

PERIL IN PALESTINE

SIR ROBERT HOLLAND*

DURING the months that have elapsed since the General Assembly recommended partition of Palestine, the gloomiest prognostications of the plan's opponents have been fulfilled. Sporadic fighting at once broke out between Zionists and Arabs, and guerilla warfare rapidly outmatched the forces of law and order. Unofficial reports set the death toll till the end of March well over 2000. The grievous sufferings of innumerable wounded and the widespread property damage from bomb throwing and looting can only be imagined.

Bloodshed always calls for vengeance, and so each side counts the score and claims that its bestialities are reprisals for the other's crimes. The conflagration is spreading and intensifying. Observers predict that organized and flaming war will follow British withdrawal in May. But there is no sure foundation set on blood. Is partition of the country the sovereign and righteous remedy for the canker of Arab-Jewish strife, and if so by what instrumentality can it be achieved?

Great enterprises affecting human welfare cannot succeed in the long run unless they are powered by emotion born of a noble idea. Will the partition proposal stand scrutiny at the bar of world opinion? Will its enforcement prove to be a cause appealing to civilized peoples on high moral grounds as a "sacred trust" manifesting the "Purposes and Principles" of the UN Charter? And as a matter of abstract justice and right, is Partition demonstrably the only proper solution for Palestine's troubles?

When the General Assembly passed its resolution of 29 Nov., Arab delegates cried, "The Charter is murdered". Arabs claim that the Charter assures to them, as to all other peoples, the right of self-determination; and they maintain that as they form the great majority of the inhabitants of Palestine, they are entitled to determine, by democratic processes and without dictation from outside powers, the lines upon which their self-government should be developed. Zionists, on the other hand, call Arab resistance an attempt to sabotage the authority of the United Nations. The issue, they say, was decided by the United Nations on grounds of principle, and the enforcement of Partition must now be regarded as a crucial test of the Security Council's ability to maintain world peace.

*Retired from the Indian Civil Service, now resident in Victoria, B.C.

Application of Charter Principles

Chapter I of the Charter, which defines the "Purposes and Principles" of the UN Organization, stresses respect "for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," (Art 1 (2)), and for "the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members" (Art 2 (1)). It requires Member States to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the integrity or political independence of any State" (Art 2 (4)); and it excludes intervention by the United Nations (under normal conditions) "in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State" (Art 2 (7)).

It seems clear, therefore, that while UNO may properly intervene in inter-statal boundary polemics involving adjustment of frontiers or apportionment of areas in dispute, its power of inquisition does not normally extend to quarrels between contending elements in a State, or to the partitioning of State domain in an attempt to compose rivalries. That would mean encroachment on a State's sovereign rights, a very exceptional measure, opposed to the ordinary canons of international practice. For instance, more than three millions of the inhabitants of Siam are of Chinese origin, and for years past the upheaval in China has stirred a spirit of intense nationalism in this overseas community, burdening the Siamese Government with an acute administrative problem, the danger of an *imperium in imperio*, and embarrassing its relations with China. But it is unthinkable that the United Nations would exercise intervention on this account and prescribe partition of the country as a remedy, unless local friction became so aggravated as to endanger world peace, a most unlikely event.

Palestine is, however, not a "sovereign" but a "non-self-governing" State and technically, therefore, cannot claim that the "Purposes and Principles" enunciated in Chapter I of the Charter apply to its condition. But the Charter is, nevertheless, based upon the broad idea that outside Powers ought not normally to dictate to the people of any country in regard to the management of their internal affairs. Article 73 in Chapter XI of the Charter declaring UNO's policy in respect of "Non-Self-Governing Territories," recognizes the principle that the interests of inhabitants of such territories are paramount; that self-government should be fostered; and that assistance should be rendered to the people in the progressive development of

their free political institutions. According to accepted democratic practice, such constitutional advance should be directed and regulated by the ascertained will of the majority of the community. It seems to follow that intervention by the UNO in the internal affairs of a non-self-governing State, as by a direction for partition, is not justifiable under the Charter unless international peace is imperilled and unless forceful action by the Security Council may be required.

