of dividing Palestine means a Jewish state without Jews, means Zionism without Zionists." A Jewish state without Jews is, naturally, an overstatement probably caused by the shock which was felt by certain parts of the Yishuv on the day when the report was published. Even on the shrunk, completely lacerated and crippled territory of the projected Jewish state there is probably room, beside the three hundred thousand Jews who already live there, for hundreds of thousands of new Jewish immigrants. Even within mutilated Palestine, there can arise a flourishing Jewish settlement which will for many, many years stimulate Jewish life, Jewish energy and Jewish activity throughout the world. But this is not Zionism, certainly not Great Zionism, and one cannot accept it as a complete solution, regardless of how enthusiastic one may be about a Jewish flag, about Jewish epaulets, about Jewish ambassadors and consuls in foreign countries...
A whole success of the Jewish National Home is hereditary as rigorously as in Palestine where the Jewish world. In spite of this, the abnormal trade-status required by the Mandate was nowhere adapted to a British demand for a reasonable amendment of these provisions, which though originally motivated by good intentions, proved later to be out of place in the present highly protectionist world. Even tourists going to Palestine were required to deposit a substantial sum to insure their early departure from the country.

Another means of combatting Jewish expansion was to make land purchases by Jews as difficult as possible. The otherwise reactionary bureaucrats of Palestine's administration adopted almost Socialist principles in their zeal to protect Arab tenants whose well-being might be affected by Jewish land purchases. Owners of uncultivated tracts of land, on the other hand, were granted freedom from taxation in order to enable them to hold on to their land indefinitely, avoiding the necessity of selling it to land-hungry Jews.

Jewish participation in public works and in the general administration of the country was reduced to a level much lower than the one to which they were entitled according to their numbers and the taxes paid by them. In most cases this was achieved through the exceedingly low compensation for all kinds of government work. Policemen, railroad workers, letter carriers, watchmen, laborers on public highways, and lower clerks receive wages based on the lowest Arab standard of living, although the government, owing mainly to the great economic opportunities opened to them immediately after the War. Nor can it be denied that some Zionist leaders, for the sake of a catchy phrase, were too often inclined to exaggerate the scope of their own aspirations, thus engendering an uneasy feeling even among those Arabs who were originally inclined to view Jewish aspirations with an open mind.

But even conceding our share in the comedy of errors which finally resulted in a bloody tragedy, we cannot absolve England from the main responsibility for the present crisis. There is not the slightest doubt in our minds that if England had faithfully fulfilled the obligations assumed under the Mandate, we would now have in Palestine not 425,000 Jews, but at least double that number, and if such were the case, anti-Jewish riots would be less likely to occur, and the chances for a Jewish-Arab reconciliation would be much greater. In any event we resent the British investigators' verdict on the impossibility of a Jewish-Arab peace. England, which from the beginning, built up its Palestine policy on the principle of "divide et impera" and any power who has consistently discouraged all efforts towards a Jewish-Arab understanding, has no moral right to make such a broad statement.

Besides, does not such a verdict give strong support to anti-Semitic theories that, because of his pernicious traits, the Jew must always arouse the resentment of his neighbors? We do not accuse the members of the Royal Commission of anti-Semitism. We concede, in all fairness, that many parts of their Report show a genuine appreciation of Jewish efforts and much sympathy for Jewish suffering throughout the world. The fact remains, however, that their verdict, though not
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intentionally, fits admirably into the anti-Semitic conceptions of the irreconcilability of Jews and Gentiles and the necessity of separating them as much as possible.

We believe that even now, after all that has happened in Palestine, it is still possible to establish better relations between Jews and Arabs if only England would honestly fulfill its Mandatory obligations instead of using its masterful tricks to avoid them. With so many examples in history, of seemingly hopeless national quarrels which came to an end when a basis for honest understanding was reached, we refuse to give up all hope for Jewish-Arab reconciliation. We cannot, therefore, accept the basic principle of the Royal Commission's report and must reject its practical conclusions.

Since its publication the partition plan has been rejected by every important Zionist body which has had an opportunity to discuss it. Even before the plan was published such rejection was pronounced by the Actions Committee at its meeting in Jerusalem and by the American Zionists at their convention in New York. Later strong resolutions condemning the proposed partition have been adopted by the Labor Party of Palestine and by many Zionist groups throughout the world. We must, however, admit that the number of actual supporters of the partition plan among the Zionists is much greater than appears on the surface. Many Zionist leaders who, in public, express the sharpest opposition to the plan of partition are, privately and sub-rosa, working for its realization. The Jewish press is flooded with hints that if the partition is rejected, something worse may happen. Another method of creating sentiment in favor of the partition is the suggestion that after it is accepted in principle, we would still be able to gain through negotiations a substantial extension of the limits proposed by the Royal Commission. A third argument is the assertion that after the establishment of the proposed "Jewish State", it would still be possible to expand our colonization beyond its frontiers.

Let us analyze, as briefly as possible, all these three arguments. How far are they in accordance with the reality? Let us first consider the possible alternatives to the partition scheme. The Royal Commission itself mentions some of them. One is confining the Jewish immigration to 12,000 a year, which is the theoretical difference between the Jewish and Arab natural increase. The other is further restrictions of land sales to Jews. The third is the enlargement of the Advisory Council by representatives, elected or appointed, of both nations.

After mentioning these alternatives, the Commission itself rejects them as impossible. Why? It offers several reasons, but omits the most important. All these palliatives would be a clear violation of the terms of the Mandate and would, therefore, arouse the greatest resentment among the Jews all over the world. If, however, a Jewish State, even a small one, is established, many Jews (at least the Commission believes so) will be contented and, England, in any case, will be in an unassailable legal position. After all, the Balfour Declaration did not promise more than "the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine . . ." The Jewish State fits admirably into the words, if not into the spirit of this famous document.

