

# n on the Palestine Issue

## Charges Errors In Judd Article

Editor:

The following are some of the errors in Comrade Judd's article on Palestine:

1) His conception of what is happening in the country is given most clearly in this analogy: "Suppose Britain had proposed an Indian division unacceptable to the Hindus but accepted by the Moslem League. And that then the Moslems, armed and supplied by British imperialism, had gone to war to support this partition? This . . . would be closer to the picture presented by Palestine." This means—if it means anything at all—that the British proposed the partition, that the Jews accepted it, and that the British are supplying the Jews with the weapons against the Arabs.

I shall not repeat the facts which I cited in my last article to show that the British are straining every ounce of strength at their command to block partition, and to impose unity under Arab domination upon the country. That this was the main reason why, during the war, they followed a policy of having as many Jews exterminated as possible is documented in almost so many words in the Morgenthau Diaries. During the past two weeks they have taken the following actions. (1) Intercepted another ship of Jewish refugees; (2) protested to Bulgaria against its permitting Jews to use Bulgarian ports; (3) bombed a Jewish newspaper (that this was done by British police was revealed by an Arab paper, which the British have since suspended); (4) warned, through Creech Jones, against lifting the arms embargo; (5) continued openly to supply the Arabs with arms.

Upon what single fact does Judd base his opinion that the British are for the partition of Palestine? What more could British imperialism possibly do, short of declaring war on the Jews, to make Comrade Judd understand that it is bent upon imposing unity upon the country?

2) Judd asks us: "Is it not obvious that it is intervening imperialism—who are stimulating the firing?" Of course this is obvious. To establish

an open flow of arms to one side, while maintaining a blockade and embargo against the other, certainly stimulates the first (the Arabs) to violence, while forcing the other side to defend itself (also by violence). Britain certainly gains from this. But there is nothing that the Jews can do to change this—the violence can be stopped only by the Arabs. It is **thoroughly false** to say smugly that both sides are equally reactionary. Don't we have a right to expect everyone to understand such a simple relationship?

3) Comrade Judd states that one of the reasons why he does not support partition in Palestine is that, unlike the situation in India, the Arabs did not agree to it. This implies that if the Hindus had not agreed to permit partition, he would not have supported Moslem right to it. Even the slightest reflection should show that to support self-determination only on the basis that the dominant nation agrees to it, is to oppose the right of self-determination. (However, whereas in India a nation has been partitioned, in Palestine only a geographic territory has been divided between two different nations).

4) Comrade Judd tells us that before we can support a national struggle, "it must be carried on independently . . . of any third imperialist force." Until the triumph of socialism on an international scale, an imperialist force will never be absent from any colonial struggle anywhere on earth. A recent example is the case of Syria and Lebanon. Ever since World War I Britain has backed Arab nationalism in these two countries against France, and against the Jews in Palestine. The decisive pressure in forcing France to quit these countries was supplied by England. Yet no one would have refused to support the Arabs on that account, or demanded that the struggle be suspended until England and France composed their differences, so as to have a pure colonial revolution.

5) "Pray, do not tell us the British mandate is ending—yes, to be replaced by the UN mandate, controlled by America," says Comrade Judd. In this amazing sentence Comrade Judd himself recognizes that which he prays us not to tell him—i.e., that the British mandate IS ending. But,

he adds, it is "to be" replaced by an American mandate—i.e., in the future. Perhaps. In the future, even the hysterically assimilationist New York Times, which frightens its readers with the bogey of a Russian foothold in Palestine, may be proved correct.

## WHAT IS THE FUTURE?

But this has not happened yet. It is only one of the possible eventualities which may crystallize from the situation (in my opinion, an unlikely eventuality). What happens in the future will be determined by many unforeseeable factors, one of the most important of which is the question of whether the Jews get arms or not.

If the Jews get arms, it should be clear that this will deprive imperialists of any excuse to intervene. Even the sending in of outside troops would not necessarily change the situation basically (any more than the use of British force changed the situation in Syria and Lebanon). Barring a major imperialist war, the only possibility for a decisive change for the worse is the establishment of a new outright mandate by some other power, or by Britain. Neither of these will happen as long as the Jews are armed.

I shall discuss some of the other errors in Comrade Judd's presentation in a future article.

Leon SHIELDS, Feb. 21, 1948.

Read and Subscribe to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

NOW!  
OUT!

The

NEW

INTERNATIONAL