

opposition. Nor is it a secret that Harold Shantz, the counsellor of the embassy and Patterson's political advisor, associates with the Yugoslav reactionaries who count on an Anglo-American war against the Soviet Union in order to regain control of the country. Some day, too, the whole story will be told how Shantz pleaded to have Mikhailovitch removed from the list of war criminals.

These are the men who express the State Department's solicitude for small nations. But the hokum stands exposed. Mr. Byrnes and the administration and their journalistic clagues are tender toward small nations only when they conform to what the State Department thinks is good for them. You are free to think, they say, only as we think, and all other thoughts are violations of freedom.

Yet there is more to the State Department's frenzy over Yugoslavia than this patent hypocrisy over small nations. Behind it is the attempt to create an atmosphere at the Paris conference in which the Eastern European states, and Yugoslavia in particular, will be forced to accept agreements inimical to their interests and threatening to their security. It is easy to see that the outburst against Yugoslavia was to obstruct an equitable and democratic settlement of the Trieste issue. It takes no extraordinary perception to see that Mr. Byrnes is inflaming world opinion against Tito for the

singular purpose of "proving" that he cannot be trusted with the control of a European port. Nor does it take special insight to conclude that through the Yugoslav incident Byrnes is in a position to withdraw from commitments he made in draft treaties prepared by the Council of Foreign Ministers.

At rock bottom all the fire-eating words issuing from the State Department are intended to widen the gulf among the leading allies. The Yugoslav affairs is symptomatic of that breach, for if the leading powers were functioning harmoniously there is nothing that happened in the last week which could not be adjusted in a half-hour of friendly talk. Instead American imperialism chose the diplomatic club, this time without the velvet wrapping. And one need only read Elliott Roosevelt's current articles in *Look* magazine to see how the "path of Franklin Roosevelt has been grievously—and deliberately—forsaken" by Truman. This madness can become a prelude to even greater madness. The method in the madness is to corrode the American mind with caustic lies, to make Americans believe that a country of 15,000,000 is threatening a country of 140,000,000, that a country whose economic life has dropped seventy percent is menacing the most advanced industrial state in the world. Hitler tried this method of fable, and falsehood and forgery. But where is Hitler now?

## TERROR IN THE PROMISED LAND

***Behind the mass arrests, shootings and deportation looms the plot to partition Palestine, to make of a Jewish "state" a British barracks.***

By **MOSES MILLER**

PALESTINE is today in the grip of a ruthless terror instigated by the British and executed with a cruelty reminiscent of Hitler's Gestapo. Military rule has been clamped down. Homes are raided without warrants and on the slightest pretext. Jews are dragged from their beds in the middle of the night and are held incommunicado for weeks and sometimes months. Curfews are imposed with increasing regularity and are already undermining whatever economic life the country possessed. And during the course of these curfews, many of them for as long as twenty-two hours at a stretch, those who have ventured to show their faces at a window have been shot at. In Tel-Aviv a number of children were badly wounded as a result of such incidents.

The people of Palestine have been deprived of the most elementary rights. Patrols march unceasingly through the streets of cities and towns and in recent raids on Tel-Aviv, tanks and armored cars were used in full battle array. Settlements which took years of

toil to build have been destroyed overnight as a result of police and military barbarism. Leaders of the Jewish Agency as well as thousands of others have been arrested and placed in prisons and detention camps. Conditions in them are little different from what they were in the days when the Turks ruled. No distinctions are made between criminals and political prisoners.

Emergency regulations have left the entire population to the mercy of any policeman or soldier who may arrest anyone on the slightest suspicion, and guilt is presumed until proved otherwise. By their use of "protective custody" rules the British have discarded all semblance of justice. These rules enable them to hold prisoners indefinitely without trial and without charges. Very often, people who have been acquitted in court are rearrested immediately and taken off to detention camps and held in "protective custody" without further trials.

Under this reign of terror, it is no wonder that a writer in Palestine 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 hundred 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."

INTO this critical situation has been thrown a new imperialist proposition, ostensibly aimed at bringing a solution but which is, in fact, a method of prolonging and heightening antagonisms, a method for perpetuating imperialist control. I refer to the partition scheme of the Anglo-American Cabinet Committee.

