

Israeli's Wanton Blood-Raid, Arab Provocations, and Dulles' Foul Hypocrisy Make a Triangle of Guilt in Palestine

By AL FINDLEY

Once again the "Palestine question" has exploded onto the front pages of the newspapers and to the top point on the agenda of the UN.

The immediate background includes charges by Egypt and Syria concerning truce violations by Israel, climaxed by the attack on the Arab village of Kibya.

After the murder of three Jews, including a woman and a child, in a border village, an armed group of Jews attacked three Jordanian villages, and in Kibya killed 46 people, indiscriminately sparing neither women nor children.

The Big Three powers thereupon brought charges in the Security Council of the UN. While the wording of the question was a little ambiguous, it was clear that it was Israel that was being brought to the bar. This did not satisfy the Arab delegate, who insisted that the agenda explicitly condemn Israel in advance.

Russia's Vishinsky supported the Arab demand, but did not play any role in further discussion of the agenda. He allowed the Western powers to carry the ball. Vishinsky's stand, however, did not prevent Jewish Stalinists in Israel and elsewhere from making considerable capital out of the action of the Western powers.

As finally agreed upon, the Security Council agenda was a compromise. Under the general heading of the Palestine question, Kibya was specifically mentioned.

There can be no doubt that the present bloody events were preceded by hundreds of border violations, some of which took the form of pitched battles. It can be readily conceded that the Israelis had plenty of provocation. In the last few years, some hundreds of Israelis have been killed by the incursions of small armed Arab bands and hundreds more have been injured.

Had Israeli retaliation taken the form of an attack on a military post or a similar action, the result might still have been political intervention by the Western powers, but there would have been an entirely different effect on popular opinion both in the world at large and among the Arab people. As it was, the wanton murder of women and children as a form of reprisal was one which only alienated even friends of Israel.

Ben-Gurion's attempt to place the blame on "irregulars" rather than on the Israeli army will not be accepted by anybody. The world is long accustomed to such spurious "irregulars" as the Chinese Stalinist "volunteers" in Korea. Neither will anybody believe that the Arab incursions have been by "irregulars" rather than by elements of the Arab armed forces.

DULLES GETS MORAL

With regard to the charges and countercharges between Israel and Jordan and the other Arab states, an impartial observer may well agree that both sides have justified the charges against each other. Whether the scales dip heavily to one side or the other may be open to debate. But what is not debatable is that the attitude taken by the U. S., Britain and France in this situation is one of complete and rank hypocrisy.

These sanctimonious governments are in no position to call for sanctions against a small power—France, which has just defied the UN by boycotting any discussion of the Tunisian crimes it has committed; the U. S., which also voted to keep Tunisia off the Security Council agenda, and which will not recognize UN authority to define self-government; Britain, which has just suppressed the government of British Guiana. . . .

The action by Secretary of State Dulles in withholding economic aid from Israel is such a moral farce that it exposes all the pretense of U. S. foreign policy.

We have been told by all official voices

that U. S. aid to other countries is an unprecedented generous gift by a self-sacrificing power without any thought of controlling other countries' actions. Dulles has now moved to use this economic aid to punish Israel, by withholding aid, exploding this myth.

Washington has more than once disclaimed any connection between its aid and its approval of the policies of the recipients. This argument was used to justify aid to South Africa despite its racial policy.

ISRAEL AND FRANCO

Above all, Washington's punishment of Israel by withholding aid sheds a new lurid light on the politics behind the U. S. deal with the fascist butcher of Spain, Franco.

If there is anyone in the country who thinks that Dulles' action was really motivated or justified by the Israeli outrage, then he must likewise come to an inescapable conclusion: that the years-

long mass-scale outrages committed by the Franco fascist government in a one-sided slaughter of workers and anti-fascists do not touch the hearts of the U. S. "defenders of democracy" as much as one action by the Israelis in a situation of mutual provocation.

Dulles and the administration have acted as hypocritical liars in one case or the other: their anti-Israel step is a condemnation of their Franco policy, and their Franco policy is a mockery of the high moral pose they have struck in the Palestine question.

This is how the U. S. government has entangled itself in its net of diplomatic deception. Genuine democrats and socialists can condemn the Israeli raid, as well as the Arab provocations; but Franco's allies in Washington cannot.

INSTRUMENT OF U. S. POLICY

As a matter of fact, the Kibya affair was not even officially offered by Dulles as his justification. He claimed that the decision had been taken beforehand.

The real reason for suspension of aid to Israel was not the latter's defiance of the UN. A list longer than this page could be compiled of cases where defiance of the UN did not result in stoppage of funds.

The real reason lies deeper in the policy of the U. S. government. It is the unjustified anger of a giant power against the refusal of a small nation to obey its

wishes. A N. Y. Times report hinted at this when it mentioned that State Department displeasure with Israel has been building up. It mentioned, in this connection, the question of Israel's moving its capital to Jerusalem and other "irritations." The State Department has been vacillating between wooing Israel or the Arab states and this only increases its truculence.