At the time when UNSCOP's Report was under debate in the Assembly, the USA delegation, which plumped for partition, did not seem to regard the situation in Palestine as potentially dangerous to the peace of the world. Mr. Herschel Johnson, in his statement of 11 October before the UN Special Committee, said frankly that the General Assembly, by admitting the Palestine item to its agenda, did not "undertake to assume responsibility for the administration of Palestine during the process of transition to independence." "In the final analysis", he observed, "the problem of making any solution work rests with the people of Palestine. If new political institutions are to endure, they must provide for early assumption by the people themselves of the responsibility for their own domestic order." With regard to the implementation of the Assembly's recommendations, he said the US Government would be willing to participate in a UN programme to assist the parties involved in the establishment of a workable political settlement in Palestine. He explained that this offer referred to assistance through the United Nations in meeting economic and financial problems and the problem of international law and order during the transition period. This latter problem, he thought, might require the establishment of a special constabulary or police force recruited on a volunteer basis by the United Nations; but he added: "We do not refer to the possibility of violations by any Member of its obligations to refrain in its international obligations from the threat or use of force. *We assume that there will be Charter observance.*"

Mr. Johnson's statement affords cogent proof that when UN policy toward Palestine was under debate, the US Government at all events was not prepared to admit that the issue of world peace was involved. The aggravated turmoil in the Middle East, which now creates a threat to international security, followed and resulted from the partition recommendation.

The common man, therefore, can hardly be blamed if he does not regard the partition proposal as a resounding challenge

to all peace-loving peoples to uphold the pillars of the Charter. He may reasonably feel that it is impossible to derive from Charter principles any justification for carving out a new State from the territory of an existing State—whether it be “sovereign” or “non-self-governing”—in order to meet the wishes of a body of alien immigrants.

Principles of International Law and Morality

But passing beyond the application of Charter principles to problems of this nature, are there considerations in the particular case of Palestine that ought to convince the world that partition is the only righteous and just remedy for the country's malady?

The arguments on either side may be summarized briefly. Zionist claims may be stated thus:

I. The British Government broke the pledge given by Mr. Balfour to Lord Rothschild in 1917 (the Balfour Declaration), which committed Britain to promotion of the Jews' ambition for establishment of a National Home extending over the whole of Palestine and not merely limited to a Ghetto within the country's borders.

The British White Paper of 1939 constituted an injustice that the peoples of the world ought now to terminate, because it aimed at the ultimate creation of a bi-national State, with interim limitation of immigration, and regulation of land purchase by Jews.

II. Zionism is deeply rooted in the remote past. Judaism and its ritual are inextricably linked with memories of ancient Jewish civilization and supremacy in the Promised Land.

Although Jews have been dispersed all over the world, they have always looked to Palestine as their spiritual home. The prophecies of Isaiah abide in their hearts. They verily believe that the Lord will set his hand to recover the remnants of his people; and that “He shall set up an ensign for the nations and shall assemble the outcast of Israel and gather together the depressed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.” (Isaiah, Ch.11, 12).

III. Nor is the link entirely spiritual. Longing for the land of Israel has always permeated Jewish thought. Since the fall of Jerusalem, an element of the Jewish race has continued to dwell in the land and has preserved the national claim. Restoration, therefore, involves a fundamental principle of international justice.

IV. A predominantly Jewish population in Palestine is an essential condition for the establishment of a National Home. The ancient civilization that has enriched the thought and spirit,

of the world must have a free abode in the cradle of its birth, so, that Jews may fashion political and social institutions after the pattern of their own traditions and character, on a level of equality with all other nations in the human family. That was the primary purpose and motive of the Mandate of 1922 under the Covenant of the League of Nations. A National Home in a minority position as part of an Arab State would burst out of such unnatural subjection. Jews who, on the strength of international promise and under national impulse, have made their homes in Palestine did not do so with the object of becoming Arab citizens of Jewish persuasion.

