

FROM MONTH TO MONTH

HONOR IS DEPARTED FROM THY GATES

“BRITISH and American imperialism,” said Dr. Moshe Sneh, former head of the Haganah, recently, “are like the two edges of a scissors. Sometimes they work together; sometimes apart. But their point is directed at us.”

How this scissors operates was clearly illustrated at the recent UN Security Council meetings. The Soviet delegation proposed that a cease fire order become effective within 36 hours of its proclamation and that the Security Council be empowered to declare as an aggressor any party refusing to obey the order and to impose all necessary economic and military sanctions.

The American delegation declared its support of the Soviet proposal and voted for it. However, the resolution failed to get the necessary seven votes and was defeated. It is no secret that the American delegation could have secured the passage of the Soviet proposal if it had wanted to. For it would be the height of naivete to believe that countries like China and Belgium would incur American displeasure by voting against a resolution which America wanted passed. How long would Chiang Kai-shek and his reactionary Kuomintang stay in power without American dollars and arms? And how many Marshall Plan dollars would Belgium receive if it incurred the wrath of American officialdom?

Equally revealing was the American delegation's indecent haste to support the British resolution, once the Soviet resolution had been defeated. For an analysis of the British resolution shows complete disregard for the UN decision of November 29 and for the fact that a Jewish state now exists. The resolution has not a word to say about the fact that it is the Arabs who invaded Israel and consequently are the aggressors.

The British resolution calls for the halting of all immigration to Israel of men of military age, thereby giving the Arab states fresh opportunity to recruit further manpower while keeping Israel down to its present manpower. The British resolution would also halt all shipment of arms to the Middle East, another treacherous maneuver which would work against Israel alone. For this would establish a world-wide boycott against Israel while the Arab states would continue to receive military supplies from Britain under the pretext that they were for other purposes.

Such is the truce which America and Britain are seeking to put across. As Richard Crossman declared, this is a “peace offensive against the Jews . . . even more dangerous

than the Arab invasion.” And while this truce is in effect, Anglo-American imperialism hopes to put the finishing touches on a plan which will insure their continued domination of Palestine, as of the Middle East generally, and that Israel shall become an Anglo-American puppet state.

What are the general outlines of the Anglo-American plan? Numerous British and American spokesmen as well as many correspondents have hinted at it. Walter Lippmann put it plainly in the *Herald-Tribune* on June 3:

“To achieve an armistice and then peace in Palestine is a matter primarily of imposing an armistice and negotiating a treaty between Transjordan and Israel. . . . There is now in sight the main outline of an honorable settlement which will fit the vital interests of all concerned, namely the expansion of Abdullah's kingdom up to the partition line, except for an international enclave of Jerusalem; a treaty of peace and alliance between the enlarged Transjordan and the State of Israel; and then a confederation with economic union between them. This would bring into existence a Middle Eastern Commonwealth which would be under the joint protection of Great Britain and the United States.”

The dangers to Israel inherent in this plan are not too hard to make out. The negotiation of a treaty between Israel and Transjordan is an invitation to Britain to resume control over Palestine. For it is no secret that Abdullah is a hired man who does Britain's bidding for a cool eight million dollars a year. Nor will American imperialism be a minor partner. For while the press and even some Jewish leaders try to give the impression that America is an innocent dupe, the facts show otherwise. Even a superficial survey of the Middle East will readily indicate the extent to which American imperialism has forced concession after concession from Britain to the point where American economic interests now surpass those of Britain.

What are the consequences of such a plan for Israel? After having fought heroically for its independence and for the abrogation of the mandate, it will find itself once more under the yoke of imperialism. But this time there will be two imperialisms to which tribute must be paid.

It is now becoming increasingly clear to many who had previously ignored the question, that the future of Israel depends upon the fulfilment of the *entire* UN decision, which means the struggle for the establishment of an independent Arab state as well as of the State of Israel. Both American and British imperialism have very con-

veniently forgotten about this part of the UN decision. And with good reason. For the imperialists' hope of reducing Israel to a vassal rests on their ability to frustrate the establishment of a free and independent neighbor state on Israel's borders, on their ability to extend the domain of a puppet state into Palestine proper and thus regain entrance and a renewed hold over all of Palestine.

In a speech at the Salute to the Jewish State at the Polo Grounds on May 15, Jacob Riftin, leader of the United Workers Party in Palestine, declared: "The British mandate over Palestine ended yesterday. We Jews of Eretz Ysroel can repeat the words of the poet: 'There was no joy in our cohabitation, there is no pain in our separation.' And yet there is no certainty that Britain really means to leave. For Britain has perfected the art of 'leaving' while laying the basis for 'remaining.' As you know the appetite not only of British imperialism but of imperialism generally is voracious in its desire to swallow up the Near East. I believe that I speak not only for the United Workers Party but for the majority of the Yishuv when I declare that we do not want our future to be built on the basis of fictitious independence as is the case, for example, with Abdullah's state. We want real political, economic and military independence."

American Jewry, like the democratic forces of America generally, have a major role to play in the struggle of Israel for independence. The American Jewish community must give unceasingly and unsparingly to help Israel in its present war for survival. Equally important is the political struggle to lift the embargo. Though hypocritical promises have been forthcoming from the White House and the administration, real recognition for Israel remains to be won. Funds to Britain from our government must be stopped and effective sanctions must be applied against the Arab aggressors.

This battle will not be won if illusions are fostered that the bipartisan architects of American policy can be relied upon. Certainly it was disturbing to hear Emanuel Neumann, president of the Zionist Organization of America, introduce Senator Robert A. Taft to the Madison Square Garden audience celebrating the proclamation of the Jewish state, as the one diplomat who never wavered in his loyalty to the cause of the Jewish state. Nor was it edifying to find a United Jewish Appeal advertisement featuring a letter of Mr. Forrestal endorsing the United Jewish Appeal.

The interests of Israel are not served by such tactics. American Jewry can carry out obligations to Israel only by a clear-cut anti-imperialist fight.