The diplomats may well be able to patch up some kind of temporary settlement. Even if raids are, temporarily halted, even if an acceptable compromise on the Syrian water problem is worked out, new violations and new conflicts are certain to follow unless a real peace rather than a shaky truce is brought into being.

Peace will not come as a result of UN action or even by pressure from Washington and London. More than that is necessary.

Unfortunately it is not only the feudal rulers of the Arab states who oppose peace. Many of the Arab peoples, especially the Arab nationalists, are even more opposed to peace than their rulers. Among the Jews of Israel, peace is acceptable but only on complete acceptance of their own terms.

Before peace can come to the troubled Near East, recognition of their joint interests must lead to a real popular movement for peace among the peoples on both sides, even if against their governments.

Trade-Unionists and Liberals Condemn Radulovich Decision at Detroit Rally

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Oct. 25—During the past week the Radulovich case drew much critical editorial comment and, according to a spokesman for the Edward R. Murrow TV program, the greatest and most favorable interest of any TV program that noted commentator has produced.

Yet on Friday, C. E. Wilson, head of the Department of Defense and top governmental spokesman on military policy matters, sandbagged Lt. Radulovich by a public statement issued at Ann Arbor, Michigan, reiterating the charge that Radulovich is a so-called poor security risk, and stating that the decision to dismiss him from the service will stand.

These developments served as the background for a public rally on civil liberties held here last Friday night by the Michigan Citizen's Committee Against the Trucks Act, the notorious anti-civil-liberties legislation passed unanimously in this state after Detroit's "red hearings," last year.

Around 400 persons gathered at the Central Methodist Church to hear prominent Michigan figures criticize the Trucks Act and blast C. E. Wilson's brutal verdict in the Radulovich case.

Charles Lockwood, prominent Detroit attorney and defense counsel for Radulovich, denounced the decision as "infamous" and pointed out that Wilson was supposed to be the highest court of appeal in this case: "Why, there isn't any point in appealing now. Wilson, sitting as Supreme Court, already has rendered the verdict."

MAZEY SPEAKS UP

Emil Mazezy, UAW-CIO secretary-treasurer, gave the highlight speech of the evening, with a vigorous defense of civil liberties for all persons, minority political parties, including the Stalinists in that category. He warned the audience that the American people had a lot more to fear from the men who own the bulk of

used against the Minneapolis Trotskyist defendants, and told the Stalinists that their record in the labor movement, their political irresponsibility during the war, made it quite difficult to arouse any sympathy in their behalf in the union movement.

Mazezy's speech was in line with the excellent resolution the CIO passed two years ago at its convention held in New York City. It was a remarkable address, for this is the first time in recent times that a prominent and official spokesman for a major CIO union took up a genuine and vigorous defense of civil liberties.

MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

Jerry Raymond of the MESA, the independent union, also made a hard-hitting plea for a struggle to defend all civil liberties. He was very effective in ridiculing the liberals who now are for fighting for civil liberties because "they are going after me next." He pointed out that fighting for civil liberties signified fighting for the rights of the other person, and must be a matter of principle. "I'm far more afraid of two Senator McCarthys or MacCarrons than I am of ten Nat Ganleys. We whipped the Ganleys long before McCarthy was around, by democratic struggle within the unions," he emphasized.

Rev. Paul Taylor, Rev. Robert Bradby

little hope through army channels for anyone on their blacklist.

RADULOVICH'S CRIME

Wilson's hints that there is more to the case than was made public at present are a vicious bit of McCarthyism, for everyone in Detroit who knows the case from A to Z recognizes that all that's involved now is the prestige of the air corps and military regulations. Even Wilson had to admit again that there was no question of loyalty. There is only the fact that Radulovich refuses to repudiate and disown his family. Investigation and testimony from the Hudson local, where Radulovich's father works, exposed the fakery of army claims and allegations against the father, who has an excellent record with 26 years seniority!

As a matter of fact, the only "crime" that Radulovich has committed—and this is unforgivable to the brass—was his refusal to take the smear of "poor security" risk quietly and thankfully, and let the air corps go about its destruction of peoples' reputations and character without public knowledge or fear of exposure. The bitter blowup of the colonel in charge of the phony hearing held at Selfridge field was a good indication of how the brass feels toward Radulovich or anyone else who dares question the ways of militarism.

Nor are the military likely to be pleased with some of the facts that Mazezy brought out in his speech on army justice. Mazezy pointed out that the Veterans Department of the UAW-CIO has already been able to change 500 dishonorable discharges to honorable ones, after making appeals on behalf of ex-GIs who were victims of the notorious courts-martial system in the armed forces.