Plans for partition are, of course, not new. Back in 1937, a 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 the real meaning of partition 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 of 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, which was purely British, the present one represents the efforts of the Anglo-American partnership. For political reasons President Truman may demur in public and may even propose that more territory be granted the Jewish sector. The administration is using the Palestine issue as a political football and as part of American imperialism's efforts to use Zionism in gaining strong positions in the Middle East. The State Department's intervention cannot in any way, therefore, be interpreted as an attempt to bring real freedom to Palestine. There is even considerable evidence to show that the recent proposal for partition was purposely harsh so that eventually agreement could be reached on a more "modified" plan which would not, however, affect the maintenance of control by the imperialists.

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, a leader of the Zionist movement 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." Everyone knew he was referring to partition. When he was asked whether he meant partition, he replied: "Don't subscribe words to me which I do not wish to utter." And 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"?

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

When the actual plan was formally proposed, the Jewish Agency—a quasi-official body in Palestine—repudiated it at a Paris meeting. It was obvious, however, that their repudiation stemmed not from opposition to partition in principle. There is no doubt that if the plan 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—Palestine's Jewish community.

The propaganda that will be carried on by the pro-partition forces will, of course, have many high-sounding phrases. They will throw out the bait that although partition is to no one's liking, at least it will bring a Jewish state. And that, they will maintain, is the most important thing. It will give us recognition they will say. We will have the right to be heard and be represented in the halls of nations.

Despite the sweet coating, it will still be poison. What kind of security is in store for the Yishuv, which will have to rely on 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 be controlled by the imperialists. 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—a British barracks 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 an arrangement. They will make some money as contractors and agents for the army. But is this what the 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 speaks? 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 and 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. But there are also in this world Arab masses, struggling for liberation. And this very struggle, that plunges them into ever greater opposition to foreign oppressors, is the very same struggle that places them ever more in 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 be either Arab-Jewish unity or it will be Arab-Jewish enmity.

Meier Vilner, in his testimony before the Anglo-American Commission on behalf of Palestine's Communist Party, stated: "The partition of this

country would spell disaster to Jews and Arabs alike. First of all, because it would strangle any possible economic development. Second, it would strengthen the imperialist regime, since partition means the dependence of both states upon the monopolistic British rulers. Third, such an arrangement would widen the gulf between Jews and Arabs. The partition plan is an imperialistic program to find a new form for the continuation of the old British rule and for the increase of tension between Jews and Arabs."

In a recent statement (August 14, 1946), Senator Pepper outlined the program which represents a basic approach to a solution of the Palestine question. He contended that so long as Palestine remained in the grip of British imperialism (and I might add—in the grip of any imperialism) there will be no end to terror and persecution. Senator Pepper therefore proposed that: (1) The American government immediately demand that England give up its mandate over Palestine; (2) Palestine shall be immediately placed under the supervision of the Big Three within the framework of the United Nations and preparations should be made to develop Palestine into an independent country.

In the same statement, Senator Pepper remarked that the Soviet Union would be able to make a great contribution because of its own experiences in eliminating national oppression. His proposals represent the only democratic solution possible. The grip of imperialism can be broken and the reign of terror ended only when the issue has been removed from the sphere of unilateral action and has been placed before an international commission of which the Soviet Union will be a part.



"Well, it's like this—inflation means higher prices. So, to prevent inflation they're decontrolling prices upward. Is that clear?"

## portside patter by BILL RICHARDS

German audiences shown *The Great Dictator* were impressed with the impersonation of Mussolini. It is quite possible that Benito never photographed better except, perhaps, on his last appearance in Milan.

*Former Italian Premier Bonomi says that "Fascism almost suffocated liberty but did not kill it." We wonder whether he's serious or just choking.*

The War Assets Administration is faced with the task of selling \$33,000,000,000 worth of surplus material. Included in the surplus should be the large quantity of brass hats that the Army is currently talking through.

*UNRRA Director La Guardia has dropped General Morgan. Evidently it didn't speak well of UNRRA to have one of its high officials from hunger.*

Italian Premier De Gasperi has complained that the Trieste settlement "bites into our very flesh." However, it doesn't go quite as deep as a stab in the back.

*The Ministry of Labor reports that Britain has more than 350,000 unemployed. No doubt they are referred to as the Idles of the King.*

General Marshall has stated that a cessation of hostilities in China appears impossible. All the State Department can hope for now is that Chiang Kai-shek is prompt about paying for his supplies.

*An atomic scientist suggests that it may be necessary for the US to conquer the entire world. It has also been suggested that this gentleman be used in the next Bikini underwater test.*

The censors still refuse to lift the ban on *The Outlaw*. If only Congress was as determined not to let the country's inflation show.