Should the partition plan not go through, and Palestine remain undivided under a British Mandate, England could not venture too far in its restrictions of Jewish immigration and land purchases. On the contrary, the whole logic of the situation would drive her at least to maintain public order in the territory of the Mandate. After future development will have proven that the riots of 1936 did not achieve their deeper political purpose, it would be senseless from the point of view of the British administration to assume a mild attitude towards efforts to repeat them. That the British can prevent such attacks, or, at any rate, stop them, before they become a habit, is convincingly proven by the present tranquility in Palestine now after the publication of a Report containing so much explosive powder . . . This tranquility is the most convincing answer to those naive persons among us who believe that poor England was helpless in the face of the last anti-Jewish attacks.

As long as Jewish lives are safeguarded, at least for several years, many of us would prefer even strict limitation of Jewish activities in the whole of Palestine to temporary greater possibilities in one separated part of it. Legal limitations may end sooner than definitely established frontiers.

In any case one cannot believe that the limitations and restrictions which may be expected in the event Palestine remains undivided, would be as drastic as those mentioned by the Royal Commission. They represent the maximum of evil; it is quite probable that the logic of the situation would drive Great Britain to a more faithful interpretation of its mandate obligations.

No less flimsy is the argument that if we give our formal consent to the partition, we will be able substantially to enlarge the frontiers of the Jewish State by subsequent bargaining. This argument seems to be the strongest drawing card in a present straw vote on the acceptance or rejection of the report: the most popular answer has been: "to accept, but with larger frontiers for the Jewish State."

A cool analysis of the situation will convince us that if we accept the partition plan in principle, the prospect of obtaining larger frontiers will prove to be an illusion. The moment we give up our
broader claims, based not only on history but also
to an even larger extent on the dynamics of Pale-
side's development; the moment we are ready to
consider the Palestine imbroglio from a static
point of view, as a problem of dividing a common
inheritance between two peoples who are definitely
unable to live in one house, the partition scheme
cannot be considered unfair to the Jews. Taking
cognizance of the present relation of forces only,
and rejecting everything that happened in the past
and which will probably happen in the future, the
offer just made us by the Royal Commission is
quite generous. On what basis may we claim the
"Negev" (the southern, semi-desert part ofPale-
tine) if by accepting partition in principle we ad-
mit the solution of Palestine's problem on the basis
of crystallization? After all there are also Arabs
to bargain with.

A sober analysis of the situation brings us to the
conclusion that with the exception of minor adjust-
ments (for instance, the inclusion of the Daganias
and a slight extension of the Jewish frontier to the
South) the general shape of the Jewish State will
have to remain as it is, if accepted.

This is why the slogan of an acceptance of the
plan but with larger frontiers is doubly misleading:
it may create in London a wrong impression
of the actual sentiment among the Jewish masses,
and it may encourage the latter to a false concep-
tion of the intentions of England.

It is possible that England may decide to parti-
tion Palestine even against Jewish and Arab
wishes. Most legal minds are interpreting the de-
cisions of the British government in this sense. Of
course a Jewish State forced upon us as a fait ac-
compli is something else than a state involving a
solemn renunciation of the historic aspirations of
Jewish people in the whole of Palestine.

Let us also say a few words about the accept-
ance with "mental reservation" advocated by cer-
tain Zionist writers: "Let us accept what is being
offered and hope for something better in the fut-
ure." This idea was best expressed by a British
Labor deputy at a Jewish meeting in London.
The good man, remembering his Bible, advised his
Jewish listeners to follow the example of our fore-
father Jacob. "Take Leah, and seven years from
now you may get Rachel."

There is only one little flaw in this analogy.
Rachel waited for Jacob and did not marry any-
body else. Had that not been the case, his chances
would not have been quite as bright.

As a matter of fact, the whole report of the
Royal Commission is based on the idea of creating
a strong Arab State which would stand on its own
feet economically, and would not have to pray
clandestinely for a future Jewish immigration.

Not only will future Jewish immigration be pro-
hibited in the rest of Palestine outside of the Jew-
ish State, but conditions will be created that will
make such an immigration economically superflu-
ous. The $10,000,000 grant of the British treas-
ury to the Arab State, together with the yearly
Jewish subventions and, still more important, the
large sums of money which will have to be paid to
Arab landowners and tenants who will prefer to
leave the Jewish State and settle in the Arab one,
will be used for finding water and developing irri-
gation facilities in the Arab state and, in general,
for the creation of a stronger, more modern agricul-
tural base for its economic well-being.

With the influx of the wealthy Arabs from the
Jewish section and a probable immigration of
Arabs from the desert, the Arab State of "Falas-
tin" will be put on an incomparably stronger basis
than the present state of Trans-Jordania. If Eng-
land was able to close Trans-Jordania to Jewish
immigration in spite of the actual starvation among
its Arab peasants and the great craving of the
larger landowners there to sell some land to the
Jews, in order to obtain cash for making the rest
profitable, how much easier will it be to keep
closed the gates of the much stronger and richer
Arab State which will be created by the partition.
Besides, the agriculturists of the new Arab State
will have a comparatively easy access to the mar-
kets of Jewish Palestine. The Report recom-
mends tariff preferences between both parts of
Palestine and our own economic future will force
us to accept this suggestion.

Finally, we must not minimize the force of
Arab nationalism which will unquestionably be cul-
tivated in the new Arab state. That state will not
be dependent on Jewish immigration for its very
existence, and unless it is, no Jewish immigration
will be allowed.

In other words we may be forced to accept the
homely Leah. But let us forget our dreams of the
glamorous Rachel; they will only disturb our
domestic peace.