regard to the Italian elections, Wallace accused the State Department of influencing Italian politics and policy by purchase, by food, by money. Also, Wallace opposes the Marshall Plan and ERP because he correctly claims that this is imperialism, and that it constitutes interference by Wall Street in the economies and politics of Europe. To threaten to withhold funds unless the British alter their Palestine policy, is direct intimidatory interference. It is crude and open use of American dollars to purchase the foreign policy of Britain. It would constitute a "string" from Washington to London, with Washington the manipulator.

Withholding of ERP is obviously quite as powerful an imperialist weapon as is its granting. Wallace himself has denounced this policy for Russia and Eastern Europe as discriminatory, tending to sharpen the international cleavage, and as actually hindering economic revival in these areas to the detriment of all of Europe. If the policy of withholding under pressure to conform to American desires can be applied to Britain in the Palestine case, it can, of course, be employed in other cases. This policy could be used to bring into line with American desires any policy of any government. For example, the West Germans could be forced to accept a permanent partition of their country under threat of starvation by withholding of American aid as the alternative.

Mr. Wallace reveals himself as no respecter of National sovereignty, and as in fundamental agreement with the imperialist methods of the U. S. He wishes only to change the direction of this imperialism, but not the imperialism itself.

The imperialist policy of Britain must be fought against. But, there is nothing "political" or feasible in supporting American imperialism as against British, or using it as a weapon against the British. The embargo can be lifted by mass pressure in the U. S., and British policy will and can be revised when the workers fight the Labor imperialists. What makes this eminently possible is that there are reports of a rising tide of popular opposition to the government policy. Such a popular attitude could be used to teach the English workers that the Palestine policy is part of the entire imperialist program of Bevin-Attlee. On the other hand, nothing could more effectively solidarize these workers with their leaders than the threat of American pressure.

(For the duration of the national election campaign, Jack Brad, whose articles on many subjects are well known to readers of LABOR ACTION, will contribute regularly on the Wallace-Stalinist party. Comrade Brad, formerly Workers Party organizer and candidate in Philadelphia, is now organizer of Local New York of the Workers Party.—Ed.)

GATES TO LECTURE ON STALINISM IN LOS ANGELES

LOS ANGELES — Albert Gates, organizer of the Workers Party, will give three lectures on "The Meaning of Stalinism," beginning June 11. The lectures will take place on Friday nights at the Park Manor, 607 S. Western, Los Angeles, and are as follows:

June 11—The Origins of Stalinism.

June 18—Evolution of Stalinism as a New Society.

June 25—Stalinism: the New World Slavery.