V. Jews have already done marvellous development work in Palestine, changing the face of the country and greatly improving the living conditions of Arabs as well as Jews by raising wages and educational and social standards. Jewish money and resource, and Jewish skill and energy have turned desolate plains and barren hills into fertile and fruitful settlements. Through industrial development and intensive agriculture aided by the Jordan Valley irrigation scheme, the problem of millions of destitute Jews in Europe and the Orient can be solved, and homes can be provided for them all.

VI. Generous sentiment everywhere ought to feel that there is no limit to the reparation owed by the civilized world to a people so grievously wronged by slaughter and dispersion during the World War. By establishing Jewish equality and nationhood in Palestine, the United Nations can make provision for the remnant, and so relieve the darkest human tragedy of our time.

VII. The Arabs have never established a Palestine Government. There has been no independent State of Palestine since 63 B.C., when Pompey stormed Jerusalem.*

VIII. The development of a strong and law-abiding Jewish State in an area of the Middle East which is of supreme importance from the strategic point of view will buttress world security.

Arab claims are listed below.

I. The McMahon pledge of 1915 to Sharif Hussein of Mecca, undertaking that Great Britain would recognize and support Arab independence within specified regions included Palestine. The British Government, therefore, had no right to issue the Balfour Declaration infringing Arab rights.

II. The Balfour Declaration has been fulfilled by the establishment of a Jewish National Home *in* Palestine. Much of the land that Zionists now claim was never actually occupied by the ancient Hebrews. They only passed through Trans-Jordan, and they only raided Galilee "of the Gentiles," and Philistia; they

*This summary is based to a considerable extent on Dr. Weizmann's Statement before the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the UN on 18 October, 1947.

held the territory that they occupied for only 500 years, whereas Arabs have held all Palestine for over 1300 years, being for half that time independent.

III. Zionists have no better claim to lands once invaded by the ancient Hebrews than present-day Italians have to Britain, which was once conquered by Rome, or than Arabs have to Spain, parts of France, Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, India, Russia, and China.

IV. The European Yiddish-speaking Jews, Ashkenazim, who created the Zionist movement, have no ethnic connection with Israel or, subsequently, with Palestine. They were a people of Turkish origin, whose history is interwoven with the very beginnings of the history of the Jews of Russia, and therefore, in Palestine they are alien immigrants. The eastern Jews, known as the Sephardim, may be the descendants of Israel. The greater number of these have been, and still are, living in the Arab world and the Orient, and most of them have denounced Zionism.

V. Arabs have a two-to-one majority in the present population of Palestine; they still retain 85 p.c. of the land; and therefore they are entitled to a predominant voice in the immigration laws. Palestine Arabs dread and abhor the prospect of being reduced to a minority in their own land. No external authority has a right to give away Arab territory to a foreign people. Partition is a violation of elementary justice and the doctrines of the Charter. Is not the wellbeing of the Arabs also a sacred trust of Civilization? Arabs claim the recognized and sacred right of self-defence.

VI. The humanitarian appeal is being used by Zionists as a political weapon, in order to found a foreign political sovereignty in Pan-Arabia. The re-location of displaced Jews is a world problem. Why should the chief burden of it be thrust upon Arab Palestine? Why not press for opening the gates of the Americas, Russia, the British and French empires? How would the United States like to be asked to admit innumerable down-trodden negroes as immigrants supplementing the existing coloured population? Arabs were not responsible for the persecution of Europe's Jews. Why should they have to atone for the sins of Western peoples by being saddled with the victims? Is it not, in truth, because Gentile communities are averse to an increase of the Jewish element in their own populations?

VII. Zionist prosperity schemes cannot compensate Arabs for the loss of their lands and rights. Arabs prefer not to have their country industrialized, or otherwise enriched at such cost.

