

PALESTINE: Two Plans

OUR attitude toward UNSCOP's two plans for Palestine rests on the firm belief that the best solution would be a dual state where Arabs and Jews would live side by side as equals. This has been first principle with us. It is our strong belief, too, that a dual state can prosper and realize a full measure of independence provided all imperialisms are expelled—in this instance the British and their covert American supporters. With this as the angle of approach we cannot completely endorse—or reject—either the minority or majority reports. The reason is simple. It would be foolhardy, for example, to ignore the fact that the two projects are the work of a group not dominated by imperialist influence and that they represent an international effort rather than the exclusive, oil-minded attempts of either London or Washington. A definite advance over the past can, therefore, be registered.

What are the merits of each plan and what are their deficiencies?

Both reports grant that the Jews have fundamental rights in Palestine; both acknowledge that the Jews are entitled to statehood. They are also in agreement that Arab-Jewish harmony is indispensable and that economic unity—although the reports differ on how to achieve it—is basic to the progress of the two peoples. Moreover, the reports insist on provisions for Jewish immigration into Palestine—but here again there are differences. In this respect the majority plan is superior for it states clearly the number of Jews that shall be permitted entry into Palestine in the next two years.

On the other hand, the majority plan is sadly lacking in that it presupposes an interim two-year period after which Great Britain will relinquish its mandate and help erect the two independent states according to the partition outlined. Imperialism does not work that way and no one in his right mind can assume that after decades of entrenchment the British, or for that matter an Anglo-American body, will simply pick up and leave without a trace. In this regard, the minority approach is better grounded and more realistic. It asks for United Nations supervision in the period of transition.

When the majority plan turns Jerusalem into an autonomous area in the heart of Palestine it is indeed paving the way for trouble. This independent territory could easily become an imperialist wedge threatening both Jews and Arabs. And by the same token the

majority's inclusion of the Arab cities of Jaffa and Beer Sheva in the Jewish state and important Jewish communities in the Arab state does not make for stability and peace. Nor is it practical or possible to conceive, as the majority plan does, a joint economic council when both Arabs and Jews will be compelled to live in separate economies. Palestine is not big enough for such ventures. The economic future of both Arabs and Jews are interdependent and a line of demarcation, despite a joint economic body sitting on top, is harmful. Without economic cooperation that is more thorough than the majority report visualizes there is the very serious menace of conflict. Both peoples must develop economic relations between themselves and with the whole of the Arab Middle East, for the Jewish community cannot advance solely by its own resources and neither can the Arabs.

In this context the minority report is decidedly more realistic. Its scheme of federation between Jewish and Arab states rests on the concept of a single economic entity. New avenues of Jewish-Arab cooperation can be opened that would be beneficial to both peoples and eliminate the cross-purposes which separate economies would entail. Jerusalem would serve as the capital of this federal union and it would be the United Nations that would give bone and muscle to the plan. But unfortunately the minority report is foggy on the issue of immigration and its provision for an Arab-dominated parliament collides with the need for complete equality, without which a dual state cannot safeguard the rights of each people.

In essence, then, a large step forward has been taken, but it falls seriously short of the goal for which the Arab and Jewish masses have been striving. It would be folly to pooh-pooh entirely either report or to accept them without qualifications or the demand for improvements. If the need for compromise is discarded the gainers will be the imperialists. They await the kind of contest in which they will again be supreme and out of which the torment of the Jews will mount. But compromise based on the unity of Arabs and Jews working through the United Nations can defeat their common enemies, just as it can force the State Department to stop equivocating and assume a position of honor instead of the abject one of making oil companies happy.

JOHN STUART.

The History of Hue and Cry: II

After the Salem witches and the Jeffersonians the target became Catholics, abolitionists, organized labor. Thought control at home, aggression abroad.

By **JOHN HOWARD LAWSON**

The first installment of Mr. Lawson's article appeared in last week's issue of NM. The concluding section will be published in the next issue.

WHEN Irish immigrants arrived in large numbers to labor in our factories and fields, the special exploitation of these newcomers was aided by a brutal propaganda campaign against Catholics and foreigners. The Catholics were now accused of precisely the same worldwide conspiracy against decency and civil government formerly attributed to the Illuminati. The circulation of anti-Catholic falsehoods produced the "normal" results—the burning of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Mass., in 1834, and riots that destroyed houses, schools and churches in Philadelphia a decade later. Books written specifically for this political purpose, such as *Six Months in a Convent* and the *Awful Disclosure of Maria Monk*, propagated the blatant falsehoods that brought these disturbances—and kept the wages of immigrants at a level which was satisfactory to their employers.

How did these anti-democratic tendencies in the decades preceding the Civil War relate to the question of imperialism and foreign policy? The bankers and speculators who were the most determined enemies of Jacksonian democracy were closely allied with the Southern plantation owners. The same bankers and speculators were also entangled with the British financiers and industrialists who purchased the Southern cotton crop.

A three-cornered web of cotton threads was woven between the eastern seaboard of the United States, Manchester cotton mills and the slave plantations. Nicholas Biddle of the Bank of the United States was so deeply involved in the plantation system and its English connections that, during the panic of 1837, he found it necessary to extend heavy unsecured

loans to Southern banks even when the position of his own bank was desperate. These credits were an important contributing factor in the failure of the Bank of the United States.

This complex of power explains the dominant role that the slaveholders assumed in national politics in the decades preceding the Civil War. Southern aims were frankly expansionist.

Slavery involved the wasteful exhaustion of the soil and the exclusion of industrial development. The slave system could not exist without territorial aggrandizement. The rulers of the South inherited the Hamiltonian dream of conquest in Central and South America. W. H. Holcombe wrote: "We anticipate no terminus to the institution of slavery. It is the means

