

Readers of Labor

Presents His View On Palestine Issue

Dear Editor:

Ed Findley's article on the UNSCOP (LABOR ACTION, Sept. 29) correctly rejects both the majority and minority reports as now formulated. He correctly points out that the minority report in no way satisfies the minimum needs of the Jews nor does it eliminate "outside" control of the country. He rejects the majority because of its complete imperialist control during the "interim" period and for the fact that it places an outside "arbiter" (read "controller") over the economic union.

Where Ed Findley is wrong is in rejecting the principle of political partition plus economic partition—if not in principle then as completely unfeasible and unacceptable.

There is no doubt that democratic Arab-Jewish cooperation, guaranteeing the national rights of both, is a preferable solution to partition. However, a large section of the Jewish population desires a Jewish sovereign state in Palestine, although a partitioned one.

Our attitude to the partition of Palestine can "in principle" be no different from our attitude toward the partitioning of India. In India, too, we did not advocate partition but said that if the Moslems—who are, by no means a nationality—desire separation, Marxists must support the demand, if the Moslems so want.

As revolutionary Marxists we must recognize the right of any national minority to separate itself from the majority and form its own independent state. True, we don't always urge them to employ this right.

In Palestine, the Jews seem to desire to exercise that right NOW. Such a bold course would immediately alleviate the burning need of the Jewish DPs and would satisfy the yearnings of many Jews for sovereignty and independence. In addition, they recognize the weakness of the Jewish position in present-day society that can only go from bad to worse in capitalist society and that partition is the most they can realistically hope for.

Economic unity at the same time would preserve all the main advantages that accrue to a united country. Anybody denying the possibility of Jewish-Arab economic union is in a poor position to propose any solution that requires greater mutual trust and Jewish-Arab cooperation.

Partition, too, means immediate independence for the Arab portion of Palestine, and removal of direct

imperialist rule from another segment of the world.

It is well to note that some Trotskyists in Palestine are for partition and proposed a concrete plan to the UN whose boundaries do not differ too greatly from the majority committee boundaries. (Of course, it did not call for a free city of Jerusalem.)

The position of revolutionary socialists, in my opinion, should be immediate independence of both the proposed Jewish and Arab states of partitioned Palestine, economic unity with no outside controller and the further unity of both states in a Socialist Federation of the Near East.

Comradely yours,

Al Findley.

Winthrop Aldrich And "Freedom Train"

Editor:

This is a continuation of my letter in the September 15 issue of LABOR ACTION dealing with the Freedom Train. Using the Freedom Train in this particular epoch isn't mere coincidence—it has subtler implications. It is banal, but nevertheless necessary, to point out once again that when public figures such as those who dedicate and will continue to dedicate Freedom Train at each stop of its journey use terms such as democracy, free enterprise, the American way of life, etc., they are insidiously selling the vast mass of Americans on the idea that America is synonymous with capitalism.

Let's take a look at one of these purveyors of good, solid, dyed-in-the-wool, honest-to-God patriots who sound off on occasions such as Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the American Heritage Foundation, which sponsors Freedom Train, is a case in point. In truth, his is a case history of what lies at the root of all feverish flag waving, chest thumping patriots who take the stump in public and proclaim their undying love for God, flag and country.

Speaking at the Train's opening in New York, September 24, Mr. Aldrich (it wouldn't be a bad idea to capitalize the last four letters in his name) departed himself in this fashion: "It is the keeping of our freedom that concerns us today. Not only does time dull the luster of the brightest faith, unless it is refreshed—but strange and alien doctrines have sprouted like weeds in our midst. There is in the world today a tremendous conflict of ideas."

Also on the rostrum with Aldrich was another would-be status quo