Moreover, the ambitious projects of Zionists are largely chimerical. Grandiose hydrological schemes are based on the impossible political assumption that water could be taken from Syria, Lebanon and Trans-Jordan and devoted predominantly to the Jewish interest. Palestine is already agriculturally satur-

ated, and the fullest development of its own water resources will not even suffice to maintain the existing population and their children on the land.

VIII. Jewish colonization and socialist experiments are repugnant to Arab individualism. The Muslim world does not want the western world, or its way of life. Western policy creates a void, opening the way to new tyrannies instead of new freedoms. Islam is being provoked once more to *jihad* ("holy war"). That is a collective obligation for all its nations and races. The Sword of Islam is not forgotten. Palestine is holy to Arabs because it is strewn with the graves of their fathers, with their monuments, mosques and chapels. A Jewish State set up within it would have no chance of survival against seventy million Arabs and the myriads of Oriental Muslims.*

Is it possible that the common man, through assessment of these rival claims, will arrive at the conviction that partition of Palestine is an objective impelling civilization to a crusade for Zionism?

As regards the much debated question whether Britain has honourably fulfilled the pledges given to Jews and Arabs, British arguments rebutting Zionist and Arab charges of broken faith are matters of common knowledge. The Balfour Declaration of 1917, undertaking to facilitate "the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people" was conditioned by the reservation "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities" in the country. It is claimed that the undertaking has been fulfilled within the limits imposed. The McMahon pledge of 1915 to the Sharif of Mecca that the British Government would recognize and support Arab independence within the territories proposed by him was conditioned by a reservation excluding certain areas from its scope. The British Government claimed in 1922 that the whole of Palestine west of the Jordan was covered by this reservation. But admittedly there is room for doubt as to the precise meaning of certain passages in the relevant documents, and British and Arab negotiators may, in good faith, have interpreted diversely references to geographical and administrative boundaries.

It may further be noted that the Balfour Declaration and the McMahon letters were not commitments binding the British people in perpetuity to a particular course of action towards Jews and Arabs respectively. Even Treaties have not that

*This summary is based to a considerable extent on Jamal-el-Husseini's Statement before the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the UN in October 1947.

effect, since obligations created by them are liable to be extinguished under certain defined conditions; as by denunciation, by execution having become impossible, or by incompatibility with undisputed law and morals. The pledges to Jews and Arabs were not treaties. They were declarations of intention by the British Government of the time; and as such were liable to be retracted for good reason by any subsequent and differently constituted British Government. Analogy may be found in the fact that President Roosevelt's assurance* to the King of Saudi Arabia in a letter dated 5 April, 1945 has since been nullified by a change in American policy under President Truman. The executive must shape its course in obedience to the people's will, within the limits of formal international obligations.

By accepting the Mandate in 1923, the British Government and people did become internationally responsible for fulfilling the two pledges; subject always to the principles embodied in Art. 22 of the League of Nations Covenant, and to the terms of the Mandate, which incidentally imposed on them the additional duty of developing self-governing institutions for the communities. But as the years passed, the content and significance of each pledge became changed through the operation of events, and their irreconcilability was revealed.

At first, there was good ground for hope that the obligations undertaken towards Jews and Arabs respectively would not seriously conflict. The conclusion of an agreement between Emir Feisal and Dr. Weizmann in January, 1919, seemed to promise well for the eventual cooperation of Arab and Jew in Palestine, and for the bridging of the gap between the two communities within the framework of the Mandate.

The original "independence" pledge to Sharif Hussein primarily connoted freedom from the Turkish yoke, which Arab States had endured for so long. Woodrow Wilson's "self-determination" theory had not then gained currency and aroused the passion of nation-groups for full statehood. That the satrapies should regain the kind of autonomy that they had had for centuries before the Turks came was expected to be enough. This is illustrated by the wording of Clause 4 of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which runs:

*Extract from President Roosevelt's letter to King Ibn Saud dated April 5, 1945:
"During our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action, in my capacity as chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people. It gives pleasure to renew to your Majesty the assurances which you have previously received regarding the attitude of my Government and my own as chief executive, with regard to the question of Palestine, and to inform you that the policy of this Government in this respect is unchanged."

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone.

The UNSCOP Report* (paragraph 176) admits that the terms of the Mandate ran counter to the principle of self-determination. Lord Balfour, before the Council of the League of Nations, remarked that "a mandate is a self-imposed limitation by the conquerors on the sovereignty which they obtained over conquered territories." Palestine Arabs probably did not realize the full implications of this until Zionist expansion aroused their fears and inflamed religious feeling.

Similarly, Zionism at first had little international significance, and at first carried no serious threat to Arab hegemony. When a wealthy group of Zionist Jews, whose headquarters were in New York, secured the issue of the Balfour Declaration, their own primary purpose and motive may have been, as Dr. Weizmann affirms, the establishment of Jews as a nation among the nations of the world. But Zionists were then a comparatively uninfluential body of the Jewish community as a whole. Many Jews already resident in Palestine were undoubtedly averse to the whole idea of an irruption of European Jews. Nor was it likely, on the face of things, that many European Jews would be anxious to leave their settled homes and prospering enterprises and form new roots in a small and inhospitable land.

When Napoleon broke the restraints of the Ghetto and Jews became free to enter the modern world on an equal footing with other people, they attained eminence in many countries and found outlets for their energies and remarkable talents in many spheres. A new era seemed open before them, and there was no need for them to contemplate migration as a people to the Promised Land of the Israelites. But the flowering of Jewish talent, and mounting Jewish success in every sphere of action and learning provoked envy and hatred, and so political anti-semitism was born. Nazis gave full rein to it by the torture and murder of 6,000,000 Jews. It is no wonder that the surviving Jewish population of Eastern Europe, in reaction to persecution, developed a nationalism that has swelled the ranks of Zionists beyond all expectation. The Bal-

*Report to the General Assembly by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, dated 31st. August 1947.

four Declaration thus gained a new content and significance as a result of Nazi race intolerance.

That is why expectations founded on the pledge are now so inflated, and why such bitter exception is taken in some Zionist circles to the 12th general recommendation of UNSCOP (2 dissentients): "that it should be accepted as incontrovertible that any solution for Palestine cannot be considered as a solution of the Jewish problem in general." Out and out Zionists want a limitless State in Palestine, of which the borders can be expanded indefinitely so as to accommodate an ever-increasing concentration of Jews from all over the world in a great National State, destined to push back the boundaries of contiguous Arab states farther and farther. They do not want the displaced Jews from Europe to be accommodated as immigrants in other countries and assume new nationality.

After many years of agonized effort and frustration, the British decided to lay down the Mandate and extinguish their obligations on the ground that fulfilment had become impossible. They are, of course, entitled to do this under the terms and general conditions of the Mandate, and therefore by quitting now they do not lay themselves open to charges of having broken faith with either Arabs or Jews. The UNSCOP Report acknowledges this by saying (page 66): "The terms of the Mandate include provisions which have proved contradictory in their practical application."

As regards other aspects of the Zionist and Arab claims, which have been summarized above, every individual must judge for himself, under the guidance of his conscience, how the balance of justice and righteousness inclines and in which direction the "sacred trust" for humanity is to be discerned. Unfortunately there can be no expectation of unanimity in favour of either side's arguments. General dubiety about the merits of the case and about the possible implications of any imposed award was reflected in the Assembly debates and in the final voting on the resolution. According to press comments, the required two-thirds majority was secured only through lobbying, vote-trading, and various forms of pressure, euphemistically described as "conciliation." Righteous wrath at Gentile inhumanity to Jew cannot but cool, as Hagana and Stern "reprisal" ferocities are proclaimed. Also, there are various countries whose peoples might well feel nervous if the "National Home" theory were sanctified as a principle of general application. It cannot be anticipated that the civilized

world will marshal itself behind a crusade for the partition of Palestine at the invocation of the United Nations. But partisans will line up eagerly on either side.

The Palestine riddle has been probed by experts six or seven times in past years. A Royal Commission in 1937 recommended termination of the Mandate on the basis of partition of the country, but next year a Partition Commission examined three partition plans and rejected them, mainly on the ground that it would be impossible so to divide Palestine as to avoid leaving Arabs in the Jewish State and *vice versa*, without at the same time doing injustice to either Jews or Arabs. Moreover, it seemed impossible to devise a self-supporting Arab State; and no frontiers that could be drawn for a Jewish State would be adequate for purposes of defence. Thereupon, the British Government issued its 1939 "Statement of Policy," based on the conclusion that "*the establishment of self-supporting independent Arab and Jewish States within Palestine had been found to be impracticable.*" The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, 1946, seemed to concur in this, by expressing the view that "now and for some time to come any attempt to establish either an independent Palestinian State, or independent Palestinian States, would result in civil strife such as might threaten the peace of the world." Finally, the UNSCOP Report of 1947 said (Page 67): "Taking into account the fact that devising a solution which will be fully acceptable to both Arabs and Jews seems to be utterly impossible, the prospect of imposing a solution on them would be a basic condition of any recommended proposal."

Nevertheless, the UNSCOP majority proposal was for partition. Its scheme is blighted by the same political, administrative and financial difficulties that attached to previous schemes. Each State would consist of three-non-contiguous areas having indefensible frontiers: the distribution of population must cause disunity in each, as the Jewish State with a total population of nearly a million would include about 500,000 Arabs and others*, while the Arab state with a total population of 735,000 would include 10,000 Jews; the greater part of the wealth and territory would be in the Jewish State: the preservation of the country's economic unity, a matter of vital importance, would become impossible: and finally, the Jerusalem Enclave, and the Holy Places not included in it, would become a battleground for hotheads of differing beliefs.

*90,000 of these are nomads—Bedouins, stock owners and cultivators.

Anyone studying the UNSCOP Report must wonder how, on the basis of the scrupulously recorded facts and contentions, the majority could have arrived at a recommendation for partition. The answer may be found on page 72 of the Report, under the head "Justification," as follows:

The basic premise underlying the partition proposal is that the claims to Palestine of the Arabs and Jews, both possessing validity, are irreconcilable, and that among all the solutions advanced, partition will provide the most realistic and practicable settlement, and is the most likely to afford a workable basis for meeting in part the claims and national aspirations of both parties.

Dr. Weizmann, speaking at Lake Success on 18 October, 1947, enforced this argument by saying:

I agree with the view of the distinguished Soviet representative, that the formal considerations of law and history are secondary at this moment to the considerations of life itself. The main justification, the main necessity for a Jewish State, arises from the facts and urgencies of life itself.

Arab protagonists might equally well say exactly the same. So the whole matter appears to have been viewed by the UNSCOP majority simply as a matter of expediency, and as a case for the operation of power politics.

The average man will probably conclude that the problem reveals itself, not as a moral issue that must enlist all right-minded people on the side of Zionism, but as a typical case of the interplay of rival forces competing for living space and thereby, incidentally, endangering the common peace.

There is profound irony in the reflection that, but for the Balfour Declaration, Zionists, by now, might have penetrated peacefully the whole of Palestine.

Danger to World Peace

World history affords many precedents of aggressive expansion by peoples or nation-groups driven by the subconscious instinct for survival—an elemental urge that pays little heed to moral precepts. The regrettable fact is that no nation-group of people, even at this day, will shape its policy in matters affecting its vital interests, solely in accordance with ethical principles or the rules of conduct embodied in international law, which is law only by analogy and cannot operate with universal authority.

Aggressive expansion of a nation group into the territory of a neighbour nation-group may involve a crime against humanity and civilization. Equally, within a State, the ill-treatment of a minority element in a State by a majority element may involve a similar crime. In both cases, inflammation perilous to world peace may result, and it accordingly becomes necessary for civilized and democratic nations to take such action as may ensure the maintenance of law and order, because the supremacy of the rule of law is the essential foundation upon which democratic institutions and world peace ultimately depend. The Security provisions of the Charter were devised with this intention.

But in concerting measures for dealing with any problem threatening world peace the body of "peace-loving" nations must study the significance of any vivid inter-group tension with special care, and assess its possible implications, lest intervention may aggravate and trouble and spread, instead of allaying, world unrest.

The UNSCOP majority probably inclined to partition as the "most realistic and practicable settlement," because it was generally believed (a) that the United States was strongly in favour of partition and would help to enforce it; (b) that Britain, for economic and strategic reasons, could not afford to quit Palestine and did not really mean to do so, and the British administrative machine would therefore, with assistance, bear the brunt of partition during the transitional period; (c) that Arab opposition need not be regarded as gravely formidable, because of cleavages within the Arab League, because Arab military organizations and resources are indifferent as compared with Hagana, and because full-scale war would disrupt Arab economy and dry up the golden stream of oil subsidies. Each of these assumptions is proving to be ill-founded, and the stark possibilities of interruption of oil-flow from the Middle-East are becoming more apparent.

The Trusteeship Council was asked, in February, to consider the provision of a permanent international police patrol for the neutral zone of Jerusalem. The partition commission almost simultaneously in a very strongly worded report, called upon the Security Council to provide a military force for the implementation of partition. But there is no international force in existence. Moreover, until such time as a World State comes into being, no international force could be expected

to have the cohesion, the discipline, the unanimity of purpose, or the special training and experience required. The loyalty of the personnel would be blurred by the obscurity of the moral issue.

To have any chance of success, the administering authority that under the general supervision of the United Nations, is to take over from the British, must probably be an individual Power not a condominium of the five smaller Powers that have been appointed as a Commission by the General Assembly. Otherwise, intrigue would be rife, and law and order could not be maintained. The *ad hoc* body of troops and police employed would need to be nationals of the administering Power so that proper reliance could be placed on their discipline, loyalty and efficiency, in face of the misgivings and grave temptations to which they must be subject.

The United States could of course tackle the job, but beyond doubt will not undertake it. And then there is the Veto. Soviet Russia, also, could do it, but the result might prove to be quite contrary to the desires of the other Great Powers. There is ground for supposing that the real aim of Soviet policy in the Middle East is to exploit cleavage, with a view to espousing afterwards whichever cause promises most advantage to Communism. Again, there is the Veto.

The moral effect of the partition decision must be weakened by the suspicion that one Great Power (USA) has been influenced in its attitude by a factor of internal politics, while another (Soviet Russia), which formerly opposed Zionism has turned to support it, apparently from motives of self-interest.

Until supreme World Government emerges, with an army, navy and air force owing allegiance to it alone, there can be little hope of enforcing a peace-preservation degree of the Security Council. But an omnipotent World Security Force, instituted before the peoples of the world are "guided into all truth," might prove to be the heaviest calamity yet endured by humanity, if it were captured by a gangster element and became an instrument of world tyranny.

Meanwhile the present plight of the UNO in its first "peace-enforcement" tests is discrediting the whole structure in the public eye, and recalls the ancient fable of "The Emperor's New Robes."

Conclusion

The partition scheme seems faulty and flawed, and incap-

able of standing up when, if ever, attempts are made to enforce it. It enjoins, not merely that Palestine shall be divided between Arabs and Jews, but that the two new States shall be integrated economically, a Utopian dream.

The root problem is still not how partition is to be enforced, but whether it is the right remedy. There is yet time to attempt the compromise between Jews and Arabs within the country, which Britain on more than one occasion might have secured but for what Mr. Bevin, on December 12th., 1947, called "interruption from other countries."

Powerful elements among both Jews and Arabs within, and without, Palestine are in favour of a federal government.

Revision of the plan must entail bloodshed, but would limit the conflagration.

We, the Nations, must "number our days and apply our hearts unto wisdom," if Armageddon is to be averted.